

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 12, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## AT THE AFL-CIO CONVENTION

... page 2

## The Amazing Public Conspiracy Of the Southern Racists

... page 8

## Beck Squirms Under Charges

... page 2

## Dulles & Goa: Stroke of Genius

... page 3

To Stop the Racist Terror in the South, Now Is the Time to Organize a

# MARCH ON WASHINGTON!

## The 'War' in the South: Money-Squeeze to Murder

By RALPH HODGES

The Jim Crow terror in the South is taking on the look of a kind of civil war—a war which is partly economic and sporadically violent—a war which is being fomented and prosecuted one-sidedly by the racist advocates of "white supremacy."

Their methods of assassination and intimidation are being tolerated and abetted by the state Democratic Party governments, and are being tolerated and winked at by the national Republican administration.

This week saw still a new murder committed, when a Negro leader in Texas was found beaten and burned to death near the town of Schulenburg. Like some previous victims, Herbert Johnson was president of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Blood is being spilled in the South. The racist assault has never been so violent in the South since the palmy days of the Ku Klux Klan after the First World War, when we had made the world safe for Democracy the first time.

Today the battle against the Negro people is not being led by the organized Klan but by the more "respectable" White Citizens Councils, who are even more direct and responsible representatives of the Southern ruling class. But the Klan is getting into the act too.

In Orangeburg, S. C., "The Ku Klux Klan has made its first mob appearance in open support of a

(Continued on page 6)

## 'Armageddon'

In his anti-football message to Georgia Tech in the Sugar Bowl affair (see page 5 for story), the fire-eating racist Governor Griffin of Georgia said:

"The South stands at Armageddon. The battle is joined. We cannot take the slightest concession to the enemy in this dark and lamentable hour of struggle. . . . One break in the dyke and the relentless seas will rush in and destroy us."

This is nearer the truth than are the evasive statements of Northern politicians and the sweetness-and-light pleas of watery liberals. Only, Governor Griffin, it cuts both ways!

In October, at a mass street rally in New York's garment center protesting the freeing of Emmett Till's murderers, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell got the most enthusiastic applause of the day when he proposed a 9-point program to do something—something other than the excellent activity of listening to protest speeches.

Since then we have heard nothing from him or others about carrying out this program. But it is not in Powell that we are interested. The program is still asking for action.

One plank in it is, we suggest, the best focusing point for a movement that could really provide an adequate answer to the appalling and frenzied attack of the White Supremacists on the lives and rights of the Negroes in the South.

This was the proposal for Negro organizations and their allies to organize a new March on Washington—

## For the New Congress Session

—opening in January.

Such a March on Washington could demand that an anti-lynching bill be put on top of the legislative agenda.

It could demand that the Constitution be enforced by refusing to seat the senators and congressmen from the state of Mississippi, as long as citizens are deprived of their rights in that state.

It could demand, from the leaders of both parties in Washington, ironclad pledges of civil-rights planks in their platforms, with teeth.

It could demand that the federal government, through its Department of Justice, intervene in the South to punish the racist assassins, kidnapers and violators of federal law protected by the states.

## A Beginning Has to Be Made

—with the above four suggestions from the same Powell program. We are not suggesting it is complete. We are sure that a real March on Washington movement would work out a more thorough one. But it is clear that there is more than enough to start.

A start must be made by Negro and labor organizations toward opening an offensive against the racist terror in the South.

On all sides, it is openly announced that both major parties have determined to wink their eyes at the plight of the Negro people, as is documented in the column to the right.

Their minds will not be changed by protest rallies only.

## One of the Biggest Victories

—ever gained for civil rights—the wartime FEPC—was won only and solely because a March on Washington movement gathered under the leadership of A. Philip Randolph and threw the fear of the lord into the Roosevelt administration.

It is history now that Franklin D. Roosevelt argued the movement into calling off the March at the price of granting the new FEPC setup. The threat alone won it, when backed up by massive preparations.

It looks to us as if only such a March on Washington—such a one as was then under organization, and such a one as will not be called off—can exercise the massive pressure required immediately to come to the aid of the embattled Negro people of the South.

## Nothing Else Can Do It Now

—that has been proposed by anyone. No one has suggested a reasonable alternative that has meaning now. Meanwhile Negro leaders are being murdered in cold blood by racist terrorists.

The anti-discrimination bodies of the new united labor movement, Negro labor and white labor, genuine democrats and liberals, spearheaded by organizations like the militant NAACP which is on the battle-line, should make immediate plans for a March on Washington!

## Both Parties Have Turned Their Backs On the Negro Fight

By BERNARD CRAMER

Both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party—including the so-called liberal blocs within both—have after due deliberation decided to abandon the Negroes to the Southern racists who are warring on them with methods of assassination, economic ruin and fiery crosses.

This is the cold, objective truth of the matter, and it is now authoritatively admitted beyond any doubt, and anyone who tells the Negro people to look for help to either of these old parties is not doing them any good.

Let's look at some required reading on this subject to get the basic facts. We are going to quote.

"WASHINGTON, Dec. 3—The prospect for any major congressional struggle next year over civil rights or the Taft-Hartley Labor Act has declined almost to the vanishing point.

"Inquiry indicated today that both issues . . . are likely to lie all but inert in the congressional session opening Jan. 3.

"It is even possible that they will not reach the floor of either House for serious debate."—Times, Dec. 4, by Wm. S. White.

How does this come about just when the most violent attack is under way against the rights and lives of Southern Negroes—this in a Washington which is supposed to be crawling with "friends of civil rights"? Where are all the liberals who are supposed to be such staunch defenders of Negro rights, and who (with the exception of Lehman) have run away just in a period when Negroes' blood is being spilled as savagely in the South as if they were pariahs?

What is the "practical politics" behind this?

(Continued on page 7)

## SEE ALSO

Page 8—The Amazing Public Conspiracy of the Southern Racists.  
Page 5—The Georgia Tech Affair.  
Page 4—Labor and Civil Rights in the South.

# At the AFL-CIO Convention: Haunted by the Class Struggle

By GORDON HASKELL

New York, Dec. 7

The American labor movement was united for the first time in its recent history in a dramatic and impressive session of the AFL and CIO at the 71st Regimental Armory in New York.

The floor of the vast armory was packed with 1500 delegates to the unity convention while some 4500 guests stuffed the galleries and spilled over onto the floor despite the efforts of the guards at all entrances to admit only delegates. Over 250 newspapermen from the labor and bourgeois press were present to record and comment on the proceedings, as well as high platforms for TV and newsreel cameramen.

Although this unity convention pre-fabricated in the meetings of the top leaderships of the AFL and CIO, and everyone present knew that the convention itself was a formality with no likelihood that any of the internal conflicts seething under the surface of the unity would break out onto the floor—despite all this, there was an air of dramatic intensity and a feeling of historical portent about the meeting.

This was in marked contrast to the deadly dullness of the brief separate AFL and CIO conventions which preceded the united one. There everyone felt that what was involved was a formalization of the death of the old organizations, while here is a formalization of the birth of a new one.

The "new" labor movement in America starts off with a lot of old ideas, which is inevitable. But the atmosphere around the convention belies any fears one might have that all that is going on here is a consolidation of the strength of everything conservative in the American labor movement.

**The fact is that, to the extent that "mood" means anything, it is the stand-patters along with the racketeers who are worried and distressed by the unity, while the more progressive elements are discussing just how and when they are going to move against the racketeers, raiders and racists.**

One little inkling of the way the wind will blow for the most discreditable union leaders was given when Dave Beck's bold move to throw his whole raiding machine into the new Industrial Union Council of the united federation was rebuffed by a united front of the former CIO leaders and Meany, who dragged the rest of the AFL leaders along behind them, leaving Beck in squalid isolation.

## THE SPECTER

One of the most heartening features of the convention, for socialists, was the concerted, all-sided and unrelenting attack on the theory of the class struggle which highlighted its opening sessions.

**We call this heartening, because it demonstrated that if ever there was a spectre-haunted gathering which sought by bold words and fervent incantations to exorcise the brooding spirit in its midst, this is it.**

How deadly it would have been if the American labor movement, or even its leadership, were so convinced that the class struggle on the industrial and political fronts was a thing of the past that they did not even bother to mention it!

The attack started with the opening speech of the convention which was delivered by Cardinal Spellman in the guise of an invocation. After a few ritualistic phrases to give his speech the form of a prayer, he went straight to the point of an attack on Stalinism and socialism, and to urging a policy of hard-bitten class-collaboration on the new labor movement.

Since prayers are subject neither to debate nor demonstration (cheering or booing) Spellman could no doubt feel safe in the conviction that no one would publicly resurrect from its resting place the memory of Spellman's own little sally into the arena of labor-management relations. Perhaps only in the bowed heads of the representatives of the grave-diggers union lurked the picture of the scabs recruited and herded to work through their picket line by this same Spellman seven years ago.

The representative of the world's strongest spiritual power having opened the attack, he was quickly followed by the representative of the world's strong-

est temporal power, the president of the United States.

**This noted expert on world history and social analysis took the occasion of his first public address since his heart attack to enlighten the assembled labor leaders on the origin and history of "the class struggle doctrine."**

"The class-struggle doctrine of Marx," President Eisenhower told them, "was the invention of a lonely refugee scribbling in a dark recess of the British Museum. He abhorred and detested the great middle class. He did not foresee that, in America, labor, respected and prosperous, would constitute—with the farmer and the business man—his hated middle class. But our second principle, the mutual interest of employer and employee—is the natural outgrowth of teamwork of progress, characteristic of the American economy where the barriers of class do not exist."

Leaving the product of his researches into the life and times of Marx for revelation at some other occasion, President Eisenhower then turned to his main theme: that the united labor movement should point the American Way for the workers of all other lands to follow. He summarized his speech:

"In the world struggle some of the finest weapons for all Americans are these three simple tenets of free labor. They are again: man is created in the Divine Image and has spiritual aspirations; second, the real interests of employers and employees are mutual; third, unions and employers can and should work out their own destinies. As we appreciate and practice that message without cease we will wage a triumphant crusade for prosperity, freedom and peace among men."

