

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 27, 1957

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Franco 'Reforms'

So the Franco regime is moving to institute a "collective leadership."...

Really and truly. A Madrid dispatch to the *Times* recounts that Franco has finally gotten round to letting an important cabinet committee hold meetings without his august and indispensable presence; that this is a first step toward making the cabinet mean something; that "in the opinion of competent observers the move marks the beginning of a gradual trend toward decentralization of responsibility."

Decentralization—why, that was the very word that has been in the news in connection with Russia, as we happened to discuss in this space last week.

So for the reflection that it casts on the more important question of developments in Russia, it is worth while to pursue this Spanish development for a few paragraphs.

The fact is that Franco does sorely need a lot more "collective leadership." He needs it to maintain the dictatorship.

This is perfectly obvious in the case of Spain—even if "collective leadership" is a phrase that has been made almost synonymous with "democratization" (Continued on page 4)

Washington Prayer Pilgrimage: Where Were the Liberals?

By H. W. BENSON

Estimates of the crowd massed in front of the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington on May 17 ranged from 15,000 by the local police to 27,000 by the arrangements committee. But the fundamental fact was the same: for the first time thousands of Negroes were demonstrating in the nation's capital for equality and democracy.

They came from all over the country, North and South, fresh from their successful bus boycott in Montgomery and taking time out from their union activities in New York City. It was proof unmistakable of the irrepressible nature of the modern Negro movement.

It was a sign of a new surge forward and a call to new action for civil rights. The fight for Negro equality is renewed.

They came on buses, trains and automobiles. Meanwhile—

- Congress as usual was stalled on civil rights.
- The president continued to evade.
- Both parties ignored the Negroes' demands.

groes' demands.

• Even the labor movement remained passive in the face of this big movement for democracy, busy with other things.

• The daily press virtually boycotted the event and only reported it after the fact.

But the rally in Washington cut through all this. The Negro will not be denied; the movement will not permit a rotten compromise at the expense of democracy between the slave-dealers of the South and the New-Dealers of the North. A fresh element has been added to American politics, the force of the Negro movement for equality which re-

Washington, May 18

invigorates democracy. It is here and it is here to stay.

The rally, celebrating the third anniversary of the Supreme Court decision on school segregation, was not called as a "March on Washington," with all that would imply as a militant, vigorous and spectacular event, but as a "Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom" with an overwhelmingly religious form. There was a peculiar admixture of subsurface militancy and resolution combined with an outward respectability.

NAACP SOFTPEDALED

The Negro clergy was in full charge and dominated throughout. Prayers, hymns and scripture readings took up most of the program, which lasted four hours beginning at noon. But all the biblical allusions were designed to portray the Negro fight for freedom from bondage and delivery from "Egypt."

Fourteen speakers came from the clergy. Only five did not. A sixth, Adam Clayton Powell, plays a dual role as a religious and a political leader.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples was praised by many but shoved into the background. It was represented by only a single speaker, Roy Wilkins, its executive secretary, and even he, in keeping with the spirit of the meeting, chose a biblical reference as the starting point of his address.

While the NAACP got only a single speaker, there were two speakers from national Negro women's groups. The leading national organization of U.S. Negroes is put on a par with two relatively minor groups.

A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, presided. Other noted speakers were Martin Luther King, leader of the Montgomery boycott; Charles C. Diggs, Congressman from Michigan; Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University.

Not a single speaker represented the white labor-liberal world. Senator Paul Douglas of Chicago was listed as a speaker but Randolph (Continued on page 2)

A Code of Democracy for the AFL-CIO

By GORDON HASKELL

The AFL-CIO plans to adopt a Code of Democratic Procedures, to go along with its Code of Ethical Practices, as a standard for all American trade unions.

A. H. Raskin, New York *Times* labor correspondent, reported on May 20 that President George Meany of the AFL-CIO has arranged for the preparation of such a code by Arthur J. Goldberg, the federation's special counsel. According to Raskin, the new code is to be presented to the five-man Ethical Practices Committee, and if adopted, to the next meeting of the Executive Council. At the present writing, no details are available on provisions of this proposed code.

If a really effective Code of Democratic Procedures is actually adopted by the top committee of the AFL-CIO, it will lay the basis for a tremendous step forward for the American labor movement.

Such a code would represent a much deeper and more far-reaching development for the whole labor movement even than the Code of Ethical Procedure which has launched the clean-up of the most notorious racketeers in the labor leadership.

