

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 11, 1957

FIVE CENTS

## A Document from Budapest: The Role of the Nagy Group Inside the Hungarian CP

... page 6

## CORPORATION FARMS VS. FAMILY FARMS

... page 2

## Three Wins Boost British Labor's Drive

... page 3

## Ghana: On This Continent a New Nation ...

... page 7

## Take a Hard Look at South's "Good" Racists

By SAM TAYLOR

The patterns of Southern resistance to the desegregation of public schools is running into its severest tests in federal courts.

Immediately after the historic 1954 decision of the Supreme Court calling for an end to segregation in public schools with "all deliberate speed," Southern racists began devising ways of delaying, blocking and subverting the intent of the court's decision.

As Southern legislatures begin their sessions this year, nearly all of them will be concerned with plugging the holes in their systems of segregated schools or curtailing, where not outlawing, the operations of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In respect to school segregation there are essentially two approaches. The first is proposed by those calling for a direct head-on clash with the federal government and the use of the police powers of the state in a knock-down drag-out fight to preserve segregation. The other is a comparatively moderate program of legal delaying actions.

While there is no hard-and-fast line between the two, the differences between those united in common defense of segregation should be taken into account.

The former is roughly the approach of the White Citizen Councils and the more

radically racist groups who want to build a movement committed to the defense of all Jim Crow institutions.

The latter are the moderates, the more "liberal" and far-sighted groups who want to avoid a direct head-on clash with the federal government as the pressure to integrate increases.

It is also the point of view of industrialists fearful that new industry will not move to their area if there is violence and bombings against Negroes. They wish to use other, legal means, and to avoid the glare of publicity.

### INDUSTRIALIST'S VIEW

At a January meeting of the Committee of 100, an organization formed several years ago to induce Northern industry to build plants in the Birmingham (Alabama) area, this problem was taken up. William P. Engel, former head of the committee, added up the costs from a businessman's point of view of what he called "hoodlumism" in the recent bombings in Birmingham and in Montgomery, 100 miles away:

"We in Birmingham particularly must face up to our deficiencies and face them squarely. The hoodlumism that has occurred in Birmingham in past weeks and in recent months has hit the headlines all over the country. This unfavorable publicity (Turn to last page)

## The Racket Probe: A Threat to Unions?

By BEN HALL

In just a few days, Senate hearings have stirred up a slithering mess of corruption in unions whose officials were linked up with enterprising underworld characters. And the sessions are to go on for a year; some say two; others think they may last indefinitely. The vast majority of unions are honestly run and it is appalling to imagine the effects upon the labor movement of a continuing parade of crime enacted before the eyes of the nation.

Responsible union officers have expressed their readiness to cooperate with government investigations of so-called labor rackets. Although they have always been resentful of government intervention into union affairs, this time it is clear that labor leaders have no intention of making any protest.

Yet it is obvious that a steady glare of publicity upon crooks in unions will tend to undermine the reputation of all unions, at least temporarily—if not on the part of well-informed citizens, then on the part of those, alas, whose minds are attuned to a quick glance at big headlines.

What is more ominous is the possibility that anti-union politicians will be emboldened by the newly charged atmosphere to press for sterner laws restricting the le-

gitimate economic and political rights and activities of labor organizations.

In the N. Y. Times, labor reporter Joseph Loftus writes: "Labor's political drive may be blunted, with the result that anti-union forces in the legislatures and in Congress will find it easier to put repressive labor laws on the books. At least labor will find it harder to enact its own program. And in such a climate, organizing, especially among the white-collar folk, will become more difficult than it has been in years."

### PROTEST?

With this in mind, some commentators maintain that the unions should have voiced a strong unanimous protest against any government investigation, taking their stand against any state interference in unions in general and denouncing the current investigation in particular as a smear in advance. But it is hard to see how they could have successfully have done so. As the register of crookedness inevitably unfolded, it would have been too easy to accuse all unions of trying to cover up for crooks if they appeared in any way to endorse a suppression of the facts.

But more: The Senate begins not by investigating legitimate labor union ac-

(Turn to last page)

## What DW's Clark Said in Columbia Debate

A debate between the foreign editor of the Daily Worker, and an associate editor of LABOR ACTION: the very idea that such a debate could be held would have sounded like a fantasy a few years ago. But such a debate was held, on February 27 before some 150 students at Columbia University under the auspices of the Eugene V. Debs Club.

Furthermore, the actual debate was far more fantastic than anything one could have imagined in the days when the constitution of the Young Communist League prohibited its members from talking to "Trotskyite fascists."

The subject was "The Crisis in Eastern Europe." The speakers: Joseph Clark of the "Daily Worker," and Gordon Haskell of LABOR ACTION. The tone was strictly within the conventions of polite debate (Clark insisted on referring to Haskell as "my colleague" throughout); the questions and discussion were voluminous.

In the course of the debate, and in answer to questions and remarks by his opponent and from the floor, Clark as-

serted the following:

The establishment of one-party regimes in Eastern Europe "set the clock back" there . . . He is opposed to a one-party regime, not only in these countries but in Russia also . . . In his opinion, the "Soviet forces had no right to intervene in Hungary." . . . He, for one, will continue to "fight for democracy" in Hungary in his paper and in his party. . . . Although he refused to use the term "imperialism" to describe Russia's action in Hungary, he described it as the imposition of the will of a great power on a small one by force, as the suppression of the national and democratic aspirations of the people of this small country, and the like. . . . He described the Russian intervention in Hungary as a "Stalinist-type" action, and attributed it to the fact that "vestiges" of Stalinism still exist in Russia and express themselves in Russian policy.

In fact, Clark went so much further in his discussion and condemnation of the non- or anti-democratic character of the Communist regimes in Russia and Eastern Europe than had any representatives of the Communist Party in other forums and debates held in New York recently, that students in the audience kept asking him why he calls himself a Communist instead of a social-democrat, and what his criticism of the social-

democrats might still be.

His reply was that he criticizes the social democrats for not establishing socialism in countries where they had come to power by parliamentary means. But he made no attempt to defend anything, except the nationalization of the means of production, in the countries where the Communists have come to power.

### PREDICTIONS

Clark agreed with Haskell to such an extent on the latter's description and denunciation of the Communist regimes (except to deny that there is a ruling class in countries where they hold sway), that the issue of the debate was drawn not on the line of democratic socialism vs. communism, but rather on the "Hungarian Way" versus the "Polish Way" of overthrowing, or transforming, or democratizing Communist regimes. Clark stated that by following the "Gomulka way" Poland was on the road to democracy (although he is for much more of it than they have yet achieved), while in Hungary they have "nothing."

He predicted flatly that by the summer of 1958 there will be another "Geneva Conference" at which the United States and Russia will either reach agreement over the unification of Germany and the

joint guarantee of "security" in Europe, or will go far toward such an agreement.

He also predicted flatly that Poland and Russia will "continue to democratize" in the Gomulka fashion, and that there will be no more "Hungary" in Eastern Europe.

Though both speakers agreed that the United States should not have intervened in Hungary with its armed forces, Clark described Haskell's assertion that socialists and especially the German Social Democrats should have encouraged the Poles and East Germans to support the Hungarian revolution with the purpose of spreading it to all the satellites and Russia itself as "immoral" and a policy which would have brought on World War III.

When asked why a man with his views still belongs to the Communist Party, and what he intends to do about his convictions, Clark stated that he intended to write and work for their adoption by the party.

Haskell asked him when, since the convention of the Communist Party at which a "compromise" on Hungary had been reached between the Gates and Foster factions, he had written an article attacking the Kadar regime and the Russian suppression of democracy in

(Continued on page 3)

# Family Farms Are Being Squeezed Out

By GORDON HASKELL

The depressed state of American farmers was much in the news during the last presidential campaign. Speculation was rife on the political effect falling farm prices might have on the agricultural areas; on the Eisenhower administration's judicious political expenditures for "soil bank" payments; on the fate of the whole agricultural subsidy program; etc.

Since the election is over, the farmers no longer get the national attention which was lavished on them before. Prices have shown a slight rise for some farm products. But the agricultural crisis is by no means over, just because it gets less attention.

We have received a copy of a report to the Board of Directors of the National Sharecroppers Fund, entitled "The Condition of Farm Workers in 1956," written by Fay Bennett, executive secretary of the NSF. We quote below a number of paragraphs from this report dealing with one of the most significant trends in American agriculture, the displacement of "family farms" by corporate farm—the "factories in the fields," as Carey McWilliams once called them.

## APPROACHING CRISIS

"There are nearly one and one-half million farm families in the United States with incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. Of these, nearly one million live in the South.

"Although Negroes constituted only about one-tenth of the total of the 5,226,000 farm families in the country in 1954, they made up almost one-third of these one million in the South with annual incomes of less than \$1,000. Very little is being done to help this group of Americans whose living and health standards and educational opportunities are clearly inadequate for them to realize their best potentialities as citizens and human beings.

"Today the greatest contrast between wealth and poverty in our country has shifted from yesterday's captains of finance and the factory worker to today's corporate farm owner and the men and their families who work in the fields. The world's most efficient producers of farm products—Americans—have not eliminated dire poverty among those who work on the farms.

"All family farms—not just the lowest-income group—are approaching crisis. Government programs, while admitting their serious plight, are permitting over 100,000 family farms yearly to go out of business. Many of these are young farm families, former GIs who started farming hopefully after World War II. Though given government aid to get started, they have been abandoned to a policy or lack of policy which permits them to be squeezed out before they can become firmly established.

"According to the 1955 Census of Agriculture commercial family farms dropped by 11 per cent from 1950 to 3,193,000 units while industrialized factory farms increased by 26 per cent to 134,000. There was a drop of 353,000 in the number of owner-operated farms, a drop of 276,000 in the number of tenant-operated farms, and an increase of 32,000 in the number of part-owner operated farms.

"A House of Representative sub-committee, under the chairmanship of Clark W. Thompson of Texas, reported in August 1956, after a 3000-mile tour of grass-roots family farms, that more than 600,000 of them had failed in the last four years. It stated that they were forced out by the industrial-type (corporate) farm invasion.

"Family farms are generally defined as those where an owner-operator and his family furnish at least one-half of the farm labor, with gross sales of less than \$25,000 annually. Disregarding the cultural value of these family production units, it should be emphasized that they constitute the major element in the farm labor force and the backbone hitherto of America's 'private enterprise' economy.

"They need not be wiped out. They can produce efficiently and compete effectively with the corporate farms through wider use of electric power and increased mechanization if they can get equal treatment in government subsidies and credit, and if all domestic farm labor is not exploited by lack of government protection and by government promotion of foreign contract labor.