The delegates rose and cheered after Eisenhower's voice stopped on the loud-speakers. But while clapping vigorously on the podium, James Carey of the electrical workers had a preoccupied look, as did a number of the auto union leaders. Wondering, no doubt, how things are going in the realm of class peace and mutual collaboration at Westinghouse and Kohler.

## POLITICS

Aside from general expressions of a desire for peaceful forms of class struggle and for a recognition of real mutuality of interests by the employers which are ideological stock-in-trade in the American labor movement, speakers at the opening sessions of the unity convention kept harping on the theme of labor politics, of a labor party.

True, as with the general idea of the class struggle, all who spoke on the theme of labor politics did so to reject the idea of a labor party. But one could not help asking oneself: since no one at this convention was proposing the formation of a labor party, since there was no groundswell movement for it, why the pains by so many authoritative speakers to attack and repudiate it?

Of course, there has been a good deal of grumbling and mumbling from the conservatives about the political danger of labor unity, which boils down in its more extreme forms to the political danger of a labor party. Labor leaders have been at some pains to assure these conservative critics that their concern is completely without foundations.

**But anyone sitting in the armory on 34th Street and looking over the vast assemblage, and bearing in mind the mighty body of workers which stands behind them could not help but recognize the enormous political potential this labor movement represents. What political party in America has 15,000,000 dues-paying members?**

The opening speeches by Reuther and Meany were as political as they were trade-unionist. Meany spent a good quarter of his time not just on "political" questions in general, but on the most exclusively political of them all, foreign policy.

Yet, toward the end of his speech, he said:

"They are worried now about a labor party. Well, I don't see any sentiment for a labor party, and I don't see any sentiment for labor to take over one of the existing parties. That is a new one now, that we are going to take over one of the existing parties. Well, I know this, that we have a right and a duty to meet those who are opposed to us wherever they present the challenge."

Come to think of it, that is about as unconvincing and ambiguous a repudiation of a labor party, or of a drive by labor to take over one of the existing parties, as one could imagine. Meany says: no one here is for a labor party; no one is for taking over the Democratic Party. But we'll fight our enemies wherever they challenge us.

Everyone knows that the labor movement is being challenged from inside both parties. Meany made this perfectly clear when he said that "the legislative trend in the last eight years has been backward and not forward." That takes in five or at the very least three years of Democratic rule!

## QUILL'S ANTICS

There are all kinds of rumors floating around the convention about various conflicts under the surface. Since the unity was achieved from on top, the struggles are taking place at the top level, while peace and harmony prevail on the floor.

Although one should rein in one's credulity on many of the rumors, there is no doubt that struggles are taking place under the surface. It would be a blue-eyed miracle if they were not.

The only surface "struggle" is between Mike Quill of the United Transport Workers and the unity itself. Quill has attacked the unity on every basis of principle which one might take up: It does not guarantee an end to race discrimination; it does not provide effective machinery against the racketeers; it does not afford certain protection against raiding; he is for a principled unity, etc., etc. He is going to convene his executive board to sit during this convention, and eventually will submit the issue of whether or not his union will be a party to the unity to his members in a referendum.

Although there is a good deal of truth in everything Quill says about the united organization, no one takes it seriously, because no one in the labor movement takes Quill seriously. He has a record as a consistent four-flushing phony, and his antics around the unity question simply help to confirm it.

# Beck Squirms Under Charges

By BEN HALL

Television audiences watched Dave Beck, president of the Teamsters Union, squirm uncomfortably under the probing questions of newspaper reporters on the CBS program "Face the Nation" November 6. The *International Teamster*, union magazine, dutifully reports his performance, just as dutifully and even more wisely refrains from telling its readers what he was asked and how he replied.

Other union leaders must have fidgeted too, as they heard Beck duck, dodge, evade and explain away corruption in his union. For Beck enters with them into the united labor movement, and if any union must be cleaned up, it is his.

Last week, a subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee heard Marvin Zalk, administrator of four New Jersey truckers welfare funds, admit that he had received \$11,000 in "commissions" from an insurance company to supplement his \$10,000 yearly union fund salary. But this incident occurred too late for comment by Beck.

Some days later, in the December *Readers Digest*, Lester Velie made charges against the Teamsters' Vice-President James Hoffa, a man who helped elect Beck into the presidency in return for his own elevation into a vice-presidency. The charges:

- Hoffa has private business relations with bosses who deal with the Teamsters. One of Michigan's biggest trucking firms formed a company to rent out hauling equipment. Profits went to Hoffa's wife.
- Hoffa used strong-arm methods to keep crooks in control of Teamster locals in Joplin, Mo. and Pontiac, Mich. The lead pipe served as an important auxiliary argument in all disputes. He beat one opponent over the back with chains and threatened to kill another.
- He and his aides accepted large

"loans" from employers which were never repaid.

- He tried to get a Teamsters charter in New York for a racketeer, Johnny Dio.
- One of his chief aides is Paul Dorfman, "one-time associate of the Capone mob." Hoffa has channeled Teamster welfare funds to a firm owned by Dorfman who has received enormous commission checks: \$101,000.

• Velie asks in conclusion, "Do the Capones have their hooks in the Teamsters? Is Paul Dorfman the conduit through which a piece of the regional Teamsters welfare-fund insurance controlled by Hoffa flows to the Chicago underworld?"

## APOLOGIST FOR CROOKS

Reporters on the "Face the Nation" program tried to pin down Beck, referring to specific incidents known to them and to charges made by Velie in a previous article in the November *Readers Digest*.

**In reply to one series of questions, Beck reveals himself as a deliberate apologist for the crooks that infest his union. We quote in full from the official text of the interview:**

"Q. Mr. Beck, what about the situation out in Minneapolis where a convicted labor racketeer named Gerry Connelly has been reinstated in the union against the wishes of the local people on orders from the International?"

"BECK: Well, of course, that, Mr. Mollenhoff [reporter for *Des Moines Register and Tribune*], is not the exact truth.

"Q: He was convicted was he not?"

"BECK: I think he was convicted at one time.

"Q: Sentenced to pay a \$2,000 fine about 3 or 4 months ago?"

"BECK: I think that's right.

"Q: He has been reinstated, hasn't he?"

"BECK: He has been reinstated by a trustee. Now, Mr. Mollenhoff, if you will

ask the question, I will try to answer it. He was reinstated by a trustee. Under our constitution, we appoint a trustee and that trustee has the full authority to make decisions. In the instance of Mr. Connelly, there were four others who were under indictment for the same charge. So, in my opinion, the trustee exercised the decision that he should either remove all four of the others or not remove Connelly. So, he restored Connelly and now all of them are under trial in the court, federal court in Minneapolis and a decision will be rendered.

"Q: That's on another charge, though, isn't it? He was convicted on one charge, and isn't it a fact that part of the time a trustee went in there, that the International had ordered this convicted labor racketeer put back in office?"

"BECK: No, that is not right at all. The International never ordered him to be returned to office. All the International did was name a trustee and a trustee restored him to office as a business representative. The International did not order it, Mr. Mollenhoff."

## LAME STORY

**Later in the interview, Beck explains in a little greater detail how the elusive trustee happened to restore a crook to office:**

"BECK: I appointed two trustees. The first one I appointed removed Mr. Connelly from office. I did not interfere with his removal in any way, shape or manner. Then, because of a tremendous amount of work, it was necessary to change the trustees. The second trustee that went in, because Connelly and four others were under indictment, then he put him back in office as a business representative..."

In another exchange, Beck admits that the International Longshoremen's Assn-

(Continued on next page)

LONDON LETTER

# Wage Demands vs. 'Responsibility' Riding Two Horses—How Long?

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Nov. 30

Riding two horses at the same time is a comparatively simple feat for a skilled circus performer. The horses run alongside each other while the performer stands astride them, placing a foot on the back of each. The essential thing is that the horses maintain the same speed and keep traveling in the same direction; should the horses decide to part company, then the rider takes a tumble.

Many of the leaders of British trade unions find themselves in such a position today. For years they have managed to ride two horses with a certain amount of skill, but it now looks as if the horses are about to part company and the trade-union leaders must choose one horse or the other, or else tumble into the sawdust and risk being trampled upon by both horses.

An indication of the difficulties now confronting these two-horse men came when the General Council of the Trades Union Congress last week issued a lengthy document on the economic situation in Britain, with particular reference to the recent autumn budget.

The most important section of the document dealt with wages. It pointed out that workers were aware, through their own personal experiences, that wage increases in the past fifteen years had been largely canceled out by rises in prices, thereby leaving the workers little better off than before. The answer to this situation, said the TUC leadership, was that wage increases must keep in line with increases in output; if this was not done the result would be unemployment.

"Every trade-unionist, and indeed every member of the community, has the responsibility of helping to overcome the country's economic problems. Trade-unionists should be particularly conscious of that responsibility, as the preservation of full employment is bound up with the solution of those problems."

In calling for a "responsible" attitude on the part of trade unions the 33 members of the TUC General Council were doing two things. First, they were attempting to dampen down the enthusiasm which is now being broadly displayed for an all-out wage offensive against the employers—enthusiasm which has found an echo in the House of Commons from such seemingly incompatible sources as Hugh Gaitskell and Aneurin Bevan.

Secondly, the members of the General Council apparently overlooked the fact that about 7 million workers in Britain are at the moment negotiating for higher wages or are in the process of lodging a claim for them—and many of the unions seeking these wage increases are powerful pillars of the TUC General Council. Miners, railroad workers and

engineers are displaying a particularly keen determination to step up their wages, and leaders of these unions are among some of the most vocal and active members of the TUC General Council.

How many of the leaders of unions now seeking higher wages opposed the TUC's document when it was debated on the General Council is not known, but few of them could have done so or else the document would never have seen the light of day in the public press.

Viewing this glaring contradiction one may come to the conclusion that leaders of unions now seeking rises adopted the TUC document with a tongue very firmly tucked in the cheek and under the firm impression that it applied to every other union except their own. But this is too infantile an explanation, for the union leaders concerned are experienced enough to realize that such a policy is too transparent to be of any value.