Ever since the problem of the racketeering and profiteering which infests a portion of the labor movement has become headline news, there has been widespread comment by labor leaders and others on the self-evident but often ignored truism that what lies at the root

of these evils is the destruction or atrophy of democracy in sections of the labor movement. Labor leaders have tended to blame rank-and-file apathy, for this condition.

More perceptive observers have pointed out, however, that rank-and-file apathy all too frequently has its source in union rules and procedures which severely penalize critics and opponents of established union administrations, and hence tend to discourage the membership from any but the most routine and listless participation in union affairs.

A code of democratic procedures cannot in itself restore a lively, vital internal democracy to unions where the membership has been held down or discouraged from participation in union affairs for years. But it could do a lot to encourage militants throughout the labor movement to speak up, to begin to rally others around them for the revitalization of the democratic life which is essential to a healthy movement.

MEMBERS NEED IT

It would give such elements the legal backing they have lacked up till now for their struggles, in much the same way as the Supreme-Court decision on school desegregation encouraged the Negroes to fight for their rights by giving them legal backing for their struggle.

As long as the labor movement has lacked such a recognized Code of Demo-

cratic Procedures, members and leaders in the more advanced, democratic unions found grave difficulties in the way of giving aid and assistance to their brothers fighting for democratic rights in unions whose internal regimes resembled feudal monarchies or modern dictatorships more than democracies. With such a code backing them up, it will be much easier in the future for the democratic forces in the labor movement as a whole to assert themselves, and to give each other mutual aid.

Democracy cannot really be handed down from above in the labor movement any more than it can be handed down from above in society at large. In both cases, the ranks must really want it, and be ready to fight and sacrifice for it.

The recent dramatic struggle in the United Steelworkers demonstrates that such a desire is far from lacking in the American labor movement, and there is every reason to believe that the months ahead will show that the willingness of the workers to fight for democracy in those unions where it has been weak or lacking is on the upgrade.

The adoption by the leadership of the AFL-CIO of a Code of Democratic Procedures would give this fight a real boost. Militants in the labor movement could do worse right now than to press for adoptions of resolutions at all levels of the labor movement urging the AFL-CIO Executive Council to speed ahead with this momentous step.

HOUSE-CLEANING —

Beck Gets the Boot

By L. G. SMITH

The AFL-CIO Executive Council has acted swiftly in removing Dave Beck, Teamster boss, as a vice president of the AFL-CIO and from its Executive Council.

In a motion passed without a dissenting vote, the Council said:

"The Executive Council finds that Vice-President Dave Beck has been guilty of gross misuse of union funds entrusted to his care.

"... Whether Beck stole the funds or borrowed them, the record shows he took advantage of his position as a trade-union official to use money belonging to dues-paying members for his own personal gain and profit.

"A full record of these charges was presented to Vice-President Beck prior to this hearing. He does not choose to answer.

"On the basis of these facts and conclusions the Executive Council finds Dave Beck guilty as charged and removes him as a vice-president of the AFL-CIO and as a member of the Executive Council."

Beck's "defense" was to claim that he could not answer the charges because he has been indicted on income-tax evasion, and to answer them would be to jeopardize his court case. He claimed also that the Executive Council had no power to suspend or remove him.

Meanwhile, there is every reason to believe that the Teamsters' convention will witness the first open struggle in that union for control within memory of living trade-unionists. Fourth Vice-President John T. (Sandy) O'Brien has announced that he will fight Beck for the presidency. He is being openly backed by John F. English,

secretary-treasurer of the international, as well as by other powerful figures in the union.

James Hoffa so far seems to be standing firm behind Beck, although he has hinted in recent months that he would like to see Harold Gibbons, St. Louis Teamster official, take over the presidency. Though Gibbons has the reputation of being an honest and efficient unionist, he has defended Hoffa inside and outside the labor movement.

LOCALS ACT

San Francisco's big Teamster Local 85 has issued a statement signed by all but one of its elected officers accusing Dave Beck of having made the union "the laughing-stock of the country" by his "intolerable actions." The statement called on Beck to resign forthwith as Teamster president.

Local 85, with 600 members, is the second largest Teamster local west of Chicago. Oakland Local 70, which is the largest, last week was reported to have elected an anti-Beck slate of officers.

The Textile Workers Union has called on Senate investigators to study corrupt collusion by employers, local politicians and police to defeat union organizing.