"The corporate—or industrialized—farm warrants a full current study that cannot be made here. Its influence on the labor market is indicated in various sections of this report.

"The vast amount of federal subsidy these enterprises receive is illustrated by two examples: Delta and Pine Land Company of Mississippi received a \$1,292,472.25 federal loan on its 1954 cotton crop. Louisiana Irrigation and Mill Company received a \$486,725.77 price support on its 1954 rice crop.

"It is the food and fiber producers such as these which throw the sharecropper and small farmer into the migrant stream, which support an imported labor program that is the key factor in keeping the wages of farm labor at less than one half the American average and in preventing effective union organization to better farm labor conditions, and which receive the bulk of federal subsidies."

## THE CORPORATE SQUEEZE

What is the economic mechanism by which the corporate farms are squeezing the family farms out of business?

First and foremost is the application of large-scale mechanization to farming, the industrial revolution in American farming which got a big boost during World War II. This means large-scale capital, and the small farmer simply cannot compete against large aggregates of capital.

Second, the government subsidy program is designed to help the large farmers far more than the little one.

Added to these is another factor, however, which gives the small farmer no way out: the abysmally low wages still paid farm labor in this country.

One of the ways in which the family farm is able to maintain itself is by the extreme exploitation of the whole family's labor. Large-scale mechanization, which vastly increases the productivity of labor, is able to meet the competition of this dawn-to-dusk-dark labor of the farmers' families, even if the farm workers were paid something like the going wage for workers in industry. But the squeeze is put on doubly hard by the fact that, as noted above, farm labor gets less than half the average wage of American workers.

"In Phillips County, Arkansas," the report states, "in June of 1956, United States workers were paid 35 cents to 40 cents per hour. Farm workers in the county that month were made up of 1000 United States workers and 1055 Mexicans. The Mexican workers theoretically were receiving 50 cents an hour, the minimum to which the Mexican government will agree. By July and August, the rate for U. S. workers had fallen to 35 cents an hour."

This paragraph points up one of the ways in which the corporate farms are able to keep wages low: by importing contract labor. During the peak season in 1956, there were 458,038 foreign contract workers in agriculture, 445,197 of whom came from Mexico under an international agreement. In addition, there are tens of thousands of migrant farm workers, often made up of whole families who follow the seasons and the crops all over the country.

From the Arkansas example given above, it is clear that although the international agreement calls for 50 cents an hour to Mexican workers, they actually get much less. Otherwise there would have been no reason for the U. S. workers' wages in the area to fall to the level of 35 cents per hour. (Is it any wonder that such a suc-

(Continued on next page)

# LABOR SCOPE

## A GROUNDSWELL OF RESENTMENT IN THE UNIONS

By JACK WILSON

Each week brings fresh evidence of a strong and growing groundswell of resentment by the rank and file against the leadership of the trade unions.

The rebellion in the steel workers' union against the McDonald machine, for example, proved to be far deeper than any union leader suspected or wanted. In the current issue of the *Nation* there is an excellent article giving more material on the real situation in the steel workers' union. Life in the steel union is quite different from that portrayed by the paid flunkies and hack writers on the staff.

Last week, top officials of the best and most democratic union in America—whatever its faults may be—the United Auto-workers union, received the shock of their lives when Local 212, the permanent stronghold of Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW, defeated every one of his supporters in a major unit election for convention delegates.

Even Pat Caruso, president of the local union and certainly one of the best secondary leaders in the UAW, fell by the wayside. One of the issues in that campaign was the modest proposal for a 50-cent dues increase, but the other sources of dissatisfaction were more significant, and worth discussing.

A few days later, another major bastion of the Reuther leadership had a narrow escape, when the administration at Chrysler Local 7 took only 11 out of 19 convention spots, and an old-time unreconstructed opponent of Walter Reuther received the third highest vote.

In many Michigan area local unions of the UAW, anti-dues-increase and anti-administration candidates are winning, notably in Pontiac and Flint.

In two major international unions, a proposal for dues increases were defeated.

Of course, in different localities and different unions, the growing spirit of antagonism to the leaderships is caused by a variety of factors, not all of them operating equally in each case.

## A WORLD APART

For a general explanation, little can be added to what one of America's old pros in the union movement said last Monday. He is Louis Hollander, president of the New York CIO and manager of the Amalgamated Clothing workers union joint board in New York.

"In many unions," he said, "there is little sign that the leaders are even trying to maintain contact with their membership. Some seem to feel that union shop contracts and compulsory check-offs of union dues have made it unnecessary for them to know what the members want or need. Too many such leaders live in a world apart—a world in which the badges of achievement are high salaries, expensive automobiles, membership in country clubs and the other appurtenances of wealth."

The gap between the ranks and the leaders has taken precisely that form. David McDonald of the steel workers' union fits Hollander's description to a T.

A far cruder form is symbolized by the

Becks and Hoffas and Brewsters of the teamsters union. This week, for example, Brewster just sold his \$75,000 string of ponies.

The kind of mentality of those leaders, who have no place in a decent labor movement, was illustrated by Hoffa this week, after a session with Robert Kennedy, counsel of the Senate labor rackets committee. Hoffa scoffed at the hearings.

"Much ado about nothing," said this Shakespearean student. (It is nice to have ex-radicals on the staff to supply the literary touch.)

Hoffa added: "Nothing factual has come out of the hearings so far. Nothing but myth, misstatements and a jumble of words."

Hollander and Walter Reuther, incidentally, among other union leaders, understand the impact of the hearings far better than that. A good look in the mirror is taking place within the union movement, from top to bottom. There is lots of room for reform, it seems.

The rank and file does its own "reforming" in the only way it can. Where it has the power to touch union officials or vote on issues, the results are becoming painful to the leaders, in far too many instances.

Besides the general squeeze of inflation, which makes a mockery of most union economic gains, the inability of the leaders to understand the ranks, from whom they are so far removed, aggravates any problems. In many cases, the dues increase question merely symbolizes the deeper causes of revolt. In the steel union, the example of the Alabama Negroes has stirred up activity among Negro unionists to eliminate the many discriminatory practices that still exist in the steel plants and about which the union is somewhat slow in moving.

In the Briggs Local 212 elections, a major factor and a perennial sore spot in those plants, which have about 30 per cent Negro workers, is the failure of the Mazey-dominated leadership to have a Negro as one of the five top officers of the local union.

In other Chrysler plants, the whole series of struggles over work standards, the policy on overtime and other issues, have become intertwined with the dues question.

Fundamentally, it adds up to the fact that the growing bureaucratization of the American labor movement has caused such an alienation of the ranks that a far too widespread feeling exists that "the union isn't ours any more."

Here, the failure to maintain or create democratic practices is now plaguing the labor leaders heavily. The struggle against racketeering, racism and raiding is being penalized because of its belated character. Unless the union movement gets ahead of the Senate committee exposés and cleans its own house as much as possible and as quickly as possible, rough days are ahead in the union movement.

This Sat. Eve.  
March 9

Come to the N.Y.  
ISL - YSL's

PRE-  
SPRING  
SOCIAL

Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14 St., NYC

## PHILADELPHIA

Friday, March 15

A SYMPOSIUM

What's Ahead for  
The American Left?

Panelists

J. A. DAVIDSON  
Independent Socialist League  
JOSEPH ROBERTS  
Communist Party, E. Penna.  
TOM KERRY  
Socialist Workers Party  
CHARLES WALKER  
F.O.R. and Liberation

Chairman

LYLE TATUM  
Amer. Friends Service Comm.

8:30 at the New Century Club  
124 So. 12 Street, Phila.

LONDON LETTER

# Three Wins Boost BLP's Drive

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, March 2

For the past ten years the political trend in Britain has been toward the right. But now there is ample evidence that this trend has been reversed and the mood of the country is inclined to the left.

This fact has been clearly demonstrated in the past fortnight when voters in three constituencies have gone to the polling booths to fill in their ballot forms in parliamentary by-elections. In each case the counting of the votes has resulted in a crashing win for the Labor Party.

The first government defeat came on St. Valentine's Day in the London constituency of North Lewisham where the death of the Tory member of Parliament, who had been returned in the 1955 general election with a majority of more than 3,000, caused a by-election.

On nomination day three candidates presented themselves for inclusion on the ballot paper. The Labor Party contender was a young lawyer with less than a year's membership subscriptions entered on his party card. The Tory party chose the owner of a local constructional engineering firm who took great pains to point out that he was a "simple man" who had worked his way up to his present position. The trio of candidates was completed by a young woman who classified herself as an "Independent Loyalist"—a label as contradictory as the candidate herself was politically. Her main plank was ultra-imperialism, jingoism and flag-wagging.

Although the young woman received a fair amount of newspaper publicity, primarily due to the fact that her appearance was more attractive than her politics, she never really entered the running. The big fight was between the two main parties who threw all they had into the campaign.

Every available full-time worker they could muster was sent into the constituency and hundreds of volunteers poured into the district by the bus, coach and train load to campaign for their particular candidate.

When the votes were counted the Labor candidate captured the seat from the Tories with a majority of more than a thousand votes, while the Tory candidate's votes were 5000 less than those collected by his forerunner.

Some of the former Tory votes went to the Labor candidate, while others were cast for the "Independent Loyalist." But, as in previous by-elections, one of the outstanding features of the contest was the number of voters who had previously

supported the Tories but this time refrained from voting at all.

In spite of this rather negative characteristic, the North Lewisham election revealed a growing measure of support for the Labor Party. It also proved that Labor's election machine now has the edge on the Tories.

Finally, and by no means least important, it provided a tremendous boost to Labor Party morale as it was the first time since the war that Labor had won a seat from the Tories in a by-election.

The second blow against the Tories came at a by-election in Wednesbury where the previous Labor MP had resigned his seat after the local Labor Party had expelled him and demanded that he quit Parliament because of his support for the Tory war in Egypt. This election thus became something in the nature of a test of the measure of support which existed among the general public for Tory actions in Egypt.

For good measure the Tories threw in the red herring of what they called the "unconstitutional action" of the local Labor Party in putting pressure on a member of Parliament; this, they claimed, was not in accord with British parliamentary practice and came near to "mob rule" by the Labor Party.

On both counts the Tories received a rebuff from the voters. Although the total number of votes cast was lower than in the general election of 1955—and the number of votes received by all candidates was smaller as a consequence—the Labor majority shot up by nearly 4000 votes.