This leaves the conclusion that the trade-union leaders are making one final bid to prolong their two-horse circus act. They can feel the horses pulling in opposite directions and are making a supreme effort to open their legs wider in an endeavor to maintain balance in a very tricky situation.

Such a performance cannot last much longer. The government clearly wants the trade unions to show exactly where they stand, and it wants their full support for a policy of going easy on wage demands. At the same time the workers have reacted violently to the latest Tory budget and are pushing hard for further increases in wages.

It is between these two horses that the union leaders must now choose, and their ultimate choice is not yet clearly defined. The Liberal *Manchester Guardian* said in an editorial comment on the TUC's document: "Interpretation of the council's statement may permit of differing degrees of emphasis," and this is just about as accurate a summing up as any. But meanwhile the horses are moving further and further apart and the time is fast arriving when a choice will have to be made between one or other of them—or violent contact with the sawdust ring and a pounding from the hoofs of both.

In political circles speculation is still rife concerning the future of Clement

Attlee and the next leader of the Labor Party. For what it is worth circles "in the know" are now saying that Attlee will turn in his leadership within the next fourteen days and that an election for his position will take place before the Christmas recess of Parliament. Tagged on to this tidbit is the opinion that Attlee will find a place in the New Year Honors List; in other words he will be given a seat in the House of Lords and will lead the Labor forces in this aristocratic debating chamber.

Such a situation is not improbable. It is well known that the Labor Party is concerned with the rather feeble performances of the Labor peers in the House of Lords and would like the opportunity to gee them up a little. Attlee, although he will be 73 in January, could undoubtedly do a little geeing up.

But all the statements concerning Attlee's future are speculation; no official

pronouncement has yet been made, and this is causing some impatience among members of the Parliamentary Labor Party. There are indications that the rivalry between Gaitskell and Morrison for the position of party leader is becoming a little tiresome, and there are also rumors that Bevan has been taking advantage of the situation to improve his position in the leadership stakes.

After the Margate conference two months ago Bevan was reduced to the role of outsider by those offering odds on the leadership stakes; rumor has it that the odds against Bevan have now been reduced considerably. While no one would tip Bevan as the winner there are not a few who now see him as having sufficiently good backing to upset the calculations of the supporters of the two main candidates, Morrison and Gaitskell. Some even go so far as to say that Bevan now stands a sporting chance of receiving the consolation prize in the shape of deputy leader.

But again, this is pure speculation and not a statement of fact. Like the current rumors concerning Attlee's future it is repeated here for what it is worth. It may not be true, but at least it is an indication of what is currently being whispered around in the inner sanctums of the Parliamentary Labor Party.

## Dulles and Goa— Stroke of Genius

By H. D.

It must have taken a stroke of genius, but Secretary of State Dulles had it in him.

The problem was: how to counter the propaganda campaign being carried on by Moscow's traveling salesmen, Khrushchev and Bulganin, in India and Burma, as they made speeches demagogically attacking the rival imperialism of the Western camp.

Dulles had a number of choices, after all. When the Stalinist dictators talked of how Britain and France followed their Munich policy of "slicing" Hitler Germany against Russia (an indubitable historical fact), Dulles could have come back with the equally indisputable fact that it was Russia which wound up as an ally of this same Hitler Germany, after the infamous Stalin-Nazi pact which gave the green light to World War II.

While it would be a case of the pot calling the kettle black, still at least truth would be served all around.

When Khrushchev and Bulganin charged that the Atlantic powers were preparing Germany for a new world war (a fact that everyone knows), Dulles could have come back with the equally well-known fact that Russia was just as feverishly putting itself and its satellites on a war footing—for example, exploding H-bombs even as the two salesmen were talking "peace" on their tour.

When the two Moscow mouthpieces

charged the accompanying press correspondents with distortion and biased news, Dulles could have come back with an exposé of the utter hypocrisy of this complaint by despots who kept their own press in line with an occasional bullet into the brain of deviationist editors.

But Dulles did none of these easy things.

Instead he and his advisors obviously searched assiduously for the most spectacular way of proving that everything the Kremlin tourists were saying was true.

This was no easy task. For example, he could have gone out of his way to defend the Munich sellout—but this, after all, was water under the bridge, and perhaps some people in India might not have gotten the point.

He might have made an indignant reply that the new German army set up under NATO was a guaranteed-peaceful instrument of angelic goodwill toward men, and that its Iron Cross, the Prussian, symbol of militarism, was now as noble a symbol of the higher morality as the dollar sign itself.

But a mere whitewash of German militarism, which is undergoing a rebirth under Adenauer and NATO, might not have been sufficiently meaningful to India's millions.

It took uncanny skill to hit on the right note, but Dulles did it. The Indian masses may not be altogether clear on many European affairs, but the one thing they do know is the meaning of foreign imperialism on their own land. It was only yesterday that they got rid of the main foreign invader, England.

So it was guaranteed that they would understand everything needful about Portugal's continued usurpation of Indian territory in its little colony of Goa on their coast.

Hence, point 1 in the method of Dulles triumph: *Of all of Khrushchev's jibes, choose as the one to answer his attack on Portuguese retention of Goa.*

Point 2: *Line up with Portugal by referring to this "Portuguese province" as if it really belonged to this NATO partner of yours.*

Point 3: *Take your stand with Portugal in the most pointed way, namely, by issuing your statement jointly with dictator Salazar's ambassador, lest anyone think you had a standoffish attitude toward this friend of yours just because he runs a fascist regime.*

What all this achieves is evident. If such a thing was done on any lesser scale, some people might just think it was simply a boner, blunder, bungle or booboo. When it attains such massive and statuesque proportions, however—and is moreover carefully exhibited at a press conference afterward, in addition—then the explanation of simple stupidity ceases to satisfy. It is no longer a "mistake."

It is simply an over-dramatization of the essence of reactionary U. S. foreign policy, which hurries to the defense of even fascist dictators who are military allies, and takes the side of colonialism, in preference to any hint of a democratic foreign policy.

## Beck Squirms Under Charges — —

(Continued from page 2)

ciation, which has just signed a mutual-aid pact with the Teamsters, remains as corrupt today as the day it was expelled from the AFL. William H. Lawrence of the *Times* asked Beck if he thought that the ILA had purged itself of racketeers. Beck replied, "No, Mr. Lawrence, I have not taken any recognition of that part of it. All I know is that they are operating under an election that they won under the auspices of the national government."

Beck promises vaguely that his International will act against racketeers only when they are duly convicted in court. He will not, then, take the initiative in cleaning up his union but will await action by government authorities.

But apparently powerful figures in government have their own reasons for overlooking Teamster corruption. When hearings of a House committee into the affairs of James Hoffa were abruptly terminated, one of its members, Wint Smith (R.) of Kansas said: "Pressure came from so high that I can't even discuss it." Drew Pearson charged that the decision to by-pass Hoffa was part of a deal to get his support for Republican Senator Homer Ferguson in his vain 1952 campaign for re-election.

In his December *Digest* article, Velie maintains, "The Teamsters had approached key figures in the trucking industry to urge Republican Party leaders to end the hearings." Beck himself re-

vealed that in 1948 and 1952 he voted for Republican presidential candidates Dewey and Eisenhower. True or not, the Republican Party will think twice before moving against one of its few possible allies in the labor movement.

But Beck's promise to act after legal conviction of crooks is hedged about with all kinds of qualifications. "Now, I assure you," he told reporters prodding him for a reply, "when those trials are over, whether it is in Mississippi or anywhere else, and it comes then to the attention of the International Union on convictions having been secured, if so, by competent authority, this International Union will immediately act."

If . . . if . . . if . . . not exactly a ringing call to rout gangsterism!

### ILL AT EASE

Meanwhile, the CIO and AFL merge. Its constitution gives the ruling body of the new federation powers to investigate corruption in its affiliates and to recommend action against it by conventions.

Teamster officials feel somewhat ill at ease. On the eve of the merger they rallied their forces at a testimonial dinner for Dave Beck under the auspices of New York Teamsters Joint Council No. 16. Martin Lacey, council president, expressed the prevailing mood in leading teamster circles: "We at the Joint Council and local union levels are far from clear as to what is expected of us in the merger, but we look forward with enthusiasm to the close

cooperation of our International Union."

His "enthusiasm" flows forth not for the merger but for solidarity with the leading officials of his own union. They will hang tightly together in order to hold on to everything they've got.

At the same dinner, George Meany doffed his hat to Beck, "He and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters have played a tremendous part in the long record of achievement of organized labor during the last century." Such a tribute is possible only in the honeymoon first days of labor unity when the immediate task is to consummate and cement the merger.

But the bare facts remain. The officialdom of the Teamsters Union, strongly entrenched in power and backed by a ruthless machine, obviously intends to do nothing to clean out racketeering in its ranks. It has powerful allies in the Democratic and Republican Parties, powerful enough to shield them from the law. It has powerful allies within the labor movement; not only their publicity-shunning similars in local AFL federations but a formal alliance with three other unions, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Hodcarriers, and the Carpenters.

It will not be easy to break the power of corruption where it has fastened its hold; the fight against it will be long and hard. But it will not be smothered to death under perfumed flowers flung at Beck.

## Reading from Left to Right

### Assorted Experts on Titoism at Work

By PHILIP COBEN

*Yugoslav Observer* is a new quarterly launched by the Yugoslav émigrés in the U. S. ("Free Yugoslav Information Center" with an address in Michigan), as a counterweight to Tito's English-language propaganda organs. We are in receipt of the first number, and sadly report that it is just about what you might expect from these people.

It is, of course, anti-Titoism from the standpoint of the old regime. The main note is that Tito is no good because he cannot be a reliable ally for the West in the anti-Communist cause. This includes the note (sounded in the lead article) that "Tito was never a renegade from the true Communist ideology." This is guaranteed to be no-end impressive to all Yugoslavs—in Washington, D. C.

Aforesaid lead article is by the S. Yovanovic who is the chairman of the "Yugoslav National Committee" in London. Second article in the issue trots forward the head of the Yugoslav Socialist Party-in-exile, Dr. Zivko Topalovic.

There is not a socialist word or phrase in the whole piece. Every sentence could have been written by a monarchist. Its main argument is explicitly that Yugoslavia cannot be considered secure unless and until it gets into NATO as well as into a couple of other military alliances (Italy and the Balkans).