The union's complaint, filed with the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field by John W. Edelman, TWU Washington representative, said it would show that "corrupt or improper activities" of textile employers use police and other officials to prevent workers from joining unions of their own choosing.

The Real Beck Story Is How He Got Up There

By JACK WILSON

The first phase of disclosure on how a rascal like Dave Beck became a powerful and rich man in the labor movement was furnished last week by the Senate investigating committee.

His beer business, his trucking and trailer connections, his financial manipulations with Teamsters' money—all came to the light of day, and it was an ugly picture of how business interests and a scoundrel, utilizing a union position, joined together at the expense of the truck drivers, whom Beck was supposed to represent; and the public took a beating too.

But the important facet of the Beck story has not yet been touched. It concerns the way he became a powerful labor leader, for in this area a basic social criticism manifests itself.

Dave Beck came to power not just because he was rough, tough, crooked, or clever, or because he was ambitious. He arose to nation-wide attention at a given time, filling a given need of the business community, more than the interests of unorganized workers.

Beck was propelled to power by the fear West Coast business interests had of the rise and growth of the CIO. Beck was their antidote to the CIO, in the first instance.

In the second place, he was the bulwark of American society, and notably of business interests in the West, against the fear of "Communism" symbolized in the public mind by the success of the maritime unions, in particular Harry Bridges, and the West Coast longshoremen's union.

On the East Coast, shipping and truck-

ing interests preferred Joe Ryan, the Anastasia brothers and other racketeers to the "invasion" of Bridges. On the West Coast, Beck was the answer to the threat of Bridges' growth and influence in the labor movement. The AFL was considered the respectable union movement, a safeguard against the triumph of the CIO.

It should be remembered that in one case, the top Hollywood movie companies paid Chicago gangsters who seized Hollywood unions a cash bribe of \$500,000 to keep things under control. Joe Schenk, the czar of Hollywood, and Willie Bioff, the Chicago punk, each received prison terms for that deal.

From this one does not have to conclude that all AFL unions grew because of the business world's fear of the CIO. Many AFL unions competed successfully with CIO unions in organizing campaigns. In the case of Beck, however, the role of the business interests was decisive, for their antagonism to the CIO and Harry Bridges was public knowledge.

Seldom in recent years was there an occasion more mortifying to the leadership of the union movement than last week when a conservative like Senator John McClellan challenged the Teamsters union and the labor movement "to clean its own house."

The humiliation does not make the challenge any less urgent. For unless the AFL-CIO moves even more quickly to put its own house in order, the basis for repressive legislation has been solidified.

Either complete and stringent rules for financial responsibility become basic in the AFL-CIO unions, as well as man-

(Continued on page 3)

Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington — —

(Continued from page 11)

explained that he could not make it for reasons which remained unexplained. Representative Jacob K. Javits of New York was also listed; he never showed up and no one bothered to refer to his absence in any way. The sole white speaker was a Jewish rabbi, in keeping with the religious aspect of the meeting. The sole unionist was Randolph himself.

Religious leadership was elevated by some to the level of a principle. Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth of the Bethel Baptist Church of Birmingham emphasized that the Negro church was taking the lead in the fight. Powell called for a "third force" on the American political scene, non-partisan but political, non-racial but led by the Negro clergy.

NO BANNERS, PLEASE

But that was up on the platform. In the crowd things were somewhat different.

Every effort was made to maintain a certain restraint. There were no placards; no applause was permitted. As a concession to audience participation, as the proceedings advanced, the chairman suggested that they might wave handkerchiefs and say "amen" as gestures of approval.

But the people were there. Many came from church and civic groups but perhaps half the audience were Negro workers and their families, brought down by their unions.

At least 2000 union men came on a single special train from New York. District 65 of the Retail Union mobilized 1100 members by train, car and bus. Hotel and Club

Local 6 brought hundreds. The Transport Workers Union and the Ladies Garment Union had large contingents. The IUE was represented.

They came with their union banners, but they could not raise them. As they got off the buses and began to parade toward the memorial behind their union signs, policemen explained that no signs or placards were permitted and the union flags came down.

On the union train, Negro unionists sang Solidarity Forever and other union songs. None of this was heard in Washington.

The rank-and-file unionists were there. But where was the official labor movement and its highest leaders? That is the big unanswered and unexplained question.

"THOSE RESPONSIBLE"

The speeches went beyond the religious guise of the rally and expressed the real feelings of the crowd who could only wave their handkerchiefs in approval.