And once again the Tory vote dropped by a far greater figure than the increase in the Labor vote. Some of these went to an independent candidate, who campaigned entirely on the narrow issue of reducing the cost of living, but an analysis of the figures indicates that a number of previous Tory voters refused to vote on this occasion.

## FAVORABLE TURN

But the big blow for the government came yesterday when Labor captured the Welsh constituency of Camarthen from the Liberal Party. The Tories did not stand a candidate in this election; instead they backed the Liberal candidate who, contrary to the general stand of the Liberal Party, gave his full support to the Tory war over the Suez Canal.

This contest was further enlivened by the fact that the Labor candidate was Lady Megan Lloyd George, who having represented the Liberal Party in Parliament for 22 years was defeated in the 1951 general election. Four years later she quit the Liberals and joined the La-

bor Party.

Yesterday, less than two years after joining the Labor Party, Lady Megan once again became an MP. She succeeded in turning a Liberal majority of 3333 into a Labor majority of 3069. And, more important, she actually increased the total Labor vote from 21,077 to 24,410—an indication of the keen interest in a by-election where 87.49 per cent of those entitled to vote actually did so compared with 85.1 per cent in the general election of two years ago.

This phenomenon—more people voting in a by-election than in a general election—is a strange one in British politics. It shows, even if due allowance is made for local factors, the keen interest on questions political now prevailing in Britain. And it marks a situation extremely favorable to the Labor Party generally and the left wing of the Labor Party in particular.

When the Suez crisis first blew up there were indications, notably in the speeches of Hugh Gaitskell, that the Labor Party was going to trail along behind the Tories. Pressure from the left wing prevented this, and very soon even the right-wing leaders were standing up on their hind legs and demanding a general election. But, after this initial flush of activity, the voices of Labor's leaders became muted and the demand for a general election was made less and less. The left wing concentrated much of its energies in the party on pressing for a general election and an all-out campaign against the Tories.

## LEFT IS STRONGER

The recent by-election successes will strengthen the hand of the Labor Left in this respect; and there are already signs of this happening.

Today's issue of the *Daily Herald*, Labor's official newspaper, examines the implications of the Camarthen by-election and makes a strong demand for a general election—now. MacMillan and his government, it says, have lost the support of the country and so should give the people the opportunity to choose a new government.

This demand for a general election will undoubtedly grow in the near future, not only within the Labor Party as the combined effects of left-wing pressure and external events push the leaders into ac-

tion, but also from the ordinary man in the street as he becomes more and more aware of just where this present government is going.

One of the biggest issues around which the two rival parties will concentrate their forces in the near future is the Rents Bill which the government is now taking through Parliament. The bill alters the Rents Restriction Acts, under which private landlords are debarred from increasing their rents, and will mean that some five million tenants will have to pay increased rents. It will also mean that 710,000 tenants will be removed entirely from the protection of the Rent Acts altogether and thus their landlords will be able to turf them out—something prevented by the Rent Acts as they stand at present.

The Labor Party seems determined to fight this issue out to the bitter end. Without waiting for a lead from party headquarters the local Labor Parties sprang into action and began organizing protest meetings, demonstrations and petitions against the Rents Bill.

Now the party Executive Committee has indicated that it gives full support to these measures and will do all it can to help on a national scale. Thus again the militant rank and file, largely taking its leadership from the left wing, is setting the pace for the entire party as it did on the Suez issue and has done generally ever since.

In addition to its Rents Bill the government has also several other matters lined up which will only serve to fan the discontent within the country.

It recently announced that the part of the National Insurance contribution, deducted from the worker's pay-package each week, which goes toward financing the Health Service is soon to be increased. At the same time it announced that the cost of welfare milk, subsidized by the government for children under five, and the cheap meals served to children attending school, also subsidized from government funds, will be increased.

In money terms these increases will not add up to a great amount each week to the average worker, although they will undoubtedly add to the ever-increasing burden of the lower-paid workers. But the mere fact that the government's action is a further pruning of the welfare measures now an accepted part of British life is arousing great anger among the workers, particularly the organized workers in the Labor movement.

With these circumstances prevailing the scene seems set for further advances by the left-wing Labor forces in the near future.

# Family Farms Squeezed Out - -

(Continued from page 2)  
Successful fight is always put up in Congress to continue the exemption of farm labor from the minimum wage law?)

Socialists are often asked what they would "do about the farmers" who, even in the opinion of the NSF, have been one of the "backbones" of America's "private enterprise" economy. One of the charges made against the Independent Socialist League by the attorney general as a basis of including it on the "subversive list" is that it advocates the expropriation of farmers.

It would seem that if the Department of Justice is really interested in doing something about people who are actually "expropriating" 100,000 family farms per year, right now, they should go after the corporate "farmers" who are squeezing them out and taking over their land. None of these happens to belong to the ISL.

The fact of the matter is that in the United States, this problem, like so many others, is being partly "solved" for socialism by capitalism's own development. That sector of agriculture which is now corporation-owned and is worked by day laborers lends itself to socialization like any other industry. None of the social questions which do present themselves in the family farm sector of agriculture arises in that sector. Farming is no more a "way of life" to the 35 cents-an-

hour farm hands or to the stock and bond owners of the corporate farms, than is auto-making a way of life to the assembly-line worker in Detroit or to Charlie Wilson.

As a matter of fact, with the socialization of the large corporate farms and a gigantic increase in farm wages, the number of independently owned and run family farms might increase.

Since a vast increase of total agricultural production would be needed immediately to take care of increased effective demand among the previously most impoverished sections of the population, and since one can assume that a socialist America would want to help out countries with a food deficit for their populations, there is really no reason to believe that a socialist government in this country would set as an objective the elimination of the family farm.

Under such circumstances, the family farm would have a chance to prove the claim, made for it in the NSF report and by others, that if it were not caught in an economic vise, it could compete effectively with large-scale farming. In some areas and for some types of farming, this might prove true, and in others not. In any event, it would be democratic decisions based on economic facts which would decide, and not any pre-conceived theories, let alone malice toward small farmers.

# DW's Clark at Col. - -

(Continued from page 1)

Hungary.

"I wrote such an article today," Clark replied, "and it will appear in the 'Daily Worker' on Friday."

Clark's article in the March 1 "Daily Worker" was actually on the Batista dictatorship in Cuba!

When questioned about the articles by George Morris in the DW which had whitewashed the Kadar regime's decree providing the death sentence for strikers, Clark asserted that they don't feel that all writers in their paper need agree on all questions, and that he does not agree with Morris' articles. (Neither he nor the editorial board of the paper has written a word showing disagreement with Morris on this article.)

In short, in the whole debate, Clark sounded not like an old-fashioned Stalinist, and not even like an official spokesman of the Gates tendency, but like a "Deutscherite" who is a little less consistent than the master.

That is, while Deutscher deplores the attempt of the Hungarian people to break out of the confines of Stalinism altogether (because such attempts interfere with the self-democratization of this regime by the bureaucracy itself), and then goes on to slander the Hungarian Revolution by echoing the Stalinist slander about the "reactionary danger" in the revolution, Clark said that the tragedy of the Hungarian Revolution is not that it was attempted, but that it was suppressed!

During the question and discussion period, the question was raised of the future of the Communist Party, and of the possibility of a socialist regroupment in America today. Clark made it clear

that he and his colleagues are little concerned with any possibility of a regroupment of the present "splinter groups" with or without the Communist Party. They look, rather, to some new development in or "out of" the mass of the labor movement which will make it possible for Communists to join with such elements in building a new "socialist" or "people's" movement in America.

Hackell pointed out that although the re-creation of a mass socialist movement depends on the rise of a new wave of radicalization in America, this does not mean that socialists can or should do nothing now to seek to lay the foundations of a broad, all-inclusive movement which would be able to take maximum advantage of a later shift in political sentiment of a mass character.

He stated that the Independent Socialist League has come out in favor of unity with the Socialist Party as a first step in the direction of socialist regroupment, and that they are now seeking to explore the possibility of such a unity on a healthy basis with a view to achieving it. He pointed out that, in the ISL's opinion, while a broad socialist movement in America should not require as a condition of membership the abandonment of the view that Russia is in some way "socialist," such a movement could not itself refer to Russia as "socialist" without forfeiting any possibility of gaining the adherence and support of large number of students and workers.

The debate was one of the most successful political meetings held at Columbia this year. The Debs Club plans to continue discussing the issues and points of view raised by the speakers at their next meeting.

# PRO AND CON: Discussion

## Says Israel Is 'Basically Defensive'

By AL FINDLEY

The time lapse in replying to Draper's answer to my letter [Jan. 7] may make it difficult for some readers too. Except for one week the delay is not my fault and was due to other considerations.

The heading of Draper's answer was amazing. "No Apologias for Israeli Regime's Policy," it read. This is a gratuitous insult and a Stalinist method of polemizing. There is not a word or implication of apologizing for Ben-Gurion nor of anything smacking of the innuendos with which Draper sprinkled his answer—"whitewashing the Israeli regime's position" or taking "a more sympathetic attitude toward the Israeli government's adventure."

I did not criticize Draper's general line. My letter solidarized myself with it, but raised points of omission and emphasis. Had I wished to disagree I would have said so. In our circles disagreement is not treachery.

Draper cannot plead that he wasn't sure where I stood, that my letter was not clear. He heard me discuss more than once. He heard me say at a branch meeting that I give no support to Ben-Gurion's war. He saw what I wrote in a draft article for *LA* on the subject where I said that Ben-Gurion was shedding Israeli blood in the interests of French imperialism—the only ones who stood to gain from the adventure. Draper's line of attack was therefore deliberate and inexcusable in polemics between opponents, let alone in discussion between comrades.

Draper implies that "missed points" are not at issue and are unimportant. Neither is correct. They are important, especially the basic one. Here was an opportunity to prove to the Arab nationalists concretely that they need the support of the Jews. It was not done. We rightly lose no opportunity to point out the converse, Draper repeats it in the last paragraph of his letter.

Draper conjures a "political view" from the citation of certain facts. There is often an interrelation between a point of view and the selection of facts. There is no excuse to ignore or gloss over certain facts in order to support a point of view. Whatever the future may hold it seems preposterous that Draper could create political differences out of the presentation of needed material to give a rounded view of the Israeli-Egyptian component of the recent fighting.

### CLINCHER?

I repeat, Israel's position is basically defensive. Does Draper deny this? Until recently *LA* took that general line. Draper himself wrote in that vein. His article was entitled "How to Defend Israel" despite complete opposition to the regime. That line of *LA* is and was correct and should be the main emphasis of discussion of the topic. There was no hint of this in his article.