This "socialist"—he must be a "socialist," for otherwise would he be accepted by the Socialist International as a representative of an affiliated party? let us not answer that too hastily—this "socialist" devotes himself to a big discussion, among other things, about how a democratic Yugoslavia would agree to defend the Istrian gate against "the penetration of the conquering armies into Italy," and not simply seek to defend Yugoslavia from the strongholds of the Bosnian Mountains.

Furthermore, gloats this "socialist," Tito has exposed himself because it is now clear that Yugoslavia—

"surely will never join the Western bloc. This regime will fight against the use of its military power or of the Yugoslav territory in the service of anti-Soviet aims..."

The next article, by Dr. Ilya Sumenkov (described as "outstanding leader of the Yugoslav Democratic Party"), is a fitting commentary on the collaboration of "socialist" Topalovic. This doctor reveals that Tito is not really a nationalist at all, but rather a . . . socialist. This last he demonstrates triumphantly by quotations from Tito himself! See?

What stands out about this crew—it wells out of every paragraph—is that all of them, from the "socialist" to the gentleman who heaps praises on King Alexander I, look forward only to coming back to power on the gun-carriages of a Western capitalist army.

Of course, up to now these same émigré politicians have had a different English-language outlet, at least occasionally. That is the *New Leader*, whose leading Yugoslav "expert" has usually been Bogdan Raditsa. Raditsa for years was a Man of Distinction: he was one of the few living organisms who insisted that Tito never really broke with Moscow at all, nor vice-versa.

Not too long ago Raditsa gave signs of having made a slight modification in this analysis. He started writing that Tito was going back to the Moscow alliance: a formulation which would mean to gullible people that a split had taken place at some point or other, probably behind Raditsa's back.

At any rate, more recently Raditsa has had competition at the Rand School. A different brand of noncooperativity took over, and in the Oct. 31 issue of this bulwark of Western civilization, Raditsa protests vigorously against a preceding two-article series in the magazine by Paul Willen, described as "a rising young specialist on Soviet affairs."

Willen's articles had contended that Tito is not going back to satellite status or "subservience to the Soviets," which is indubitably true; but for our money, he had himself achieved something of a classic (of a type the very opposite of Raditsa's) with the closing paragraph of his first article.

There we learn from this rising young specialist that "the general drift of Yugoslavia internal policy over the past five years reflects a far greater influence of John Dewey and John Mill than of Marx, Lenin or Stalin." (This after the Djilas purge.)

And in Yugoslavia, where he saw it all with his own eyes and heard it with his

own ears, this young specialist, who has obviously risen quite a bit, reports: "I heard American industrial relations—particularly the Guaranteed Annual Wage—held up as a model of progressive social thinking by prominent Yugoslav Communists. Most surprising of all, I heard the British trade unions criticized for clinging to old conceptions of class struggle and American trade unions praised for rising above these conceptions toward a more responsible and management-oriented view. Without even free trade unions, it is doubtful that the Yugoslavs can implement the progressive industrial relations they praise in the U. S.; yet it is interesting that it is to the U. S. that they are presently looking for new and fresh developments in this field."

One sees that this rising young specialist is not of the opinion that J. Dewey and J. Mill have as yet freed the Titoist trade unions, which are still instruments of the totalitarian state against the workers; therefore he is "surprised" to find that these totalitarian "unions" praise the management-oriented view, which is so "progressive" in the U. S., and that they have a distaste for the class struggle, which naturally could be directed only against the totalitarian "management." . . . It is clear why this young man is rising.

#### CEREAL STORY

But let no one think that Americans have a monopoly on this sort of thing. Earlier this year an English tourist, Hallam Tennyson, published a book *Tito Lifts the Curtain*. We haven't read it, but there is a little pearl in it, to judge by an excerpt accidentally quoted in the *London Tribune*.

Quite in passing, Tennyson refers to the Titoist political system as "totalitarianism imposed by persuasion rather than fear. . . ." Turn those seven words over in your mind and savor them. Slavery is freedom, and the Yugoslav people have permitted the gag over their mouths because they are convinced they like it that way, not because of the knife at their throats.

But let no one think that this inoffensive and kind-hearted Englishman is a Titoist whitewasher; he is a sincere and honest person whose only drawback is that his skull is filled with pure Cream-of-Wheat. And that's his democratic right.

### Labor and Civil Rights in the South

• The Mississippi Federation of Labor last month gave a rousing ovation at its convention to Rev. L. J. Twomey when he told them:

"I am a Southerner, but no United States Senator who states that the decision handed down by the United States Supreme Court regarding segregation is desecrating Southern tradition is speaking for me."

Talking about the Emmett Till murder case, Father Twomey, director of New Orleans Loyola University Industrial Relations Institute, stressed that "the actions of the people in Mississippi are flashed across the world to the Communists and they use our actions as clubs to beat us over the head."

Asserting that "non-whites hold the balance of power in the world," the Catholic priest said: "Unless we do away with racial prejudices, we are lost. We in the labor unions must organize and show them that the little people of the United States have rights."

• State CIO Council conventions in Tennessee, Virginia and Texas have adopted resolutions supporting the Supreme Court decision and opposing plans to create so-called "private" school systems to maintain segregation.

• Both AFL and CIO summer schools in the South this year included courses on "Special Problems of the South," stressing the need for an effective civil rights program not only to promote justice but also to speed unionization of the South.

• A wildcat strike of CIO Rubber Workers at the General Tire and Rubber plant in Waco, Texas, to prevent the upgrading of a Negro tire-builder, was quickly snuffed out when the local's membership voted overwhelmingly to return to work—with the Negro worker keeping his promotion.

Labor unity, many of us feel, will speed these steps forward among union-

#### BOOKS AND IDEAS

Joll: Second International

## Bad History, Worse Politics

JAMES JOLL: THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL, 1889-1914.—Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1955.

By VICTOR HOWARD

Names like Bebel and Jaurès, dates like August the 4th, and places such as Basel and Stuttgart are only dim echoes to younger generations of socialists. Yet it is only by understanding the era represented by these symbols that we can comprehend the state of the working-class movement today.

• Histories of the Second International as such are few; one who wants to understand the period at all is compelled to harvest his information from scattered biographies and autobiographies, histories of individual parties, and polemical documents.

A good history of the Second International would well serve those who lack the leisure for this exploration, but James Joll's opus is not it.

As a bourgeois English patriot out of sympathy with the aims of socialism, and an Oxford Fellow to boot, he scarcely understands the importance of the theoretical conflicts which racked the pre-war socialist movement. The domination of the Comintern by the dead hand of the Russian bureaucracy is equated by him with the position of the German SDP in the Second International. This situation was most "unfortunate," he finds, because it retarded "the development of a specifically French Socialism, excluding some of the ablest men in the Third Republic from office for many years."

The British Labor Party is fortunate, Joll believes, "in that the concept of the class struggle has rarely been applicable to day-to-day English political life." In fact, he adds, there was in Britain "little sign of the class struggle." (Not even in 1926, apparently.)

His exalted opinion of his own ruling class is also revealed in his remark that "Jaurès . . . was far more ready to attribute peaceful intentions to the Liberal government in Britain than were the Germans (with the honorable exception of Eduard Bernstein)." Since it soon became perfectly clear that the intentions of the Lloyd George government were anything but peaceable, we can see the basis of Joll's praise of the German revisionist.

Another corker is Joll's conclusion that the German SDP could not have re-

sisted the war even if they had desired because "Where effective action against military power was most likely to be required, that very power made it impossible for effective action to be taken." There are more stupid remarks like this, but why go on?

Joll also reveals his pedantry by quoting at some length passages in German, French, and Latin without translating them.

Yet the book is not worthless. He raises questions which some socialist writers for factional reasons either ignore or distort to fit their doctrine. For instance, he deals with the difficult relations between the Austrian Socialist Party and the subject nationalities of the Hapsburg Empire.

Everyone can agree with Joll's conclusion that with the coming of the war, its greatest test, "The life had gone out of the Second International, and it was never to return." There is something remarkable also about the fact that the death of this movement which was once inspired by the influence of Engels should also coincide with the deaths of three of its greatest figures in as many countries: August Bebel in 1913, Jean Jaurès in 1914, and Keir Hardie in 1915. (No "great man" theories are here intended.)

"The Socialist parties had become ossified," concludes Joll, "their leaders indistinguishable from bourgeois politicians, their officials no different from bourgeois civil servants; and the collapse in 1914 revealed the gap between their Marxist words and their reformist deeds."

While this criticism could have come from the pen of a Marxist, and often has, the over-all view of Joll is that they were not reformist enough. After all, didn't they commit the great error of keeping "able men" out of cabinet posts for many years?

## Silone to Reply

Ignazio Silone, the well-known Italian socialist and novelist, has accepted our invitation to reply to Lucio Libertini's criticism of his role in the socialist movement, which appeared in our Nov. 28 issue under the title, "The Case of Ignazio Silone." However, he writes, he is now traveling and will not be able to write his reply until his return to Rome later in December.

Silone's note, sent from Paris, says: "Your letter of Nov. 25 was forwarded to me here in Paris, where I have been for several days. At the same time I received three letters from American friends on the same subject and a letter from a weekly which puts its columns at my disposal. But from here I have to go to Switzerland and perhaps to Germany: so I lack the time to give an adequate reply to all the far-ranging questions of doctrine, politics and psychology. However, leaving aside insults to which I never reply, I feel the duty to explain my objective positions. So I will write a reply to these different letters as soon as I return to Rome, around December 20."

LABOR ACTION will be happy to publish it as soon as received.



## LABOR ACTION

December 12, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 50

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

### HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by George Orwell

\$3.50

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## The Georgia Tech Affair: A Partial Victory

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

In their desperate struggle to defend Jim Crow, the racists of the South have pushed for their lily-white principles in every area of life, in schools, waiting-rooms, buses, trains. The immediate conclusion of the most recent of their attempts—this time involving football—was satisfying enough; but the over-all meaning of the incident is not so heartening.