President Johnson of Howard University told the crowd: "There are no laws, no sacrifices, including imprisonment, that will stop us from defending that organization which truly represents us" (NAACP).

Roy Wilkins reported that the NAACP had been virtually outlawed in several Southern states and called upon Negroes to remain "steadfast in the face of terror." "Wickedness reaches into Congress itself," he said, and declared that if no civil-rights bill were passed, the voters in 1958 would hold those responsible to account.

But "those responsible" soon be-

came less anonymous. Representative Diggs demanded that Eisenhower speak out. The House, he said, would pass laws to protect the right to vote in the South but the Senate is the road-block. "If Lyndon Johnson, Democratic leader in the Senate, doesn't act to stop the dilatoriness of the Senate Judiciary Committee, it will be his responsibility."

A lot of good Northern Democrats will suffer, he continued. In the South, large numbers of Negroes will vote Republican "and I won't blame them," added Diggs, a Democrat.

He called for more than prayer. "If you do nothing but pray, you could have stayed home at the family altar. You have to translate your souls' yearnings into action."

It was Powell who brought the political issue to a climax. He denounced the "hypocrisy of both parties." We are at the Lincoln Memorial "because we get more from a dead Republican than a live Democrat." He excoriated the "bi-partisan Jim Crow policy of double-dealing, double-talking hypocrites in both parties." He denounced Paul Butler, Democratic national chairman, for refusing to speak up for civil rights.

He called for a "third force on the American political scene against the two-party hypocrisy." There is no one in the South big enough to stop our movement, he declared; a third force could bring support to the outlawed NAACP in the South. He called for boycotts, work stoppages, slowdowns, picket lines to dramatize the Negroes' demands.

"Turn the tide from hypocrisy to honesty," he exclaimed, and called upon Eisenhower, Nixon, Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn to face Negro delegations and explain themselves.

TO PRESS FORWARD

Martin Luther King, last speaker, also leveled the finger of accusation at both parties. The hypocrites are not confined to one party, he said. "The Democrats capitulate to the Dixiecrats in the South and the Republicans capitulate to right-wing reaction in the North."

He ridiculed the Northern liberals "who see all sides of every question and fail to become committed to either side." He called for continued struggle for Negro rights by meeting "hate with love and physical force with moral force."

Many moods and many tendencies came together in Washington at this "prayer for freedom." But if one element stands out above all others it is this: the Negro movement expresses its determination to press forward for democracy—against the old parties, if need be; in the face of official labor passivity, if need be; without the public support of hypocritical liberals, if need be.

And this determination is one of the great hopes of our times.

NEW YORK
LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, June 6

BOB BONE

The Story of the NAACP

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Party and the H-Bomb: BLP Fumbles an Opportunity

By OWEN ROBERTS

The British Government is feeling very pleased with itself. Not only has it successfully exploded its first hydrogen bomb and, as the liberal *Manchester Guardian* describes it, "paid entry to that select companionship of nuclear powers," but it has managed to perform this operation without provoking in Britain the storm of public protest which only a short time ago seemed likely to erupt simultaneously with the detonation of the bomb.

It is true that there have been protests, and these will probably grow as the tests on Christmas Island continue. But generally speaking the news of the first explosion three days ago seems to have been received with an air of complacency by the people of Britain.

This is not because the tests have the backing of all the population, for there are many opponents of the government's policy spread over a wide section of the public. It is rather because of three distinct factors which have taken the edge from the opposition.

• First, the opponents of the government are divided in the degree of their opposition.

• Second, the government has carried out an active propaganda campaign in support of the tests—and in this it has been aided by the press.

Third, and most important, the Labor Party, which could have become the rallying point for oppositionists, is hopelessly compromised in its policy on nuclear weapons.

THE '55 MUDDLE

Labor's inability to lead the opposition to the H-bomb stems from the period of the Labor government when the Attlee administration gave the go-ahead signal to scientists to develop British nuclear weapons. Once this course had been mapped out there could be no turning back, at least for the right-wing leadership.

Two years ago Labor's attitude was taken to its logical conclusion when the Parliamentary Labor Party supported the Tory government in its decision to manufacture H-bombs. Swinging the

Parliamentary Labor Party this far behind the Tories was no easy task for the right-wing Labor leaders and was not accomplished without a great rumpus. Many Labor Members of Parliament, realizing rather late in the day just where they would end up if they followed along with this policy, rebelled. As a consequence, when the vote was taken in the House of Commons nearly 60 Labor MPs refused to enter the division lobbies and sat solidly in their seats in defiance of the party whips.