Draper obviously confuses Israel and the Israeli regime. Such confusion can only lead to analyses that have no relation to reality, that impress one as being out of this world even when citing solid facts.

Draper says *LA* cannot accept the idea that Israel is basically defensive; he then throws his "clinch": If Israel is basically or historically defensive, why not give it at least critical support? Draper should and does know better. This line of attack is a deliberate attempt to muddy the waters.

Even when a country is actually and concretely in a defensive position, socialists do not necessarily support the war even critically. When other imperialist forces are involved, the question of defense becomes subordinate. Surely, Draper should have given others the benefit of the doubt that they took the Israeli collusion with the British and French into account.

Draper also knows from his own experience that in other cases too a basic historical defensive position does not lead to critical support. The 1939 minority of the SWP took the position that despite the fact that Russia was then considered a workers'-state and in a historical defensive position, we gave no sup-

port to the Kremlin attack on Finland.

Draper does not deny that the present war for the Arab rulers is a "continuation of the war of 1948." He equivocates, "It is not simply [my emphasis] a continuation of the war of 1948." Granted. But we must take into consideration the important fact that in an important and basic way it is a continuation. Draper did not do it in his article.

What is the war for Israel's rulers, Draper asks. It is the dead-end of the policy of bigger and better reprisals. They were designed to pacify the border, to force a peace by a powerful blow. They failed. The ante was raised to a point where Ben-Gurion felt that only a blitzkrieg in alliance with Britain and France could do the job. The aim was not primarily acquisition of the seized territories but to use them primarily as bargaining positions, for the present borders, for free navigation, to impose a peace treaty, etc., and the government of Israel is doing precisely that at the present time.

Draper not only selects the facts to suit himself but in one instance his position leads him to fly in the face of facts. He writes: "The reactionary Arab leaders are not the only ones who look forward to eliminating rival states in the area, while denying it." The facts are that Arab leaders do not deny but even boast of it on occasion. Arab socialists and even American socialists of the Cannonite variety support this position. Who is apologizing for existing regimes, Draper or I?

### ON EXPANSIONISM

Draper assumes a pedagogic role and says, "The present Arab-Israel conflict . . . must be analyzed concretely." Good. I agree, but insist that he do so too. In discussing the Israel government's expansionist aims in this, the Sinai action, he becomes very concrete. He points to *Jordan*. I quote: "It is not just a question of particular statements about Sinai . . . the basic and historical aim of the Zionist state . . . is to 'reclaim' . . . all of Eretz Israel, historic Palestine, which would require in the first place the swallowing up of Jordan." A "better" example of concretely analyzing the Egyptian-Israeli fighting is difficult to imagine.

Draper knows that the question of "historic Palestine" divides the political parties of Israel; that even the right wing does not favor it as a practical political policy. Only Herut does. The General Zionists refused a merger with Herut because of this point. The majority may dream of such a "glorious" eventuality, but all evidence points to its rejection as a concrete political aim. To have their present boundaries assured and legalized is the primary and basic concrete policy—and here I include the government—of Israel. Draper may believe that this is only a temporary position awaiting a new historical opportunity. Maybe, but even he must admit that for the present period legalization of existing borders is the concrete politics.

The war against Egypt raises different problems than a war against or about Jordan.

At any rate it was not historical Palestine that Israel acquired in war against Egypt; it was Sinai. Gaza, which is part of historical Palestine, with its 300,000 Arabs was the least inviting part. No expansionist policy would pick on Gaza. It is more of a liability than an asset from a "Jewish Statist" point of view. Only an attempt to stop the border fighting and pressure against Egypt can explain the drive into Gaza.

Draper makes dark references to people who act as, well . . . agents of one side or another on the question of border provocations. Findley gets a backhanded acquittal that does not acquit. He writes: "Israel kept raising the ante in the border provocations" as if to refute me when I said the Israeli government acted to halt the border attacks of the Arabs. True. That is no news to me. I wrote in that vein and in *LABOR ACTION* to boot. Draper points to the individual and small-scale nature of the original border

(Continued on page 71)

## Reply: Analysis of a Straddling Formula

By HAL DRAPER

Let us try, against odds, to keep the discussion of Israel's aggression on the political questions involved. Unfortunately, a reader might find it hard to deduce what these are from Comrade Findley's letter.

In *LA* Jan. 7, Findley launched his peculiar formulation that "Israel's position is basically defensive," in connection with our discussion of Israel's attack on Egypt.

The reply said:

"*LA* cannot agree with his formulation about the 'basically defensive' nature of the Israeli government's position in the attack on Egypt. (1) In the first place, there is naturally a question of exactly what this formulation means politically. If the Israel government's position is 'basically defensive,' then why not give it at least critical support? As I understand it, Findley gives no kind of support to the Israeli adventure in Egypt; though he does not take the chance to mention this in his letter. But he does call it 'stupid, reactionary . . . self-defeating. This combination of adjectives has a certain element of ambiguity.' . . . And this ambiguity is what was next analyzed.

Now two things can be immediately noted:

(a) It was I, and not Findley, who took care to mention that he was on record as being against the Israeli attack. The point was and is precisely the inconsistency or ambiguity of trying to combine this position with the "basically defensive" formulation. Now look across at Findley's fourth paragraph for an insight into the strange fury of his letter.

(b) The reply carefully said that we cannot agree with the formulation about the "basically defensive" nature of the Israel government's position in the attack on Egypt. Here is precisely where we get into the ambiguity or evasiveness of Findley's formulation.

Does or doesn't Findley think that the Israeli government's policy was or is "basically defensive"? And is he or isn't he talking about the attack on Egypt, as we were? Findley won't say. He's not going to let himself be deliberately confused into facing these questions.

See, for example, how he goes about referring to the reply: "Draper says *LA* cannot accept the idea that Israel is basically defensive . . ." He does not even permit himself to quote or paraphrase correctly the fact that it is a question of a line on the policy of the Israeli government, and in this attack on Egypt. Instead he substitutes his own slippery formula that "Israel is basically defensive."

Suppose some reader were to try to start a fierce polemic in our columns as to whether "Russia is basically defensive," while sliding out from under any attempt to attach the question not to some abstract "Russia" but to the real existent Moscow government, and evading any effort to localize the question with respect to a real situation? And then accused you of being a Stalinist and a general no-goodnik for trying to pin him down?

The resulting discussion, at any rate, if it could be called such, would be somewhat shadowy. That indicates one trouble in trying to grapple with those parts of Findley's letter which digress from vituperation.

### SUPPORT THE ATTACK?

This is perhaps sufficient comment on Findley's complaint that I try to conjure up a "political view" on his part, whereas all he is innocently trying to do is give "citation of certain facts . . . needed material."

It is characteristic of one who is trying to straddle with an ambiguous position that he becomes awfully resentful when his balancing act is upset. Thus Findley protests violently (and unnecessarily) that he does not support "Ben-Gurion's war," but he invents this "Israel is basically defensive" formula which can only provide a political apologia for it.

With this new letter of his, there can be no doubt about it. Examine the crucial

point where he tries to grapple with the "clinch": "If Israel is basically or historically defensive, why not give it at least critical support?"

His reply is quite clear here: he won't support Israel's attack because "When other imperialist forces are involved, the question of defense becomes subordinate," because he is taking "the Israeli collusion with the British and French into account." This is the only, sole, and lone reason he gives.

It follows inescapably, therefore, from the "basically defensive" formula that if Israel had pulled the job alone, Findley would have had to support "Ben-Gurion's war." His objection turns out to be, not that Israel attacked Egypt, but only that Israel allowed its own aggression to be subordinated to that of its two European imperialist partners.

Is this really Findley's view? I don't guarantee that. It's merely what his letter says, as anybody who understands the ABC of politics can read for himself. But comrade Findley is trying to do a straddle, and my formulation may be too painfully precise for his conscience. (As for Findley's reference to the 1939 dispute over Russia, he has the minority position of that time garbled; it would take too much space to set it right here.)

The same tenacious evasiveness can be seen in Findley's discussion of whether the present war is a "continuation of the war of 1948" for the Arab rulers. He jibes at my reply. Very well; how does he propose to "take into consideration" that this is true (he says) "in an important and basic way"?

Straddling words; for we supported Israel in 1948 against Arab aggression; and if this war is a "continuation" of that one "in an important and basic way," then we have here an "important and basic" reason for supporting Israel again in 1957, even though Ben-Gurion is now the aggressor. Does Findley follow through on this simple thought, which moreover can be read all over the American press? No, he jibes and skates away. He has done enough, it seems, by throwing forth this plain installment of an apologia, but he will get furious and call you all sorts of names if you try to hold him to its clear meaning.

There is nothing else in Comrade Findley's letter on the essential political questions involved.

### 'HOW TO DEFEND'

For the rest of Findley's letter, which is a considerable portion of it, I could not possibly begin to deal adequately here with the equivocations and misstatements which fill every paragraph. On quite a number of things about which Findley polemizes in the same kind of manner as we have already noted, it would perhaps be enough to refer anybody interested back to the original exchange of Jan. 7, which reappears here in unrecognizable form.

Thus Findley claims that instead of discussing Israel's landgrab in Sinai, I pointed only to Jordan. This is false.

Thus Findley says "Draper makes dark references" to "agents" of one side or the other, and does not acquit Findley. This is false.

These are also examples of the kind of stuff with which Findley's letter is deplorably loaded.

Here are some short comments on points which could usefully stand fuller discussion some time:

(1) About "how to defend Israel": what we have written and will no doubt write again under such titles has no con-

(Continued on page 71)

**LABOR ACTION • 17<sup>th</sup> YEAR**  
 March 11, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 10  
 Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company,  
 114 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone:  
 WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May  
 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under  
 the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1  
 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).  
 —Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by  
 contributors do not necessarily represent the views of  
 Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.  
 Editor: HAL DRAPER. Business Mgr: L. G. SMITH.  
 Associate Editors: GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

## LYL Decides to Dissolve

By TIM WOHLFORTH

For the first time since the formation of the Young Communist League in the early twenties the Communist Party has no youth organization affiliated or fraternally related to it.

At a recent national convention, the Labor Youth League decided to dissolve as a national organization. This follows by a few months the decision of the New York State LYL to dissolve. It was understood that many of the local clubs and branches of the LYL would continue in existence but under other names and with no national affiliation.

The LYL was formed in 1949 as a youth organization fraternally related to the CP. Later, with the dissolution of the Young Progressives of America, it attempted to broaden itself and take in many of the elements previously attracted to the YPA. In recent years the LYL has been the brunt of a powerful witch-hunting attack on the campus and has been forced off most campuses. It has also been engaged in a fight against its listing by the attorney general as a "subversive" organization.