By now, the facts should be well known. Governor Griffin of Georgia attempted to keep Georgia Tech from playing in the Sugar Bowl against the University of Pittsburgh because Pitt had a reserve fullback, Bobby Grier, who is a Negro. Immediately after the governor publicized his stand, a mob of rioting students from Tech hanged Griffin in effigy and demanded their right to a bowl game. Finally, the Georgia Board of Re-

gents ruled that Tech should go on with the game.

At the outset, it should be clear that the motives of the Georgia Tech students are probably more related to enthusiasm for a Bowl game than to opposition against Jim Crow. Nevertheless, they have made it emphatically plain that they have refused to take "white supremacy" lock-stock-and-barrel. In coming out against racism, even to a limited extent, they have separated themselves from the die-hards like Griffin. This much is to the good.

But the terms under which the Board of Regents okayed the game offer little cause for rejoicing. To begin with, the Regents reiterated their defense of Jim Crow in Georgia, resolving that "all contests held within the state of Georgia shall be held in conformity with the constitution, laws, customs and traditions of the State," i.e., Georgia football is now officially Jim Crow.

And on the question of out-state games, the Regents were hardly more encouraging. They held that "no contract or agreement shall be entered into for an athletic contest in any state where the circumstances under which it is to be filled are repugnant to the laws, customs and traditions of the host state."

This bit of doubletalk requires a little translation: Louisiana, the host state in this case, is pro-segregation; but the Sugar Bowl is having Pitt, a team with a Negro player; therefore, Georgia serves notice on the rest of the segregated states and on Louisiana that this sort of thing should not be allowed to happen again, that football should not be an exception to the "laws, customs and traditions of the host state." In other words, in the very act of conceding on this one issue, the Georgia Regents have attempted to use their influence to

push for Jim Crow athletics throughout the South.

The "Southern Gentlemen," a pro-Jim Crow pressure group, got into the act with a wire to the governor of Louisiana, "You must use the full power of your office to maintain segregation in Louisiana," and another wire to Fred Digby of the Mid-Winter Sports Association in New Orleans telling him that the forthcoming game was another step in destroying "the Southern way of life."

Thus the Georgia incident. On one level—a short-term one—it is a victory: the game will go on. The students at Georgia Tech have at least demonstrated against Jim Crow even if within limits. But on another level, the Georgia case reveals the tremendous force of reaction which is marshaled against integration; it indicates the need for much more wide action than one riot against the canceling of a Bowl game.

## A Sectarian Decision by SDA Leaders

By MAX MARTIN

It is vitally necessary for all democratic groups and forces on the campus to struggle militantly in behalf of progressive and democratic demands: this is a firmly-held opinion of the Young Socialist League. Imperative for such a struggle, in our view, is the broadest possible cooperation of all democratic student organizations, of the liberal and socialist students, for action on those questions in regard to which they agree; including the fight for student rights, the fight for academic freedom for teachers, the fight against Jim Crow.

Since the YSL is the only nationwide socialist youth organization and Students for Democratic Action (SDA) is the largest and broadest liberal student organization, these two groups have played and can play key roles in rallying broad student action, through their initiation of progressive student campaigns and through their activity in them.

Such cooperation is all the more necessary these days, given the reactionary nature of our period. All political groups on campus are small and isolated from the mainstreams of the student body. If SDA is several times the size of the YSL, it is a fact from which liberals can only take cold comfort, considering the concrete figures involved. We, for our part, are unhappy about the tininess of SDA as we are about the tininess of the YSL: they are both indices to the reactionary nature of politics today.

Most students today are apathetic and afraid; they shy away from politics and political actions, pursuing their studies and preparing for their careers in isolation from political events and political life. The reasons for this situation are no great mystery; we have discussed them in the columns of *Challenge* and shall do so again.

At the moment we merely wish to point to the fact, and to draw from it the lesson that it is therefore all the more foolish, all the more sectarian, for student groups to refuse to act jointly today with other democratic campus forces on those issues where agreement exists, because of differences on other questions.

The instances in which campaigns on the campus have succeeded in drawing the mass of the student body into action have been rare. Those that come to mind are the student opposition to the Regents-imposed faculty "loyalty oath" at the University of California (Berkeley), the student strike at City College in New York, and the student struggle in opposition to the Brooklyn College administration's suppression of the student newspaper, all of which date back a good number of years.

Most student political activity has been confined to actions by one or more student groups containing memberships

ranging from a half-dozen to twenty-five. That the effectiveness of a project engaged in, let us say, by three student clubs, each having a dozen members, is limited as compared with more mass activities, is obvious. How criminally stupid it would then be for one of the two liberal groups to insist that the third group, the socialist club, be eliminated from the effort.

### HURTING THE CAUSE

From the point of view of numbers alone, and not counting the increased strength brought to campus united-front actions by the experience and devotion of socialist students, of YSLers, participating in them, it is the height of sectarian folly for liberal student organizations to refuse to enter into cooperation with socialist students because of the views of the latter on the war or the Russian Revolution. Such a refusal can only hurt the effort to defend whatever cause is involved and in the long run, therefore, the liberals themselves.

The YSL, as well as its two predecessor organizations, the YPSL and the SYL, has always felt this way and has always endeavored to bring about conditions for the maximum cooperation possible.

The efforts toward this end by student socialists in the past have met with different degrees of success. At times a fairly high degree of cooperation between socialists and liberals has been attained on some campuses and in some localities—the 1950 Conference for Democracy in Education in New York, for example—while at other times it has proved near-impossible to persuade liberal student groups that cooperation between themselves and student socialists would be desirable.

The reasons for liberal reluctance in this regard have varied. Part of the time, what lay at the basis of the liberal refusal has been an unwillingness to take action at all; a feeling of helplessness; moods of apathy; or fears, in past years when the Stalinists on campus were stronger than they are today, that the CP youth would capture and destroy any united-front movements.

At other times, when liberal student groups were genuinely interested in conducting a fight over a particular question, they shied away from joint work with socialists because of suspicions of

the latter, or because they mistakenly felt that disagreement over fundamental political questions precluded cooperation on questions where there was no disagreement, or because of pressure from their adult organizations, or because of concern with "respectability."

In the last year or so, there have been a number of instances in the New York area of cooperation of a variety of student groups, mostly in connection with academic-freedom questions. In this the YSL and SDA played important roles. The YSL welcomed these instances of cooperative effort; if the occasions themselves were not outstanding events it was not because socialists and liberals worked together, but rather it resulted from the fact that more students did not join in, and from the fact that SDA, YSL and the other groups together are not, unfortunately, huge forces. We welcomed the cooperation and called for more of the same.

### STEP BACKWARD

From this point of view, we must regard the recent action taken by the SDA National Board at its Philadelphia meeting on November 26 as a grave and shameful step backwards. The SDA board adopted a report which in effect forbade SDA chapters to cooperate with the YSL under conditions where they are the only two groups involved, and, while not ruling out entirely SDA-YSL cooperation in circumstances where a number of additional groups are involved, the SDA decision takes a hostile view of it.

The report adopted by the board lists three criteria by which it felt the question should be judged. First is the YSL democratic? The report answers by saying that there is no evidence that the YSL is undemocratic. We will pass over this rather weak way of saying that the YSL is a democratic organization, proof

of which SDA has in abundance; we do not wish to be thought of as caving.

Secondly, is there agreement or disagreement between the YSL and SDA on basic questions?

The report finds, and this is no secret to anybody, that there is a fundamental divergence of views on international questions and foreign policy. Why should this lead to an inability to cooperate on civil-liberties questions? The report does not say, for it cannot.

Instead, in what has to be frankly and sorrowfully labeled as a piece of dishonesty, whether conscious or unconscious we cannot say, the report takes up the question of whether or not there is disagreement or agreement between the two organizations on civil liberties, and finds . . . disagreement.

To do so, of course, the SDA report has to refrain from discussing our views on civil liberties, to refrain from saying whether we are for democratic rights or not, and this is exactly what the report does. Nowhere in this lengthy document on the YSL can one learn that the YSL defends the civil liberties of all vigorously.

Instead, the report discusses two things: our analysis of the reasons for the witchhunt and our belief that in the long run only those who understand the connection between the witchhunt and the cold war, between the witchhunt and the decline of capitalism, and who connect their struggle for democracy at home with the fight for a democratic foreign policy, can be effective and consistent fighters for civil liberties.

With this analysis, as everybody knows, SDA does not agree. In our opinion, one of the weaknesses of liberalism can be found right here.

But what follows? Should the YSL feel that, since we disagree on our understanding of the whys and wherefores of the decline for democracy in this country, we can therefore ignore the fact that SDA does defend civil liberties, and hence declare cooperation undesirable?

That foolish and sectarian we are not. But that foolish and sectarian the SDA National Board has just decided to be.

### NO CREDIT

The third criterion of the SDA report is: Do the benefits outweigh the disadvantages?

Under this head, the document discusses in a murky fashion the idea that it is not so advisable to cooperate with groups which don't play fair, since they might do nasty things to SDA. This section has to be vague since there is nothing for the report to say about the YSL in this regard, or any such complaints to make against the YSL, since no occasion has arisen.

(Turn to last page)

### SAN FRANCISCO • YSL

#### INTRODUCTION TO SOCIALISM

Thursdays at 8 p.m.

- 1) Dec. 1  
Introducing the YSL
- (2) Dec. 8  
The World We Live In
- (3) Dec. 15  
A World of Imperialism and War
- (4) Dec. 22  
The Road to Socialism

For information on place, etc., write

SAN FRANCISCO YSL

P. O. Box 3092, Rincon Annex, S. F.

# Poland Setting Lures for the Emigres

by A. RUDZIENSKI

The in-fighting is continuing between the Warsaw government and the Polish political émigrés in exile. There have been a number of bad blows suffered by the satellite regime: the spectacular escape of Colonel Swiatlo, a high official of the UB (political police), and his revelations in the American press and Free Europe radio; and the flight of the composer Panufnik and the poet Milosz, former sympathizers of the regime, and of Professor Korowicz of Cracow University.