But even on this occasion the left-wing abstentionists were hopelessly muddled, and in no case was this more apparent than with Aneurin Bevan—self-professed leader of the rebels.

Bevan did not oppose the manufacture of H-bombs by Britain nor did he oppose their use in a future war. Instead he created a terrific hubbub in the House of Commons on whether the government should meet an attack with "conventional weapons" by using the hydrogen bomb.

This may have been an interesting debating point for military strategists, but it was of no consequence to politicians who should have occupied themselves with fundamental principles. The result was that Bevan succeeded in confusing the issues facing the MPs, got the left-wing enmeshed in a situation not of its own making, and ended up by getting himself turned out of the Parliamentary Labor Party and very nearly out of the national party also.

Thus what should have been a fight against nuclear weapons and their role in the government's scheme of foreign policy was diverted, and the left wing had to devote its energies to save Bevan from expulsion from the party and get him reinstated in the Parliamentary Labor Party. By the time this objective had been achieved the opportunity for making a principled fight on the real issues had passed.

CRISIS OVER BROWN

A few months later Britain became busy with the 1955 general election, and as an appeal to the electorate the Labor Party made what appeared to be a slight shift in policy: it said Britain should attempt to get an international settlement on the question of nuclear weapons and for ending tests. This, however, was but a slight shift of emphasis rather than a basic change in policy—for every political party in Britain has paid lip-service to such an idea right from the time the first atomic bombs were dropped on Japan.

After the election the H-bomb was largely forgotten by the Labor Party as all energies were turned to the effects of Tory policies on the internal economy of the country.

From time to time the matter would be raised, usually by a section of the left wing; but by and large the H-bomb did not become significant until a few months ago, when it became apparent that Britain's H-bomb development had reached the stage where a full-scale test was imminent. And once again a storm, albeit a minor one, broke on the Labor Party.

This storm was set in motion by right-winger George Brown, Labor's "shadow defense minister" in the House of Commons. Speaking on the radio in a party political broadcast, Brown came out in favor of the H-bomb tests and so aroused the anger of the left wing, particularly among a number of left Labor MPs who had earlier begun agitation against the tests.

Brown, it must be said, was adhering closely to the party line, because in supporting the manufacture of H-bombs by Britain the Parliamentary Party had

automatically given consent to the testing of the bombs; and this Brown pointed out.

But party line or not, first-class crisis seemed to be on the horizon and the press was filled with "think pieces" predicting a split in the Labor Party. This, however, was averted by the traditional method of the Parliamentary Labor Party—a compromise.

At a special meeting of the Parliamentary Party it was agreed to press the government to suspend its tests in the Pacific as a gesture to the remainder of the world and in an endeavor to give space for possible international discussions along the lines of the old, old formula. The threatened breach averted, the Parliamentary Labor Party carried its policy into the House of Commons, where it was met with some derision by the Tories, who were able to point to Labor's own responsibilities in developing nuclear weapons. The result, to quote *The Economist*, "brought the government political victory."

THE RANKS DEMAND

Behind this fumbling of the Parliamentary Labor Party, which was only saved from becoming completely ineffective by the activities of left-wing MPs who took advantage of the situation to voice their own views, feeling was building up in the country against the H-bomb among local Labor Parties and various community organizations, and the situation speedily developed where the anti-H-bomb campaigners in the localities were running streets ahead of the Labor Party in Parliament.

The depth of feeling among the rank and file of the constituency Labor Parties was adequately demonstrated by the tens of thousands who turned out to Labor's May Day demonstration in London a fortnight ago. The organizers of the demonstration had decided the theme of the march through London's streets would be against higher living costs and the government's plan to put up rents. The marchers themselves thought otherwise.

When the column of thousands moved off through the streets it was dominated by posters, slogans and banners on the question of the H-bomb. Many were crude, home-made affairs, but they were all to the point: "Ban the Bomb," "Stop the Tests"—these were the repeated demands shaped in various ways.

Some local parties had even gone to the trouble of making mock bombs which they dragged on trollies or mounted on trucks, to give added point to their demands. Others had enlisted the support of their children to march miles through the streets carrying posters, almost as big as themselves, demanding a future safe from H-bombs.

ST. PANCRAS ACTS

But the activities of the local parties have not been confined to May Day protests. Many have started off campaigns in their own areas against the H-bomb and its makers.