The move to dissolve comes in the aftermath of the intense ferment and disorientation in the ranks of both the youth and adult sections of the Stalinist movement in this country and elsewhere following the 20th Party Congress and the recent counter-revolutionary repressions by the Kremlin in Hungary.

Many LYL members began to question

their whole political orientation. A number of these youth found the easy way out by simply leaving the movement and leaving politics.

However, hundreds of others in and around the LYL clubs and branches still wish to continue the fight. They feel themselves drawn to the side of the Hungarian workers in their struggle. At the same time they are repelled by American imperialism and wish to continue the struggle against the witchhunt, and the reactionary politics of our own ruling class. They wish to rally support for the Negro people in their heroic battles for equality in the South.

**We in the YSL appeal to these youth to join with us in struggling against both Stalinist oppression—as in Eastern Europe and elsewhere—and against the oppression of the American ruling class both at home and abroad.**

We realize that there remain many political differences among us. But we feel these differences can be overcome through friendly discussions and through joint activity aimed at fighting the witch-hunt and supporting the Negro people in their struggle, aimed at supporting the workers in Algeria, Hungary, Poland and elsewhere in their struggles for freedom.

As the only nation-wide socialist youth movement in this country we open our doors to all of you who wish to continue the struggle against capitalist and Stalinist oppression throughout the world.

## A Polish Students' Manifesto

LABOR ACTION last week described some of the developments that have been going on in the youth organization of the Polish Communist movement, in connection with the revolutionary ferment in the country. Following is an interesting document from the fight that has been going on.

The background is the fact, reported last week, that on Dec. 6-7 a Revolutionary Youth Congress was called in Warsaw to replace the official youth organization which had been thoroughly discredited. The call was issued by the student organ *Po Prostu* and a youth daily, bypassing the regime-sponsored machinery. The congress represented a high point in the new independent organization of the revolutionary youth, though later this new Revolutionary Youth Union was merged back with the Stalinist youth.

The Dec. 6-7 congress issued a letter to Polish youth from which we quote some sections.

"The only previous organization of the younger generation, the ZMP, has ceased to exist. The ZMP was an incarnation of the Stalinist concept of the youth movement. Its aim was to minimize and falsify the existing difficulties, to neutralize the political aspiration of youth, to raise blind and obedient executives, thoughtless robots. . . .

"We are establishing the Revolutionary Youth Union as a vanguard political organization of that part of youth which wants to fight, by active and selfless participation in political life, for the building of the Polish model of Socialism, for the implementation of the people's power by democratic means, for the prosperity of the nation, for the full sovereignty of Poland in the economic and political fields. . . .

"We reject the Stalinist Communist models of morality in which the chief role was played by the principle: the

end justifies the means. We shall strive for the revival of the ethical models of Socialist humanism. . . . We are internationalists; every active young man or woman can be a member of the Union, regardless of nationality or race. We are in favor of freedom of conscience. . . . but we consider that membership in the organization entails that a man or woman strive to learn the truth and recognize the ability of the human mind to learn it. . . . We consider the principles of scientific Socialism the best weapon for our movement and we want to apply them in practice, cleansed of Stalinist interpretations and falsehoods. . . .

"We are in favor of the full independence of the Union. We are no annex of any party. We wish to preserve in our action, however, the line of the Marxist party of the working class, reserving for ourselves the right to interpret the party line and to influence the shaping of that line.

"We recognize the role and political importance of the leadership of the party, which is the leading force of our nation. We are, however, against an administrative form of party rule, and against substituting party for state authorities. We are also against the ordering about of our organization by the party. The party can present its line through party members who are at the same time members of the Revolutionary Youth Union, without infringing in any way on the independence of our organization and inner-party democracy.

"We continue the beautiful traditions of the struggle of the Communist Youth Union, of the Independent Union of Socialist Youth, of the Youth Organizations of the Society of Workers Universities, of left-wing peasant groups. We continue the traditions of the Union of Youth for Action from the time of the Occupation, and of the struggle for the people's power in Poland in the years 1945 to 1947. Our Union is the successor to the revolutionary organizations of Polish youth."

## The Case of Schuschnigg At the U. of Colorado

A fight has broken out at the University of Colorado over the appearance at a university conference of Kurt Schuschnigg, the former chancellor of pre-war clerical-fascist Austria.

Alex Garber, a visiting assistant professor at the university, was scheduled to be the chairman of a panel in a "Religion as a Force in World Affairs" discussion. He resigned, stating, "I have no quarrel with Von Schuschnigg. My quarrel is with the . . . officials for not publicizing his background. If I were moderator, I would be under a moral constraint to add that which has been pointedly omitted in the official publicity."

Garber then went on to document his charge, pointing out that Von Schuschnigg had participated in the creation of the Dollfuss police state, that he had admitted Nazis into his cabinet, and so on.

The official program had simply noted that Von Schuschnigg . . . was elected to the Vienna Parliament and later held other government positions until 1934 when he was appointed chancellor to succeed Dollfuss; he maintained this position until he was imprisoned by the Germans in 1938."

Two things must be noted at the outset.

First, Garber did not propose to ban Von Schuschnigg from speaking, but rather demanded that his record be publicized. In this sense, there is no question of academic freedom or free speech involved.

Secondly, the omission of the pertinent information about Von Schuschnigg is not only glaring, but it left out material directly relevant to the subject under discussion. The fact that a man speaking on "Religion as a Force in the Modern World" had been a leading clerical-fascist certainly provides a context for his talk. Not to mention it would be like introducing the head of the Communist Party in a talk on Russian affairs as a "journalist," or a Nazi like Goebbels as an "ethnologist" . . . or, for that matter, a spokesman of the Young Socialist League speaking on socialism as a "student of society."

### FASCIST RECORD

How true this is became apparent after Garber took his stand.

To begin with, Von Schuschnigg wrote a letter of reply which is a masterpiece of equivocation, distortion of the truth, obfuscation, and on and on. He wrote: "It is true that the Austrian Parliament regime was abandoned in 1933 and some of the basic political rights were suspended. This was done in a war-like state of relations with Nazi Germany which, as is well known, wanted to incorporate (annex) the Austrian Republic. . . . The trade-union movement gained strength even if it was in this period completely government-sponsored. . . ."

The above is a brief excerpt from Von Schuschnigg's defense. It is scandalous.

Von Schuschnigg was a leading figure in a government which turned its guns on the workers in the street, which fired upon the Karl Marxhoff in Vienna, which outlawed the trade-union movement and the Social-Democracy, which put forward "corporatist" programs of fascism, which maintained friendly relations with Mussolini and Horthy. He was an enemy of democracy, the working class and freedom. That he was also an enemy of the Nazis is a fact which concerns an argument among thieves; it does not alter the basic character of this man's political record.

Now some twenty years later, his

statement is an obvious attempt to gull the students and faculty of the University of Colorado. It is devious, hypocritical, untrue—it forms part of a rather large lie.

But all this is a tempest in a teapot? Then listen to how the editors of the *Colorado Daily* were taken in. They ask of the designation of Von Schuschnigg as a fascist:

"Does one mean by a 'fascist' a right-wing politician, forced into compromising deals by the onrush of history? Or does one mean a brutal Nazi totalitarian who menaces life and freedom in his maniacal quest for power? the eminent keynoter may have been the former. His seven years as a prisoner in solitary confinement in Nazi concentration camps is convincing testimony that he was never the latter."

The editors have been fooled—by Von Schuschnigg's distortions. No, Von Schuschnigg was not a Nazi. But he was a fascist. And not simply a compromising right-wing politician (an Austrian Chamberlain, say): he was a politically conscious fascist who participated in the murder of free institutions and human beings in Austria.

That even after Garber's announcement of the facts, that even then the student editors continue to distort the past, to say that Von Schuschnigg is not what he was, is ample proof that Garber was right in the first place. The conference was derelict in not giving some indication of the real state of things.

### NO FALSE PRETENSES

Not a word should be construed to indicate that Von Schuschnigg should be denied the right to speak at Colorado. Fascists should have a right to speak, Stalinists should have a right to speak, etc.—but if the inviting group is derelict in its obligation, individuals such as Garber have the duty to see to it that a hoax is not perpetrated, that a man who even now defends the repression of democracy in Austria should be presented as a simple, professorial observer on the subject of religion in the modern world.

The charge against Garber, made by the *Daily Colorado* that his tactics are McCarthyite are on a political level with the way in which they allowed themselves to be fooled by the "compromised" Schuschnigg. Garber had based his statement on recognized authorities. The *Daily Colorado* commented: "His trick of merely quoting others' opinions is one of the favorite dodges of McCarthy and other witch-hunters." And that should just about refute itself; comment is hardly necessary.

We repeat: Von Schuschnigg should be allowed to speak—and we welcome Garber's clarification of the facts. It is unfortunate that a man who helped to shoot workers down in the street and to destroy free institutions should be able so readily to convince the student editors at Colorado. A little history is in order.

But more, one wonders, for Von Schuschnigg, it seems, still hasn't learned; he is still in favor of what he did. And that is an essential piece of information for any student who wants to listen intelligently to what he says about "religion in the modern world"

### Get The Challenge

every week — by subscribing to *Labor Action*. A student sub is only \$1 a year.

## A DOCUMENT FROM HUNGARY REVEALS AND ANALYZES

# The Role of the Nagy Group Inside the Hungarian CP

## Background of the Document by 'Hungariscus'

Because of its great interest, we here present fully what was briefly reported on in our pages last week (in the Challenge)—a document giving a Hungarian revolutionary's evaluation of the Hungarian Revolution.

We take this from the January 31 issue of France-Observateur (Paris), the weekly edited by Claude Bourdet which has been a political focus for various kinds of left socialists, independent socialists, neutralists, Stalinoids, etc. in France. On the Hungarian Revolution, the pages of France-Observateur have consistently taken an excellent position, thoroughly anti-Stalinist and very informative, especially in the writings of François Fejto.

On a page headed: "A Document: The First Self-Criticism of the Hungarian 'National-Communists,'" François Fejto gives extensive quotations and summations from the manuscript in question. An introductory editorial note explains as follows:

"A document, signed Hungariscus, is presently circulating in multiple copies among intellectual circles in Budapest. It is the work of a figure, from Imre Nagy's entourage, who has up to now

escaped the clutches of Kadar's police. This document constitutes the beginning of a study on the Hungarian insurrection of November, and the first attempt at self-criticism by the Hungarian Communist elements who were in at the start of the revolution. The document includes also an analysis of the present political situation in Hungary and a chapter dealing with the problems of Stalinism and the Yugoslavs' criticism of Stalinism. We cannot publish his volume (about 20,000 words in length) in full, but here we can give its main lines; for its author requested that this be brought to the acquaintance of the French public through France-Observateur."