The Warsaw government patiently prepared its retaliation. It struck a blow for itself with the return to Poland of Hugo Hanke, a member of the government-in-exile headed by "President" August Zaleski. After he was named to the government by Zaleski, Hanke disappeared from London and popped up at a Warsaw microphone, declaring that his return "may cause a great deal of disturbance in émigré circles."

Hugo Hanke was a gray figure, unknown in Polish political life, but he belonged to the Christian-Democratic Party, was a Silesian, was a worker and a former collaborator with Korfanty, the well-known Upper Silesian Christian labor leader. This was the reason why he was named to the émigré government, to bolster the failing prestige of August Zaleski and his Pilsudskian "presidential" regime-in-exile. This was the occasion for his career of "transmigration" from one reactionary camp to the other.

It is an interesting fact that the continuators-in-exile of the Pilsudski camp (Zaleski and his government) are softer to Stalinist penetration than is the democratic émigré camp, represented by the National Executive of the parties-in-exile. I suppose this is because of their political isolation, as well as the hatred engendered against their "allies" by the American-British betrayal of Poland in the Second World War.

But the Warsaw regime also achieved another success in its "return to Poland" campaign among the émigrés. The well-known right-wing socialist leader Adam Szczynski, former president of the trade-union federation in Poland and vice-mayor of Warsaw in 1939, accepted their "invitation" and went back.

It is true that Szczynski belonged to the right wing of the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) and was very close to the Pilsudski camp; but his return represents a "victory" for the regime in the eyes of working-class opinion. The satellite leaders can tell the workers that their old leaders, who were the bitterest

enemies of "Communism," are coming back to "our beloved motherland."

Though in the case of Hanke the democratic National Executive declared in a statement that he was a UB agent and charged President Zaleski with irresponsibility, nobody says the same thing about Szczynski, who had been a labor leader and socialist all his life, albeit a right-winger. But it is characteristic that Stalinism prefers the rightists, and vice versa.

## "COME BACK . . ."

The political "thaw" in Poland opened new possibilities for the regime in its fight against the free Poles and its campaign for the repatriation of the émigrés. The most important pre-war intellectuals and non-CP leaders of Poland directed an appeal to the émigrés which can be summarized: "Dear fellow countrymen, come back, the country is waiting for you. . ."

The official organ *Zycie Warszawy* published an article by a well-known writer saying "it is incomprehensible but some Poles have forgotten that they have a country of their own, and it is time they remembered and came back to rebuild their motherland which was destroyed by the war." It is incomprehensible, reiterates this writer, that Polish writers and intellectuals are working with shovels, exploited by foreigners, wasting their lives and their talent, instead of using their pens and their abilities in the service of their country. Not a word about political differences or about the political past. "Come back, dear fellow countrymen, the fatherland is waiting for you." The government has granted amnesty for all political crimes and nobody will be held responsible for his past activity. The government offers to pay for the return trip "from any point in the world."

The repatriation campaign is conducted in the spirit of the "thaw" and began with successes in the case of two important men. It is directed in the first place to writers, intellectuals, politicians, because these exist under difficult conditions sometimes working very hard physically, and because they represent the greatest danger for the regime. The émigré workers and peasants generally have better jobs and better wages than they had in pre-war Poland, not to speak about what they would get in the Stalinist "paradise."

Many of the people have families in Poland and cannot resist nostalgia for their home country, which is so strong among Poles and Russians. Many engineers, technicians and intellectuals want to participate in the "reconstruction of

the country," forgetting about political differences and Russian domination, because, as they say, "Poland remains Poland" in spite of her present regime. And the Warsaw regime knows very well how to exploit all human weaknesses. It offers all of them a free trip home, a job, reunion with one's family and friends, and also the "beloved motherland."

The leading circles of the Polish emigration answered with a violent anti-Russian campaign. They also sent an official delegation to the Geneva meeting of the Big Four to make trouble for the Poles and Russians. It was sent by the democratic National Executive which is supported by the Polish parties-in-exile and perhaps unofficially tolerated by U. S. policy, to play the émigré government and committees against the satellite regime in the event of a favorable Russian-U. S. bargain. It is only in this limited sense that I have referred, in previous articles, about a possible deal between the Kremlin and the Polish émigrés.

## Industrial Level Up

Poland's Six Year Plan is coming to an end. Great progress has been made in the industrial development of the country. From an agrarian-industrial country, it has been transformed into an industrialized nation.

Since the start of the plan, industry has grown by 250 per cent; official sources say 400 per cent because they are comparing it with the 1939 level in pre-war Poland.

Coal production will probably reach only 95 per cent of its goal; steel production was aimed at 5,000,000 tons but will probably reach 4,500,000; electric power—17 billion kilowatts instead of 19; iron—3½ million tons instead of 4½. The rate of industrial growth was restrained a bit by economic difficulties and the "thaw" spirit. But in spite of that, industrial growth represents a big success for the regime: this cannot be denied. Poland is passing through something like an industrial revolution.

The problem is that this industrialization is paid for by the growing exploitation of the working class and peasant masses, as well as the middle class, and their standard of living has dropped to 50 per cent of the already low standard of pre-war Poland.

Connected with this are some of the difficulties in the fulfillment of the

planned program, for there is a growing gap in some cases between an industry and its raw-materials base, and also between industry as a whole and agriculture.

Also the picture in foreign trade sheds some very interesting light on the question of pressure and exploitation by the "first socialist country of the world." After Warsaw rejected participation in the Marshall Plan, industrial-investment was supposed to be achieved through Russian credits amounting to 1½ billion rubles. For this economic aid the Polish people are paying a high price—not only the loss of liberty and lowering of living standards, but also colonial tribute to Moscow.

Russia's share in Polish foreign trade is growing from year to year, and is now two-fifths of the total, more than all the countries of the West combined; the largest item in the Polish "export" to Russia, consisting of 8 million tons of coal, represents scarcely one-tenth of the entire export to Russia, because the price of coal is one-seventh of the world market price. This is the earnest of Russia's "socialist aid" to the Polish people, and the reason why Polish foreign trade has a deficit, in spite of the change in the structure of Polish exports to Russia, which are now made up one-third of industrial installations, machines, railway cars, etc.

Hence the "thaw" policy responded to economic exigencies, the pressure of Russian economic exploitation, the inequalities and contradictions of industrial development and of the physical limits of human exploitation.

The deficit of Polish foreign trade, calculated at more than \$150 million annually, results not only from the importation of machines and equipment but also from the peculiar nature of the exchange between Poland and Russia, and of the special prices paid by Russia for Polish commodities (we gave the example of coal but the prices paid for other goods are very difficult to learn).

The new Five Year Plan looks to a slackening in industrial development. For example, steel production is planned to reach 6-7 million tons, and not 10 million as it would in accordance with the previous pace. The plan also calls for "consolidating" the levels attained especially in the newly built basic industries. Russia's economic pressure and exploitation, and the objective difficulties and contradictions of industrial development in Poland have imposed concessions on the planners, but within a very limited framework.

# The 'War' in the South: To Murder — —

(Continued from page 1)

White Citizens Council campaign to prevent racial integration in Orangeburg County schools." (N. Y. Post, Dec. 6.) White-robed Klansmen lit a blazing cross, symbol of the lynching spirit.

The recent murder attempt against Gus Courts in Belzoni, Mississippi, illustrates many facets of the deep social crisis which is tearing at the old South. Courts, a Negro merchant and a local leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was shot because he refused to back down before the notorious White Citizens Councils.

The act for which Courts was judged guilty and sentenced to die, by his invisible and anonymous white judges, was that of refusing to be intimidated into withdrawing from his right to vote. In Humphries County, which includes Belzoni, no Negro has voted since the 1870s. Seventy per cent of the population is Negro.

So far, as might be expected, there are no clues to the identity of Courts' assailants, and there are not likely to be any if the authorities can help it. The FBI after a hasty and inadequate investigation was, at last report, awaiting "word from Washington." The local guardian of law and order, Sheri Shelton, was claiming to look for some "nigger agitators" who (he deduced) had shot Courts in order to further the cause of desegregation!

This total breakdown in law enforce-

ment and the use of open violence and terror against Negroes who dare to demand their rights is characteristic of the deep South today.

Earlier this year, the Reverend George Lee, another resident of Belzoni, was shot and killed in broad daylight in front of the Belzoni Court House. Lee was the leader of the NAACP in Belzoni and also had announced his intention to exercise his right to vote. His murderers have not yet been found. Courts knew that he was next; yet he chose to stay and fight.

Emmett Till's abductors, Milam and Bryant, after admitting they had taken Till from his grandfather's cabin, were not indicted for kidnaping by an all-white grand jury in Mississippi because they decided that "he went with them voluntarily."

## DELAINE CASE UP

In South Carolina, the Rev. Delaine, a Negro minister and a leader in one of the cases upon which the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregation was based, was forced to flee from the state.

He had received many anonymous threats of violence and his church had been burned down by arsonists. When a band of men cruising in a car outside the home where he had sought refuge opened fire on him, he returned the shots. His extradition from New York on charges of assault is now being asked for by the state of South Carolina. Whether Governor Harriman, a bashful candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, will extradite him has not yet been announced; though it seems improbable from the point of view of political expediency.

Another incident, also in South Caro-

lina, highlights the intensity of the campaign of intimidation. A white minister, the Reverend George Stafford, declared publicly that the South ought to obey the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregation. He was forced to resign by his congregation, one of the leaders of which is Federal Court Judge George Bell Timmerman Sr.

Timmerman is quoted as remarking that the "broad views" of the minister made him unsatisfactory for his post. This is the same Judge Timmerman whose decision favoring segregation in the public schools was one of those overthrown by the Supreme Court.

## KKK's HEIR

In Mississippi, terror and intimidation is spearheaded by the White Citizens Councils. These councils are headed by the "respectable" and wealthier members of the Southern community. At a recent state-wide conference of the councils, one leader boasted that not one of the members of the governing board was worth "less than \$500,000."

Attending this same conference, at which a resolution was passed asking all Southern states to set up a "regional commission" which would use public funds to maintain segregation and promote white supremacy, was United States Senator James Eastland (chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee which is investigating "subversive" threats to 100 per cent Americanism), Governor White of Mississippi, Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, former Gov. Fielding Wright, and John Satterfield, president of the Mississippi Bar Association.