The way in which one London party, St. Pancras, has done this merits mention.

Under an Act of Parliament the local councils all over Britain must create and maintain in their areas a civil-defense organization. This is paid for by finding 25 per cent of the cost from the local rates and the remaining 75 per cent from a central government grant.

The Borough of St. Pancras is held by a Labor majority and, to publicly register its protest against H-bombs and the uselessness of civil-defense measures, it decided to wind up its civil-defense organization and transfer all the buildings and staff to the housing department. This has, of course, met with the strong disapproval of the government, which will probably send in a commissioner to organize the civil defense and charge the bill to St. Pancras council.

However, St. Pancras has made an effective public demonstration which was further heightened during the May Day demonstrations when the Labor councillors, wearing their official badges of of-

fice, marched through the streets of their borough bearing anti-H-bomb slogans led by one of Britain's top jazz bands (which, incidentally, gave a fine jazzed up rendering of the "Red Flag" to the thousands of people who were waiting to move off in the big all-London demonstration).

It is known that other Labor-controlled local councils where the left wing is in a strong position are considering following the example of St. Pancras despite right-wing opposition to the idea. If this is done on a wide enough scale, the civil-defense structure of Britain would be in danger of collapse and public attention would be forcibly drawn to the fallacy of defense against nuclear warfare.

NO LEAD

Not only have local Labor Parties tried to give a lead on the H-bomb, others have also spoken up.

The British Council of Churches appealed to the government to suspend its tests; and at the Baptist Union a demand that Britain should give a lead by ending its tests was narrowly defeated by only five votes in a gathering of seven hundred delegates. Similarly, many local church bodies have voiced their alarm about the tests.

Last week-end several thousand women gathered in Trafalgar Square at an anti-H-bomb meeting and then marched through the streets wearing black sashes. Others are maintaining a constant "vigil" at the House of Commons.

But in spite of the many pointers to public feeling, no nation-wide campaign has been built up and, as previously stated, the responsibility for this rests with the right-wing leadership of the Labor Party. They should have given the lead—but they could not because of their compromised position.

This lack of leadership has meant that the H-bomb opponents are still at sixes and sevens. Some are demanding international talks to stop the tests; others, talks to stop the making of bombs. Some are demanding that Britain should stop its own tests without waiting for international agreement, while others (mainly those on the left of the Labor Party) are putting forward the straight demand that Britain should immediately end its manufacture of nuclear weapons.

With no central rallying point these ideas have no chance to meet and crystallize into a common program of action. As a consequence the opposition to the government is stifled.

UNSCRAMBLING?

The government has not been slow to exploit this situation. Through its Tory MPs, newspaper friends and others, it has sought to spread abroad the idea that opponents of the H-bomb are fellow-travelers, Communists, cranks or just plain stupid people. This effort would have been smashed to pieces had the Labor Party leadership come out strongly to voice the opinions held by those who are probably the majority of its active workers in the localities.

Instead it has been left to scientists (some actually employed in government atomic research establishments) to demonstrate the hollowness of the government's accusations by publicly stating their doubt about the wisdom of H-bomb tests, and to the spokesmen of the Labor left wing.

However, in order to put the picture clearly, it must be added in conclusion that there are welcome signs that the crossed lines on H-bombs among the Labor left wing seem to be slowly getting unscrambled. Bevan has implied, if not explicitly stated, that he is now against the making of H-bombs by Britain. *Tribune* has gone even further and stated that the compromise of calling for suspension of British tests must be made "a stepping-stone toward a frank and coherent policy of opposing the entire nuclear arms race."

This is better late than never—but if Bevan and his followers had tackled the matter in the correct fashion several years ago the present situation might never have arisen and the demonstration of thousands of students in Japan might have been matched by similar demonstrations led by the Labor Party, in Britain.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Beck Story ---

(Continued from page 2)

datory free and secret elections, or legislation purporting to be to this effect will gain overwhelming support, including support from broad sections of the ranks of labor, tired of being exploited by racketeers and cynical bureaucrats.

Nor will the union movement be able to avoid such legislation in all probability, merely by denouncing it as anti-labor or interfering with labor's rights. By reforming itself, the union movement makes triply more difficult any attempt by Congress to attach repressive amendments to ostensibly good legislation calling for financial reports and free elections in the organized labor movement.