So it is clear from this note that what is involved is one man's opinions and conclusions; it is, in effect, an exploratory discussion article by one participant toward beginning an understanding of the Hungarian Revolution; and it is in this sense also that LABOR ACTION presents it to our own readers.

Following, then, is the text of the article as presented by Fejto in France-Observateur; the foot notes are his too. The passages in quotation-marks are directly cited from the document by Hungariscus.

"The crumbling of the anti-Rakosi opposition inside the Hungarian Workers Party began with the fall of Rakosi," reveals the document, which starts with a retrospective analysis of the anti-Rakosi movement inside the Hungarian Workers Party. "After the military crushing of the national insurrection, one can say that the opposition completely disintegrated."

Three tendencies appeared among the "socialist opponents of the Rakosi-Gero-Kadar regime."

The first comprises those who dream of continuing the military resistance, of organizing a guerrilla struggle:

"Their schemes reflect complete incomprehension of the real situation, and impotent rage. They [i.e., the partisans of armed resistance—F. F.] do not take account of the fact that the majority of the population would not support this form of struggle. Besides, the guerrilla struggle could not achieve its aim in the face of a counter-revolution<sup>2</sup> which gets stronger daily, under the implacable pressure of foreign occupation."

"Without any doubt, the November strike constituted a powerful demonstration, unprecedented in world history—a magnificent demonstration of the Hungarian working class's fidelity to the ideas of the insurrection. It strengthened and battle-hardened the workers' councils, which were the only organs of struggle surviving the insurrection. But the strike could not win the day when even weapons necessarily had to succumb to an infinitely superior enemy . . ."

"True, strikes still break out here and there," continues the document. The clash of arms has not entirely ceased. But involved here are only rearguard skirmishes: the fate of the revolution was sealed at the time when the second Soviet intervention was unleashed. Today they are already laying the bases for the regime's consolidation. There is every possibility that this consolidation

It is significant that the document makes no distinction between Rakosi and Gero on the one hand, and Kadar on the other.

<sup>2</sup>The author of the documents uses the term "counter-revolution" to designate the repression of the revolutionary movement of October unleashed by Kadar; Kadar now (and it is his first success after so many setbacks) rests on a police force of some 40,000, it seems, recruited from among the veterans of the AVO, ex-officers of the army and members of the party apparatus who were dismissed or persecuted by the rebels.

will succeed. It is true that it will not be a definitive consolidation, it will not be complete—far from it. The consolidation will be somewhat stagnant, a consolidation of decay. But it will be done. Now, if yesterday the opposition inside the party made the mistake of not recognizing fast enough the fact and significance of the insurrection, it would be no less great an error on its part not to admit, at least for the time being, that the revolution is over, and that consequently we must look for new methods of struggle."

### FLIRT WITH KADAR?

After criticizing the advocates of guerrilla warfare, the document goes on to the second tendency: whose champions "are beginning to flirt with Kadar's Socialist Workers Party." Here is what he says of it:

"We don't even want to talk here about the cowardly and opportunistic elements who hasten to join Kadar: we can only be glad to see them desert the camp of Hungarian socialism. But there are many among our comrades who believe, or at least want to believe, that inside the Socialist Workers Party they could resume the struggle against Stalinism. Yet isn't it true that the principal lesson which we can draw from the last few years is indeed the failure of struggles carried on inside the party, within the framework of the party statutes?"

"Hungary is the Communist country where the internal opposition against the party leadership was the most powerful; more powerful even than in Poland, where the opposition included numerous supporters inside the Central Committee itself. Now the great merit of the Hungarian opposition is that it proceeded to a deep-probing criticism of the Rakosi regime, thus preparing the way for the popular democratic revolution of October in which the insurgent people expressed their agreement with the opposition's criticism by the clash of arms."

"Thus, history confirmed the correctness of the opposition. But at the same time it passed severe judgment on it for having failed to organize itself as an independent force. While the party leadership kept on stigmatizing the anti-party faction in a whole series of resolutions, what did the opposition do? It discussed. It discussed the question whether it should or should not organize as a faction. It did nothing to reach the people and particularly to establish positions in the working class. It did nothing to approach the bourgeois democratic

parties. At bottom, even on the eve of the revolution the Communist opposition limited itself to getting up petitions and giving forth with Cassandra-like prophecies—courageous ones, to be sure, but ineffectual."

"It is true that it was the Communist opposition that prepared the revolution. However, if one excepts a few rare individuals, the revolution was a big surprise to it. So, at the time the revolution broke out, the leaders of the opposition were not on the barricades but in the corridors of the party headquarters, isolated from the people. On the afternoon of October 23, the members of the opposition paraded joyously and triumphantly in the streets; but on the evening of the same day, they looked on impotently as History broke loose in an unforeseen and incalculable way. The people took their road independently of the Communist opposition; but at bottom hadn't this opposition always been separated from the people?"

### NO HOPE IN CP

The author pursues this merciless Marxist criticism of the mistakes committed by Nagy's friends:

"Thus, only a few of the members of Imre Nagy's group, few writers, few journalists, few members of the Peto Circle were around when the weapons of criticism had to give way to the criticism of weapons. Even among those who constituted the principal mass base of the movement, the university students, there were far fewer armed fighters than was believed during the first days of the insurrection. In fact, it emerges from statistics published by the hospitals that 80 to 90 per cent of the wounded were workers. Well, these figures underline better than anything else the mistake of the opposition, which consisted in abstaining from all organization in the working class. Consequently, the Communist opposition remained impotent precisely there where it should have been able to give spectacular demonstrations of its strength. The unforeseen explosion threw Nagy's supporters onto a car careening at top speed which they could neither steer nor stop, since it wasn't they that had set it off."

The document admits that later "the most aware members of the opposition, once they had recovered from their surprise, set themselves to establish contact between Imre Nagy and the rebels." But precious time had been irretrievably lost:

"From then on it was necessary to make concessions that were too big (and sometimes unthought-through) in order to bring unity between the Nagy group and the popular rising." The author is thinking above all about the proclamation of neutrality: "At this time Imre Nagy was already at the head of the insurgent people, like Kossuth after the March 1848 revolution; but unlike Kossuth who had five months at his disposal to organize the revolution, Nagy had no time left to do anything. The Soviet tanks were already in motion."

Thus, according to the document, the setback of the Hungarian Revolution was not due only "to the treason of the Rakosi-Gero-Kadar clique and the Soviet aggression," but also to the inability of the Communist opposition to organize itself when it had the time.

"It would therefore be a grave error to fall once more into the illusion that one can de-Stalinize the party from the inside. Hasn't the new party an even more militarized and police-dominated structure than the old one?"

"Certain comrades let themselves be deceived by the fact that Kadar and his friends present themselves as the relentless enemies of Rakosi and Gero. And when we reply by saying, 'There have been enough statements; how about actions?' then they bring up certain measures like the abolition of the compulsory work-books (a measure decreed by Imre Nagy, they seem to forget) or the setting up of the Workers Councils (but weren't these born in the fire of the revolution

and hardened precisely in the struggle against Kadar).

### CONCESSIONS—YES

"They also mention other minor concessions which represent a certain liberalization: for example, the fact that the newspapers have become livelier, that more Western films are shown, etc."

"It is not too difficult to understand the reasons which cause Nepszabadsag to publish photos of lightly clad beauty queens and so many picturesque affairs in the paper. Rakosi himself, speaking to the workers of the press, explained more than once that the purpose of such practices in the capitalist press is to deflect the attention of the masses from the essential things. On this point Rakosi was perhaps not wrong."

"In any case Kadar's press gives such an abundance of details on the sensational murder in X or Y street only in order to make us forget the murder which is perpetrated against the freedom of our people. His newspapers tell us of the little robbers in order to turn our attention away from the big robbers, those who have robbed the faith and confidence in socialism of hundreds of thousands of our compatriots. They give us the spectacle of beautiful nude girls only in order to console us for a reality which beats everything we have ever known for brutality and lies . . ."

"But aren't Kadar and his friends proceeding to a de-Stalinization?" some of our comrades ask us. "Haven't they gotten rid of Rakosi's supporters, and aren't they sincerely seeking the Hungarian road to socialism?"

No, answers the document:

"It is Rakosi supporters who are black-listing other Rakosi supporters. Besides, the individuals who are fired in this way are held in reserve. They are sure to be back at the fleshpots very soon; and then they will plume themselves on having remained Stalinists even at the time when Kadar did not yet dare to so avow himself."

"... The specifically Hungarian road to socialism, as Kadar proposes it to us, is in the direction of a Presidium inspired by the Rakosi-Gero duo and led by telephone calls from USSR Ambassador Andropov and the chief of the Kommandatura, Gen. Lashchenko."

This does not, however, exclude the possibility of a relative liberalization of the regime:

"Anyway, it would be difficult, after the revolution, to pursue the course abandoned by Gero. Kadar must know that. Thus—as has happened very often in the course of history—it is possible that despite the defeat of the revolution some of its important demands may be realized. We must fight to have that happen—but we must fight knowing that that road is lined with the corpses of our revolution. It is only a sideroad in an empire, a road which ties us inseparably to Moscow. But the Hungarian people don't want that. And we can be sure that the very first time this people goes into motion, the hundred thousand members of Kadar's party will desert it even more precipitously than the 900,000 members of Rakosi's party deserted Gero last October . . ."

### THIRD CURRENT

A third tendency also is showing itself among the former members of the Communist opposition in Hungary: it comprises those elements who, disappointed and discouraged by the recent events, turn away from socialism and reject it even in its popular, national and democratic form as sketched out by the insurrection, and go over to bourgeois democracy.

The author of the document treats them with scorn. "It is a shabby ending to come into Eisenhower and Eden's port after having served on Rakosi's ship so zealously and for so many years."

To be sure, he admits that the bourgeois democracies of our day "assure more welfare and freedom to citizens than do the Socialist Republics forged with Soviet chains." But, he says, "the Marxist criticism of capitalism remains valid, as does the Leninist critique of imperialism; the Egyptian expedition furnishes a new and striking proof of that . . ."