Senator Stennis from Mississippi, appointed a member of President Eisenhower's new federal commission to study constitutional rights, sent his sincerest

regrets because he could not attend.

The councils do not directly and openly incite violence—all they do is give the weight of power and prestige to acts designed to crush the Southern Negroes' attempts to gain their political and economic rights. They openly advocate that "pressure" be placed on Negroes who either petition their local school boards to desegregate the school system or who try to exercise their right to vote. One common form of intimidation is economic.

## ECONOMIC GUNS

For example, in Yazoo City, Miss., where fifty-three Negroes signed a petition asking for desegregated schools, the full power of the White Councils was demonstrated. The Yazoo Herald published a full-page advertisement listing the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the signers of the petition. The ad was "published as a public service by the Citizens Councils of Yazoo City." In a few days, only two of the original 53 signers were left.

Many of those who withdrew their names shared the fate of the two whose names remained on the petition. Those of the signers who were merchants had their credit cut off by the banks; the Southern distributors for national brands would not supply them. One of the petitioners, an official of the local NAACP, is a skilled plumber. Before the petition he earned \$150 per week; after the intimidation of the Council, he could hardly make \$20 a week.

The thing that is important about the White Citizens Councils is that they represent the ruling circles in Mississippi. The sentiments which they express are shared by the main body of the conservative Southern ruling class.

# Both Parties Turn Their Backs — —

(Continued from page 1)

The Republican Party has sought to rub off on itself some of the glory of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision, made by a unanimous court of justices: to listen to some, one might think that Eisenhower did it all himself by appointing Warren to the bench. But in the face of the current semi-civil-war in the South, the Eisenhower administration has turned its back on the Negro.

As this is written, Attorney General Brownell has just openly refused to order a federal investigation of the Till kidnapping and murder, in spite of the fact that excellent grounds for federal intervention exist. The same goes for the subsequent cases of assassination.

That this is so was testified to, lefthandedly, by Mississippi's Governor White at a press conference on Nov. 28, apropos of the Gus Courts attempted-murder case. The governor was worried about the shooting for an interesting reason and opined that it should be solved:

**"There is no telling what could happen. So much pressure could be exerted on federal officials charging that the laws of Mississippi are broken down and the right of citizens taken away that it could force federal action."**

So the racist Democrat admits unwittingly that something "could force federal action," while the lily-white GOP attorney general announces that it's not going to happen.

But something "could force federal action" against the will of both the Democrats and Republicans, the party of Jim Crow and the party of big business.

In Mississippi itself, the Republicans and Democrats are peas in a pod in repressing the Negroes:

**"... E. O. Spencer, a hotelkeeper in Jackson, Miss., has donated an office without charge to the White Citizens Councils of Mississippi; Spencer also dispenses whatever Republican patronage is available to his state and is an occasional house guest of the Attorney General of the U. S. Herbert Brownell is Spencer's host; and Herman Talmadge is Adlai Stevenson's."—Murray Kempton, Nov. 29.**

## United with the Racists

But especially in the North, it is not the Republicans but the Democrats who have been making the greatest appeal to Negro workers, in their capacity as the party of "liberalism." In 1955-56 the Democrats have decided apparently that, as between the Negro and the Southern bourbons, they will take the latter.

When the Democratic Party conference met in Chicago, Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive director, told the assembled party state chairmen that they would lose the Negro vote next year "if they persist in ducking the civil-rights issue," and—

**"that they cannot effect a spurious 'party unity' with extreme right-wing Democrats in the South and still expect to 'retain the support' of Negro voters. Negroes are outraged, Wilkins said, at what has come to be known as 'Mississippi justice.'"—N. Y. Post, Nov. 18.**

They proceeded to do just what he warned against. The same paper reported three days later on the party conference:

**"The Democrats are . . . actually united as they have not been in a half dozen years, but the 'unity' has been achieved largely by that sort of 'self-discipline' which includes glossing over the big issues. Everything has been sidestepped here from the Emmett Till case and the 'Mississippi Terror' to the Texas-led drive to put across the oilmen's natural-gas bill at the next session of Congress."—Nov. 21.**

Well now, Wilkins had said they "cannot" do it. They did it. What do we do now?

**"We submit," Wilkins had also said in his speech of dire warning to the Democrats, "that a party which permits any section of its organization to resort to intimidation and murder as a means of keeping in power cannot fail to take remedial action and still hope to retain the support of large and important segments of the electorate in key areas outside of the intimidation and murder belt."**

Do we now support, or withdraw support

from, this party which "permits" the above-mentioned system of intimidation and murder? And where do we go from there?

Or are the Democratic leaders right in judging that this sort of threat is bluff, and nothing but bluff, because Negro voters have "no place to go" except to vote for the Tweedledum Republicans?

Witness:

**"It is the Democratic Party of Mississippi which is running the campaign of lawlessness. It is the Republican-ruled Department of Justice which has failed to take any meaningful federal action in defense of the victims."**

That is a nicely balanced indictment straight out of an editorial in the *N. Y. Post* (Nov. 25). What follows—from it? That liberal daily hasn't said. It hasn't said because it is busy supporting the man who is at the head of the whole cowardly pack of Northern Democrats who are turning their backs on the Negro. That is Adlai Stevenson.

## Stevenson as Right Guard

In this same editorial, the *Post* salves its editorial conscience with an anonymous slap: "Politicians who say the Supreme Court's desegregation decision settled everything are substituting wishes for reality."

Who is this politician? They mean Stevenson, who had said just exactly that in a big press conference a few days before, following in the political wake of Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnston of Texas.

Johnston's view to the effect that the court removed civil rights from politics was quoted to him, and Stevenson commented:

**"Well, I think that is inevitable, that certainly from the decisions of the Supreme Court on the law of the land, and the matter of the desegregation of the schools, it has been removed from the political arena and disposed of by the judiciary."**

A reporter immediately asked him to comment on "the refusal or failure of some states" to abide by the decision.

**Stevenson: "I don't know that I can comment about it in the abstract." (Who asked him to comment in the abstract? Why couldn't he get as concrete as Till's murderers?) "I think the Supreme Court's decision speaks for itself, and I believe that the law should be supported by all of the citizens of the country."**

A couple of minutes later, the transcript of the press conference reads as follows, verbatim:

**"Q.—Governor, on the Emmet Till case, could you tell us how you—"**

**"A.—Excuse me. I would like to say with respect to the tax situation that . . ." (and Stevenson went on to add some verbiage in answer to the preceding question, and the conference was thereupon ended before Till's ghost could rise again).**

Weaving and passing as in this exhibition would make a football star out of Stevenson in the Sugar Bowl, if his political managers would let him play there.

## The Jailkeepers

The liberal *Post* says there are "politicians" who "are substituting wishes for reality," and painfully refuses to mention the name of its idol. But is this the trouble with Stevenson—that he mistakes his wishes for reality? Does he think that in the real world the civil-rights issue has been "removed from the political arena," even while Southern Negroes are suffering the bloodiest attack since the 1920s?

This is not so. This is a cover-up and a whitewash. Stevenson covers for the Southern racists (whom the liberals attack) and in turn the liberals cover for Stevenson. . . . In this chain-reaction the Negro fight is being smothered by its "friends."

Stevenson has entered into a political deal with the Southern Democrats. Everybody knows this. He has agreed to go along with their onslaught against Negro rights, i.e., wink at it, in return for their support to his presi-

dential ambitions. This deal is over the Negro's back.

**"Adlai Stevenson has run out on the Southern Negro; and, form being what it is, Averell Harriman presumably cannot be far behind. . . ."**

**"So the South—even the worst of the South—is back with us Democrats and for reasons which should shame us. . . ."**

**"There are nearly 1,000,000 Negroes in Mississippi. If they were sealed away by the French in Morocco, we would all be screaming that John Foster Dulles is remiss in his duty to suffering humanity."**

**"But, in Chicago [at the national party conference], Democrats who think themselves worthy of being president of the U. S. contend for the affection of the jail keepers of 1,000,000 Americans."—Murray Kempton, Nov. 22, and right he is.**

You might add: If these 1,000,000 Negroes were all sealed away by the Russian totalitarians, all these indignant democrats would be screaming, quite rightly, about the crimes of the Kremlin despots. Who's "screaming" at the jailkeepers of the Negroes in America?

Not Adlai Stevenson, who started his plan of wooing the racists in 1953, when he made his good-will tour of the South, chumming with Herman Talmadge and his ilk.

It is not peculiar that Talmadge is a Stevenson man today. Talmadge is not ignorant enough to think that a lily-white Southerner can be elected president. He is smart enough to know that the best his breed can hope for is a Democratic captive of the lily-white Southerners. Hence—

**"Adlai Stevenson is far in the lead for the 1956 Democratic presidential nomination among Southern party leaders. . . . He is looked upon as the figure among the leading aspirants who can come closest to uniting the party's diverse elements, North and South. . . ."—Washington columnist Thomas Stokes, Oct. 21.**

**"[The Dixiecrats of 1952] are now coming home and Mr. Stevenson will receive their undivided support this time."—Senator Hubert Humphrey, N. Y. Post, Oct. 20.**

Averell Harriman, who is thirsting for the Democratic nomination, and who has been trying to pose as a left-of-center Fair-Dealer, has been equally agile in sidestepping the civil-rights issue. Although he demagogically criticized Stevenson for favoring "moderation," Harriman got so moderate on civil rights that his mouth filled with hot mush when reporters brought it up at his press conference Nov. 21.

## Keep Your Mouth Shut, or—

Nobody has a right to condemn these sad specimens of politicians unless he is willing to face the same question which has turned them to chicken (Southern-fried).

This is: *Are you willing to split the Democratic Party, or split from it?*

Stevenson, Harriman, Humphrey, and their similars in both parties are turning away their eyes while murder goes on, because the alternative is to split their party.

The Negroes also must keep their mouth shut, at least limit themselves to grumbles, or else move in a direction which means split in the Democratic Party.