The virtual collapse of the opposition to George Meany and Walter P. Reuther's insistence on carrying out the Code of Ethical Practices, and in further improving the internal structure of the labor movement, makes labor's job much easier. All the nonsense about the Teamsters taking on the AFL-CIO in a head-on fight disappeared last week when four vice-presidents of the Teamsters offered Beck's head to George Meany as the price of respectability.

It was not enough. A palace revolution is too late. The internal convulsions of the Teamsters have just begun. Ditto for the other unions ear-marked for public scrutiny.

Without the cover of a union card, most of the racketeers would already be on the run or in jail. The duty of the labor movement is to remove that protection from its parasitic scum, and to re-establish itself as a totally clean and dynamic force in American society.

WHY ISL REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE—

Letter to the 'American Forum'

On May 13 there was announced the formation of the *American Forum—For Socialist Education*. In a statement of purpose, the American Forum declared that it seeks the promotion of "study and serious untrammelled political discussion among all elements that think of themselves as related to historic socialist and labor traditions, values and objectives . . . however deep and bitter their differences may have been."

The American Forum, whose organization in the main stems from the initiative of A. J. Muste, veteran pacifist and editor of *Liberation*, is under the chairmanship of Muste and has for its secretary Sid Lens; there is a forty-member National Committee.

Among the members of this committee are: Kermit Eby, John T. McManus, Albert Blumberg, Bert Cochran, Dorothy Day, Dave Dellinger, Farrell Dobbs, W. E. B. Du Bois, Conrad Lynn, Clifford McAvoy, Doxie Wilkerson, H. H. Wilson, Milton Zaslow, Waldo Frank, and others. Thus there are participating in the National Committee of the American Forum leading members of such political organizations and periodicals as the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Socialist Unity Committee, *National Guardian*, *American Socialist* and *Liberation*, although these figures do so as individuals.

The Forum has already been the subject of discussion and attack in such bourgeois papers as the *N. Y. Times* and the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*. It goes without saying that LABOR ACTION rejects and condemns the intentions behind such attacks. Next week, LABOR ACTION will devote an article to our estimation of the *American Forum*.

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, was invited by the Forum to serve as a member of the Forum's National Committee. We publish below, for the information of our readers, the reply of Shachtman to this invitation.

National Committee,
American Forum—
For Socialist Education

DEAR FRIENDS:

I must decline to accept your invitation to serve as a member of the National Committee of "American Forum—For Socialist Education."

In view of the fact that I actively supported the initiative taken by your National Chairman some months ago in calling together representative individuals for the purpose of exchanging views on the situation of the radical and socialist movement in the United States, and of the proposals I put forward at the first meeting that he arranged, as well as the opinions I expressed in connection with the second meeting in the form of a letter to your Chairman because I could not attend, I want to accompany my declination with a brief explanation that may be of interest to you and others concerned. I have held up writing this letter until I had the chance to discuss the whole matter with your National Chairman a few days ago. I can add, in passing, that my explanation has of course nothing to do with the newspaper attacks on the Forum which followed its public announcement. I have nothing but contempt for the intentions behind the advice which the reactionary press offers to socialists, and in particular I regard the clamor for governmental and police intervention and persecution with loathing.

MISGIVINGS

In expressing my "definite misgivings and reservations" about the plan to set up the American Forum as it now exists, I wrote your Chairman two months ago, under date of March 19, as follows:

"I am prepared and even eager to discuss with anyone and everyone, regardless of his affiliation, the minimum basis required for that cooperation and dispelling of suspicion and hostility which are needed if socialist reunion and progress are to be achieved. To confer and discuss, or even to debate vigorously in public—that is one thing. To join now in a common organization—is another. That implies that the sponsor, and any group he is prominently associated with, takes political responsibility for the enterprise. I am ready to take responsibility for something like your 'American Forum' regardless of the wide differences among its proposed sponsors on a host of theoretical and tactical questions, including the most controversial ones. But only with the provision that such a Forum is explicitly committed, on the basis of common agreement of its sponsors, to support of democratic rights for all, not less in what some call the 'socialist bloc' of nations as in capitalist nations. I can discuss with those who reject such a commitment. I cannot unite in a permanent organization with those who still find it impossible to repudiate that totalitarian denial of full rights to the people in the name of socialism which they so rightly and promptly condemn and

combat under capitalism.