In conclusion, the document declares that Hungarian socialists must work out a path between Scylla and Charybdis, between Kadar's Stalinism and the bourgeois-democratism of Bela Kovacs:

"The socialist partisans of Hungarian

(Continued on next page)

GHANA in the Van of African Independence

# On This Continent a New Nation

By PRISCILLA CADY

Ghana, no more to be known by its colonial name of the Gold Coast, is now a free nation, since March 6. The emergence of such a nation from imperialist rule is a day for rejoicing indeed.

Contrary to the impression one might receive from the popular press, the right to self-government was not a free gift from the noble and kindly hearts of the British but the result of a long, hard and determined fight, principally made by the Convention People's Party under the leadership of the present prime minister, Kwame Nkrumah.

According to St. Clair Drake (in the Freedom Issue of *Africa Today*), the post-war independence movement grew out of a boycott against foreign firms, led by businessmen and intellectuals, which resulted in the United Gold Coast Convention, raising moderate demands for more self-government. Acting as secretary for this body, Kwame Nkrumah became the center of a group of more aggressive nationalists, and they left to in 1949 form the Convention Peoples Party.

There can be no doubt that the success of the CPP is due to the fact that it addressed itself to the broad masses of the people and enlisted their support. It became immensely popular in the Gold Coast Colony and drew large support from the other areas (Ashanti, Northern Territories and British Togoland). As a result of a civil-disobedience campaign, Nkrumah and others were imprisoned; a general strike took place which forced the British to hold an election in 1951 and the CPP won with a large majority.

It was by no means harmful to the nationalist cause that Nkrumah was elected prime minister while in jail, and he and his colleagues wore "prison graduate" hats proudly.

Once in possession of this limited amount of political power, the Conven-

tion People's Party steered a straight course toward its present goal. There were aspects of the situation which helped it and those that hindered.

### CLIMATIC FACTOR

The most important aspect is that Ghana lies in West Africa. This means that, because of the climate and the malarial mosquito, there were no European settlers in the colony, hardly even any permanent administrators. Therefore, from the beginning of their rule, the British had to rely on developing an educated African group to maintain continuity, and to allow much of business affairs to remain and develop in African hands. The cocoa industry, the mainstay of the country, was controlled by British in an indirect rather than a direct way.

One need only compare the tragic fight of the people of Kenya for a very few of the rights enjoyed by the Ghanians to understand the importance of having or not having settlers, of being on the east or west coast. Britain, with Ghana a friendly member of her Commonwealth, had very little to lose by being "generous."

Of course, there is always the danger of raising the hopes and demands of other colonies, but, while the very Western democratic negotiations with the Ghanians were going on, Britain was coolly putting through the hated Central African Federation and ruthlessly exterminating the Mau Mau movement. And not until those tasks were accomplished did she finally approve the independence of Ghana.

This is by no means to say that the British have Nkrumah in their pocket; as we said before, he fought them doggedly, and he won a long and hard battle. And Nkrumah is fully aware that there is more to Africa than Ghana.

In his autobiography he says: "nationalism is not confined to the Gold Coast. . . . From now on it must be Pan-Africanism, Nationalism, and the ideology of African political consciousness. African political emancipation must spread throughout the whole continent into every nook and corner. . . . I have never regarded our struggle. . . . an isolated objective. . . . There is much more beyond."

Some of the problems that Nkrumah had, and has, to deal with stem from the fact that the Gold Coast was an arbitrary geographical division, and the various areas have their own problems.

Ashanti, the center of the cocoa industry, largely still ruled by tribal chieftains, organized the most vigorous opposition to the CPP and formed the

National Liberation Movement. It still seems to be doubtful what course they will take—they pressed, for example for a loose federation with a great deal of autonomy given to each area—but at present they are operating as a loyal opposition.

The Northern Territories region has its own problems. More or less isolated and left undeveloped by the British, its people feared a continuation of this and established their own party, the Northern People's Party, which elected 12 of the 104 members of the recently elected legislative assembly.

British Togoland has its unique problem. Half of a country as it is—a German possession, Togoland was split between France and England after the First World War—its people were faced with the problem of hoping for an eventual all-Ewe federation, or going along now with Ghana. In a recent UN plebiscite the vote was for unification with Ghana, but obviously the situation will never be settled until French Togoland is free. These are problems, however, which can be coped with within a democratic framework.

### AMBITIONS

In a speech delivered to the Legislative Assembly in November 1956, Prime Minister Nkrumah discussed some of the democratic provisions of the constitu-

tion. Equal rights to all; elected, responsible bodies; guaranteed rights of minorities and guaranteed free elections—these are, he says, basic.

"Allied to minority rights and of equal importance," Nkrumah goes on to say, "are the rights of individuals. The government believe that the individual citizen of Ghana ought to be guaranteed by law freedom from arbitrary arrest. The government believe that the individual's home should be inviolate and not subject to arbitrary search, and that his property should not be arbitrarily confiscated, and he should have the right of free speech. The government believe that any individual should be entitled to join any trade union, political party or other association of his choice. The government consider that freedom to practice whatever religion a citizen follows should be guaranteed by law; the government think that it is an essential part of democracy that there should be a free press and that provision should be made by law that any state broadcasting system is as free to put the opposition's point of view as that of the government. Above all, the government believe that the courts of law should be absolutely independent of the executive and should be a bulwark for the defense of the rights of the individual. . . ."

"Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my speech, a tremendous responsibility rests on us. . . . We must show the world that Africans can give a lead in justice, tolerance, liberty, individual freedom and in social progress. . . ."

We salute the democratic nation of Ghana and its free people, and hope with them that these ambitions will be realized.

## PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

### Says Israel Is 'Basically Defensive' —

(Continued from page 4)

attacks. That too is not news. I wrote about it in LA. These do not contradict the fact that the border was in a constant state of turmoil whether by individuals, political groupings, bands or on a governmental basis. All they do is emphasize the reactionary and self-defeating nature of Ben-Gurion's policy of dealing with the matter. The flames could have been kept low and localized, as was done in the late '30s in the policy of Havlagah (restraint). The time gained was used for Israel's benefit and for a political offensive to gain a real peace. Ben-Gurion did not do it; the result: one war and the end not in sight. But Ben-Gurion's mistakes cannot remove the fact that there were provocations every day, etc.

I made no "wild" claims for the anti-imperialism of Israel's government. Its policy has not been anti-imperialist or anti-colonial. By citing Algeria, Cyprus, Morocco, Draper is destroying a straw man he erected. Draper says Israel's policy is "determined by its own narrow

state considerations. . . . neither anti-colonial nor pro-colonial." Correct. He only strengthens my case against the Stalinists and Cannonites against whom I explicitly directed my remarks.

Instead of refuting me by saying the Israeli politicians supported the ousting of Glubb Pasha because it got rid of the Arabs' only capable military commander, Draper only proves my point that these politicians feel they can compete better with Arab states that are free and independent and not backed by imperialism.

The point is that Israel's "narrow state considerations" lead it to support, in many cases, anti-imperialist moves. "For Israel, freedom of the present [emphasis in original] Arab states is desirable." This lays the basis of common Israeli-Arab action against imperialism.

I did cite the potential anti-imperialism of the Israeli people. That potential can become a reality provided the socialists and Arab nationalists adopt a policy that will activate it. This potential is not only the general anti-imperialist potential of the working class but is in line with the "narrow" interests of Israel.

### Analysis of a Straddling Formula —

(Continued from page 4)

nection whatsoever with Findley's straddling formula. I would write in the same sense on (say) "how to defend the Arab people against Israeli expansionism," wherever that would be a useful approach (say in Syria in criticism of the Baath socialists).

In ISL resolutions, a socialist view of "defense of the nation" is presented; this does not mean that the U. S. is in a "basically defensive" position vis-a-vis Russia, as per Findley's formula. And so on.

(2) Pulling back from his rosy presentation of Jan. 7 on Israel's anti-imperialism, Findley now says all he's claiming is "the potential anti-imperialism of the Israeli people." This makes hash out of his original remarks since the Israeli people are hardly unique in this respect. Obviously the real issue is the present relationship to imperialism of the Israeli regime. Findley dodges again from the immediate consequences of his apology.

(3) Nasser and many Arab leaders do deny for all public and official purposes that they are for wiping out Israel. I

paired of their expansionist ambitions' denial of their expansionist ambitions. Findley is mistaken about questioning the fact.

(4) Findley's apology for the Zionist leaders on expansionism amounts to saying that most of them don't consider its realization practical now, or at least one shouldn't talk about it now. What he dodges is the political question involved, precisely the basic and historical drives toward Zionist expansionism inherent in Zionist politics and ideology—a subject I have long planned to give a full treatment some time. Expansionism was not itself the activating motive for the aggression on Egypt, for which see LA Nov. 12.

(5) It's fine that Findley knows all about how it was Israel not the Arab governments that kept raising the ante in the border provocations for seven years from 1949-1955. Few do. But anyone who gets acquainted with the details of that appalling story, of which the Kibya massacre was only a high point, will find it so much the more difficult to swallow straddling formulas about "basically defensive."

## Role of the Nagy Group —

(Continued from page 6)

freedom must separate themselves from everything that is today practised in Hungary under the false label of socialism. They must become independent. It is only by becoming independent that they can unite with the popular movement and cooperate with the democratic and bourgeois elements who do not dream of a restoration and who aim at a true social renaissance."

### SEARCH FOR NEW ROADS

The first task of this movement will consist "in creating the theory of Hungarian socialism, through a revision of all the theses which were up to now considered to be definitive, through a confrontation with the reality of our era. Only after having clarified our ideas and aims should we go on to the second stage: that of organization."

To give an example, the author of the document himself sketches out a critical examination of Stalinism, with frequent references to Tito, while indicating the gaps in the Yugoslav criticism of Stalinism. An important fault which he finds with the latter is that it hits at the betrayal and deviationism of certain individuals and does not probe deeply enough into an analysis of the system. But whatever the deficiencies of the Yugoslav critique may be, "Tito's party has rendered an enormous service to international socialism, first by defending the national independence of Yugoslavia and, in addition to that, by taking the initiative on workers councils and economic decentralization."

But while this process is maturing, the Hungarian revolutionists, he believes, can play an important role in the search for new roads to socialism, in opposition both to terroristic Stalinist Communism and to social-democratic tendencies "which associate themselves with capitalism." That goes all the more since "Hungary's October revolution laid bare the vices and plague-sores of Stalinism better than all the theoretical critiques ever did."

### THE ROOTS OF GHANA

"The name Ghana is rooted deeply in ancient African history. . . . It kindles in the imagination of modern West African youth the grandeur of a great medieval civilization which our ancestors developed many centuries before the European penetration and subsequent domination of Africa began. . . ."