This is the hard choice presented by practical politics. Read this:

**"I am not sorry I didn't vote for Henry Wallace for president of the U. S.; but, for the first time, I'm glad he ran. He forced the Democrats to take a position on civil rights, and Olin Johnston [i.e., the Dixiecrats] walked out, and that created the Harry Truman we remember. Now Johnston is back, and there's not even so bad an alternative as Henry Wallace, and, if any voter doesn't like the sort of thing Stevenson and Harriman are doing, where can he go?"**

That's Murray Kempton's complaint, and he has no answer. For his question itself contains a bit of the poison which has paralyzed his type: ". . . And that created the Harry Truman we remember."

What is the Harry Truman we remember, after he was elected in 1948 on the basis of a strong civil-rights promise and strong Fair Deal talk? We remember a president who did nothing for civil rights, not even as much (we are sorry to say) as an Eisenhower did after him!

In 1948 Truman was afraid that voters who were discontented, discontented with his formula of Fair Deal talk and no program for the people, did have some place to go, even if this alternative was only a discredited fellow traveler of the Communist Party like Wallace. It lit a fire under him.

The Negro people, together with their labor allies and liberal friends who are willing to strike out on a new path, need a party of their own—a labor-based third party to challenge the whole setup.

This is the answer to the decision of the Democrats and GOP to abandon the Negroes to the White Citizens Councils. The Negroes need "some place to go" politically, with labor.

# The Amazing Public Conspiracy Of the Southern Racists

By PHILIP COBEN

Openly and in the public sight, the Jim Crow leaders of the South are spelling out their conspiracy to subvert the law on the question of educational segregation. This is perhaps the most amazing public conspiracy to flout the federal government that has ever been seen in this country.

Ironically, among the leaders of this conspiracy are two U. S. senators, both from the state of Mississippi, with posts in the current witchhunt against "subversives." These are Senator Eastland, who heads the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and Senator Stennis, who was recently appointed a member of the president's special commission to investigate the loyalty-security system.

A virtual blueprint on how to subvert the Supreme Court decision is contained in the Nov. 18 issue of *U. S. News & World Report*, in the form of two long interviews with Senator Stennis and Senator Ervin (N. C.).

The two Southern senators explain in some detail eight methods which they and their racist colleagues are preparing and exploring.

That Senator Stennis was a little queasy about his frank approach was evidenced at the end of his interview when he told the questioner from the right-wing Republican magazine in which all this appears:

"I am a little slow to go on television or radio for interviews like this, but you are such a high-type organization and such a fine publication that I knew that what I said would not be distorted in any way."

And on December 2, at a state rally in Mississippi of the White Citizens Councils, Senator Eastland spread before the crowd a plan for creating an organizational and political center for the same public conspiracy. The idea was to set up a "regional commission" with state funds to coordinate Southern racist resistance and to promulgate white-supremacy doctrine. Eastland's own speech was larded with racist slanders on Negro inferiority in unusually uninhibited style.

## EIGHT METHODS

The eight methods outlined by Stennis and Ervin are as follows.

(1) **Withholding of tax money from desegregated schools, thereby forcing compliance with "Southern customs."**

Said Stennis: "the ultimate test of the operation of any given school rests upon the necessity of tax money to pay the teacher and to build a school building. The courts cannot supply this revenue."

And: "I think as a practical matter for the school to have the necessary lifeblood of taxation money, it must be operated in a manner satisfactory to the majority of the people of the tax district."

Ervin added that a court case brought by Negroes could not "enforce the decision of the Supreme Court by impounding the taxes of a school district" that refused compliance.

(2) **Very important to both subversive senators was the scheme for forcing endless litigation before any compliance could be attained through the courts.**

## CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

The SDA decision does SDA no credit; on the contrary in the eyes of many serious militant liberal students it will discredit that organization.

Its effect, unless it is reversed, will be to cut down still further what little organized political activity by students there now is. It will not eliminate much student action because, for one thing, there isn't much to begin with. But in this period even that little is precious and to reduce it is criminal.

One can only hope that SDA will recognize its error and revoke its action. The YSL, as always, stands ready to join with all liberal and democratic students in the fight for democratic and progressive gains, a fight at whose disposal all democratic student groups should be ready to place their forces, and in whose behalf the broadest student cooperation should be forged.

Stennis carefully made the point that legal action would have to be brought before each and every one of the 1400 separate school boards in his state (similarly in other states); this could be done only where someone could be found, un-intimidated, to bring the suit in each district in each separate case; in event a final injunction was issued in any case, the school-board trustees could resign; this might force a new suit to be brought so as to bind their successors; if this was successful in turn, then "if the people abolished the district and created another, then an entirely new legal situation would arise, and a new suit would have to be started."

"Q.—All they would have to do would be to keep changing school boards or districts and the decree wouldn't reach them?"

"A.—That is a possibility that naturally will be fully explored."

Later Stennis added: "nothing will happen, in my opinion, until the last court of authority in the nation has passed on that particular case and put its finger—"

"Q.—And then there'll be another case?"

"A.—It must put its finger on that particular school board and say, 'You must do this. This is the end of the rope for you.'

"Q.—That's only one school—"

"A.—Yes, that's only one school. And I think it would mean just a new start for that school."

Ervin had an even brighter idea. District-by-district wasn't enough:

"Q.—Could there be just one suit brought which would settle the issue for all the Negroes in the district?"

"A.—No. This is true because the question would arise whether or not each particular Negro child was excluded by the school board in question on some justifiable ground unconnected with his race."

As Stennis said with gratification, on the basis of this plot "the points involved will doubtless be litigated for many years to come. . . . From a practical standpoint it means a generation of lawsuits."

In the Eastland plan unveiled on Dec. 2 another gimmick is added. Mississippi plans to pass a law against "unauthorized practice of law," aimed at making a lawyer subject to court action under certain circumstances if he handles a case against segregation. This is taking a leaf out of the national witchhunt pattern; not only persecute dissenters but also intimidate lawyers from taking their cases.

## RIGGING SCHEME

(3) **Stennis and Ervin also hinted at a nullification scheme by intimidating the Negro population of a district into asking for "voluntary" segregation. Stennis said he "wouldn't be surprised" if this happened in some counties of his state, and cited a couple of local Uncle Toms who were to be its "spontaneous" organizers (on the Russian system of "spontaneity").**

It's legal, Stennis assured his interviewer: "I know of no law or principle of law that would require a particular child to go to a particular school unless it wanted to." It would be the "perfect answer" if all parents signed statements testifying to their "voluntary" entry of their children into the right school.

In Ervin's interview, this "voluntary" plan almost openly became farcical. The following sounds exactly like a translation from the Russian of the kind of item explaining how it happens that factory workers organize "spontaneous" demonstration in favor of cutting their own wages:

"Q.—How would a school system based on voluntary segregation be set up?"

"A.—The local school board would allot certain schools of a district primarily to the use of white children and other schools of the district primarily to the use of Negro children and let the parents residing in the district voluntarily [get it?] send their children to the schools primarily allotted to their respective races."

(4) **The school boards will not assign children to the segregated school according to race—this would be a violation, you see; the children would be assigned to the right school for any reason except race. Stennis and Ervin explained this virtually without camouflage.**

A new Mississippi law, it was mentioned, already authorizes the rigging of pupil assignments on the basis of "health, welfare and morals." Some rigging system like this, said Stennis, is "going to be a part of any pattern of assignment to different schools." Aptitude tests could be used too, he said; also (more vaguely) "a classification of teachers and pupils."

Ervin explained in the same connection that a new N. C. state law this year gave local boards "complete authority over the assignment of children in the schools."

## "POLICE POWER"

(5) **Of course, the best-known scheme for subverting the court decision is the plan to abolish public education as a last resort.**

Stennis said "they would be reluctant and regretful, but if necessary they would take the step." Ervin threatened that "any concerted effort to force racial integration . . . is likely to result in the abandonment or the materially altering of North Carolina's educational system."

Associated with this idea is the passage of measures now eliminating the state compulsory school-attendance laws. Eastland, at the racist rally, announced this was going to be done in Mississippi. Besides, claimed Stennis, even where they remain "these laws would not be enforceable in the federal courts."

(6) **Stennis sketched an idea which seems to consist of using the state governor as a bulwark against any federal court control on the ground that the governor is immune:**

"Q.—Could a federal court cite an entire state legislature for contempt?"

"A.—Neither the state legislators nor the governor can be cited. In order to carry out a local plan they might put the governors on every school board in the state."

The Supreme Court cannot "handle" the state legislature and the governor, he asserted.

(7) **The above is perhaps a sub-point of the more general plan of setting the state's "police power" against federal control. To the layman this may sound roughly like what happened in 1861, but perhaps it is more complicated for lawyers.**

Even Stennis was uncertain about its constitutionality but he didn't allow a bit of dubiety to stand in the way of definite statement:

"Q.—It is not completely clear just what some of the leaders down there mean by police power. Do they mean that the governor, for example, could declare that 'if we mingle the races in this particular school we are going to invite civil disorder, therefore we will not permit that'? Could the governor do that?"

"A.—Yes, to meet a given situation that might develop in any school district, I think that would be proper use of police power."

"Q.—And the governor is beyond the reach of the Supreme Court—"

"A.—Yes . . ."

Perhaps it is under the head of the state's "police power" that, as Eastland announced, Mississippi is due to adopt a law providing penalties against "any person interfering with state law under the color of federal authority," referring to FBI agents who "interfere" in a state case.

## FORCE AND VIOLENCE

(8) **Lastly, interspersed through the senators' remarks, are hints of retaliation against any Negro troublemaker, precisely as the White Citizens Councils are in fact doing. Stennis, for example, insinuates that integration would mean the firing of many Negro teachers. Eastland hinted at race riots, while formally counseling against violence.**

He is certain, said Stennis, that "white school children and their parents" would not "peacefully accept this decision and attend such mixed schools."

They would then rebel against it by force and violence, subverting the Constitution and the Great American System of Government as determined by the established institutions of Our Democracy?

The answer seems to be yes, as given by the chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and his colleague on the Loyalty-Security inquiry commission.

## 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!

**Get Acquainted!**

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

**HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE**

**LABOR ACTION**

Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2.  New

6 months at \$1.  Renewal

Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....