"For the one thousand years that the Ghana Empire existed it stretched across the Sudan from Lake Chad in the east to the Futa Jalon mountains in the west. . . . Egyptian, European and Asian students attended the great and famous universities that flourished in Ghana. . . ."

"We take pride in the name, not out of romanticism, but as an inspiration for the future." KWAME NKUMAH

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City  
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

# The South's 'Good' Racists — —

(Continued from page 7)

licity has overshadowed the splendid reputation we had built up over the last 10 years for industrial and cultural progress. To my personal knowledge we have lost plants and other operations because of these events and the resulting publicity." (Emphasis added.)

Later in a press interview Engel called upon the business community to awaken to the danger of permitting hoodlumism to continue, and to display to everyone, everywhere, the readiness of the businessmen to act to help to correct a situation in which law and order are threatened. (*Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 20.)

There is no reported opposition to segregation in any of its manifestation, only to the "hoodlumism" of the White Citizen Councils. The stand is firmly on the side of "law and order," that is, legal means for doing what the White Citizen Councils are hoping to do with their bombings and physical assaults upon Negroes.

## COLEMAN AS LIBERAL

The best example of this "law and order" line or "middle of the road" approach was the election of Gov. James P. Coleman of Mississippi in 1956. Coleman won the governorship over former Governor Fielding Wright, Dixiecrat vice-presidential candidate in 1948, who ran a blood-and-thunder campaign in which he pledged that a bayonet would have to be rammed through his body before he would submit to desegregation.

Coleman established something of a reputation as a "liberal" Southerner when, after election, he declared in a state-wide broadcast that "so far as I am concerned they [the murderers of Emmett Till] both should have been con-

victed and electrocuted." Although as state attorney general he argued in the U. S. Supreme Court against staying the execution of Willie McGee on three occasions, thus ensuring McGee's execution on a frame-up charge of taping a white woman.

During the primary race, which is equivalent to election, Coleman ridiculed Fielding Wright's contention that the use of Police power was the answer to the segregation issue:

"The bayonet stage will never come to pass with Coleman as your governor. There are ways to keep the schools open without using bayonets. Police power is a weak straw that has been broken by more than 500 decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court since 1883.

"Look, we can't whip the whole U. S., but we know we can use the Gore Law as an answer for the next twenty-five years."

The Gore Law, passed by the Mississippi legislature in 1954, enabled local school boards "without reference to color" to assign children to a particular school for any of several reasons—health, intelligence, previous educational preparation or any other allegedly pertinent factor. As Coleman also said:

"The point is that any legislature can pass an act faster than the Supreme Court can erase it. You won't be licked then as long as you don't want to be and keep fighting." (*The Reporter*, Sept. 22, 1955.)

This was the only issue that separated Coleman from the five other candidates in the primary, and though he was given virtually no chance to win at the outset, he did win.

Governor Coleman, who is known as a "Loyal Democrat" in Mississippi since he supported Stevenson in 1952 and 1956,

is steering a more moderate course than Governor Griffin and the Talmadge machine in Georgia. In Georgia the Talmadge-dominated legislature just recently passed a resolution calling for the impeachment of six justices of the U. S. Supreme Court on the grounds that they are guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanors."

The main effort in circumventing the school desegregation decision is the passage of laws giving local school boards the power to assign students to schools on grounds other than race. Pupil-placement laws have already been passed in Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina and Virginia. In South Carolina the law provides for closing the schools upon an integration order and for giving tuition to the students to go to private schools during the period of litigation.

## MIDDLE OF THE ROAD?

Typical of, or rather the "best" of, the pupil-assignment laws is the one which was introduced in Tennessee by Governor Frank Clement, who was keynote speaker at the 1956 Democratic national convention. Its backers say that it embodies the "best" features of the laws enacted in North Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, Mississippi and other Southern states.

It is a "no compulsion" or "voluntary" law which leaves it up to the local community to do what it will about desegregation. On the face of it, there is no prohibition against integration or maintaining segregation. Since the Tennessee Supreme Court rules that the state's segregation laws are unconstitutional, the act authorizes the local boards to assign students, permits transfer of students out of school districts, and allows school districts to operate joint schools. In none of the laws is there any reference to race or to the court's decisions outlawing compulsory segregation.

This is the "middle of the road" approach, for both the NAACP and the White Citizens Council opposed the laws; and according to some liberals it must be correct since both "extremes" opposed the bills. But all it does is permit the segregationists to hold on where they make a concerted effort to do so, while at best it tries to straddle the issue.

It is better than the laws in Virginia, for example, which call for the withholding of state funds from any school district which integrates. But it is not good enough, since it does permit the evasion of the desegregation decision.

It says to a community in effect: if you want to maintain segregation, go ahead, and we have provided the legal cover under which you can do it; on the other hand, if you want to desegregate, we will not cut-off your funds.

The right of a Negro child to attend a non-segregated school is clear-cut. It must be accomplished, under the court's decision, with all deliberate speed—not with all deliberate evasion.

## PUPIL-PLACEMENT DODGE

It is these pupil-placement laws which are now coming before the federal district courts in a series of crucial tests. The legality of the laws rests upon the intent of the legislatures, the administration of the laws on a non-discriminatory basis, and accompanying legislation. But it is clear that the intent in all the Southern states is to circumvent the Supreme Court's decision.

The issue is not the right of school districts to assign pupils, since non-discriminatory assignment rights are inherent in the functioning of school boards. In New York City, pupil-assignment will have to be used in order to break up the segregated schools in the Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods. However, even in the "best" of cases, as in Tennessee where there is a scrupulous avoidance of any mention of race, the intent is clear. Or else why would the law have been enacted in the first place?

The hardest blow thus far against these laws has come in a decision handed down last month by Federal District Judge

Walter Hoffman in a case involving integration of the schools in Norfolk and Newport News, Virginia. He ruled that the pupil-placement laws were part of a campaign of "massive resistance" designed to prevent desegregation anywhere in the state and "unconstitutional on its face."

However, Judge Hoffman only called for the beginning of desegregation and he conceded the possibility of redistricting school areas to minimize desegregation.

It is reported that Norfolk and Newport News would have been ready to make a beginning on integration two years ago if it were not for the pressure of Senator Byrd's political machine in the state—a pressure which according to the *N. Y. Times* of Feb. 24 has engendered "a degree of fanaticism [on the segregation issue] that has not been matched since the bitter days of Reconstruction."

With this decision it would appear that pupil-placement can only be a temporary expedient in the attempt to hold back the tide of integration. However it can still be litigated up to the Supreme Court, a process which can take a couple of years or even more.

Pupil-assignment was looked upon as the major stop-gap in these states, and now that its foundation is being hacked away, the question is which way will the Southern states go: toward integration or toward the destruction of the public school system.

In Virginia, as in the rest of the coastal states through Louisiana, it would seem at the present time that the direction is toward the destruction of the public school system and the institution of some form of "private" school set-up.

With this the struggle for integration enters a new phase. Thus far only 673, out of about 3600 school districts in the Southern and border states, have been integrated in the nearly three years since the Supreme Court called for integration, and most of these have been in the border states. By the next school year in September 1957, at best another hundred or so will integrate, still mostly in the border states.

After that the real test will come as the racists dig in and the Negro people push forward to claim their democratic rights.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# The Racket Probe — —

(Continued from page 1)

tivities and implying that these are illicit; it actually starts by probing genuinely criminal, illegal, or immoral actions by union officials (and others) in and around unions, which have in fact nothing to do with authentic labor activity in any form. Where the government is ferreting out real crimes, who can call halt? If a labor official uses his union connections to start a string of brothels, that hardly makes prostitution a form of class struggle. If a doctor steals hospital funds, that hardly makes larceny a recognized medical achievement.

Everyone knew the type of exposure that was beginning. No decent union officer wanted the labor movement to be saddled with any degree of responsibility.

But in one thing, they have probably failed: their readiness to cooperate will not dodge the aspersion on labor. Loftus is dubious: "The question, though, is whether even this [cooperation] is enough to avert the kind of climate that will adversely affect all unions." At this stage, the harm could hardly be avoided.

## PASS THE BUCK?

It is asked too: didn't our high union officials welcome government action so that they could pass the buck to others? Perhaps it might be maintained, they were embarrassed by criminal practices in some unions, and finding it too hot to handle, they were more than glad to see politicians take over what should have been a union job.

But this suspicion misses the mark. Actually, the most influential union leaders will use the government exposure to facilitate their own inner-union drive against the rackets.

The Teamsters Union, with its powerful connections inside the labor movement and out, was a hard opponent to touch. It would not have been easy to win over big sections of organized labor to a knock-down campaign against its corrupt elements. But after some of the practices of its agents are held up to public scorn, it will not be so easy for them to rally defenders.

There is no doubt that the investigations will speed up labor's own drive against racketeers; from a narrow technical standpoint, too, unionists are provided with information, evidence and

ammunition from the hearing record that they could not get, to that extent, on their own. At the hands of government investigators and union representative bodies, the rackets will be driven back.

Once all that is said, however, one basic fact remains. True, the crooks and gangsters will be hit. But at the same time, the prestige of the labor movement as a whole will suffer. Every instance of crookedness will reveal another place where labor failed to clean its own house. The harm has been done and there is no overcoming the neglect of the past.

The labor movement, not long ago, had at last decided to act against rackets within its affiliates. But it had waited too long. As Loftus puts it, "the labor movement received support as a force for social justice, not as a business."

But it did not act enough like a crusading force for social justice.

Over the years, it should have aroused its members and their passions against crooks who became leaders and vice-versa. It should have created the spirit of internal opposition to all forms of injustice, immorality, and bureaucracy. It should have stimulated real democracy, put to scorn high living on the union payroll and fat salaries for office holders. It should have stimulated and encouraged a membership that would not tolerate a perversion of the ideals of working-class solidarity and its debasement into private rackets.

But we do not have that kind of labor movement yet. The members are too often shoved into the background while efficient machines of officials runs things, usually honestly but bureaucratically.

Meanwhile, under the pressure of the CIO and then the progressive minority in the AFL, the labor movement was induced to recognize the need to take official measures against dishonest practices. Constitutional provisions were adopted; codes of ethics mapped out; committees appointed; union hearings held; suspensions of a few locals and small internationals took place; and slowly there loomed the possible campaign against the racket strongholds. But it did not come soon enough.

The public hearings prove that it was too late to escape the evil consequences of permitting rackets to flourish for so long. The lesson, we hope, will not be lost.

Get All Your Books from  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City