"If the sponsors of a national 'Forum' can agree in simple, forthright English to such a commitment, so essential in the light of the past discreditment of the name of socialism, I would be honored to associate myself with the enterprise despite all differences that exist otherwise on questions of theory and tactics. If they cannot agree on such an elementary notion—if they equivocate or evade it altogether—the new organization will lay itself open from the start to charges and suspicions from which I fear nobody—not you or I or others—could convincingly defend it. It would start under a cloud that I would not want over my head."

At your March 1957, meeting, where it was finally decided to establish the present American Forum, a member of the Socialist Party, speaking as an individual and in his own name, proposed that all participants commit themselves to the elementary principles of democratic socialism for all countries. This proposal was rejected. The primary opposition to it came from spokesmen of the Communist Party and others who regard the totalitarian regime of Russia as representing some kind of socialist or working-class state. All the other participants, except the comrade who made the proposal and the comrade who represented me at the meeting, bowed to this opposition. I cannot accept as serious the argument that what is involved is some academically or abstractly flawless definition of democratic socialism acceptable to the entire world, and therefore requiring an extensive preliminary discussion. What is involved is simply an agreement that socialists are no less clearly and emphatically for such rights as free speech, free press, free assembly, right to organize, free elections and the like in a country calling itself (or called by others) socialist, as they are for countries which are capitalist.

THE MAIN CONSEQUENCE

Your statement says, among other things, that you wish to "concentrate on discussion of the program of a democratic socialist movement in the U. S. and how such a movement may be brought into being." I do not see how it will be possible to do that with any effectiveness if the participants in the Forum have, from the outset, been unable or been unprepared to reject the totalitarian denial of the simplest democratic rights to the working class in particular and the people in general which outstandingly characterizes the regimes with which some of your most prominent

members have been and still are associated as defenders. The failure or refusal to emphasize that there is agreement on this minimum basis for cooperation of different groups in one organization, has produced the consequences that could have been foreseen and that confirm my misgivings about launching the Forum.

I am not concerned, I repeat, with such consequences as the attacks in some of the newspapers. It is other consequences implicit in the very constitution of the American Forum to which I refer. Instead of being able to "concentrate on discussion of the program of a democratic socialist movement in the U. S. and how such a movement may be brought into being," there seems to me to be no way of avoiding concentrating your efforts from now on upon an entirely different matter, namely, the correctness of non-Communists and non-supporters and opponents of the totalitarian Stalinist regimes to join in a common organization "For Socialist education" with Communists and supporters and defenders of these regimes. This not only alters and thwarts the original purpose of free discussion which is likewise free of mutual political responsibility for all the participants in a discussion, but places an unwarranted burden upon those who have acquired serious and responsible positions in the broad labor, Negro and other movements. The isolation of such individuals can only further the isolation of socialism from these broad movements, and certainly will not alleviate it.

HELP TO UNITY?

You are, by now at least, aware of another consequence of the establishment of the Forum in its present way and on its present basis. All those on your National Committee who are spokesmen of political groups or periodicals have joined you with the authorization of their respective organizations. The exception is the Socialist Party, whose opposition to your enterprise is based on reasons which I share in some part as I do not in another part. To solicit support for the Forum from members of this party in the face of its known position, cannot contribute to the "eventual socialist unity" which your public statement proposes as an aim, and it is not contributing to it. On the contrary, it has already had the effect of exacerbating relations in that party. In my letter of March 19 to your National Chairman, I referred with restraint to the fact that one of the organizations whose spokesman is a member of your National Committee is obviously engaged, under the formula of socialist regroupment, in mere commando raids upon the membership of other organizations, including among others the Socialist Party, the Young Socialist League and our organization, the Independent Socialist League. It is surely not necessary to dwell on the reaction which such a course produces among others. I do not know what consideration you have given to this matter, or if it has been discussed at all. I trust that you will give the consideration which I regard as indicated to the matter which I raise, entirely on my own responsibility, with respect to the Socialist Party and the situation that is being created in it.

I write this letter with some regrets. I, together with my comrades of the Independent Socialist League, are intensely interested in advancing the cause of socialist regroupment and reunification in this country. Toward that end, I am still ready, as I have been since the question was first raised in recent days, to discuss and debate, formally or informally, with any similarly interested individuals and groups, without discrimination or conditions, whether he is a member of the Communist Party or any other organization with which I disagree radically. You know that our comrades in particular welcomed the recent appearance of a left-wing current among leaders and members of the Communist Party which made it possible, for the first time in years, to think in terms of fruitful discussions. Those I took my part in and am ready to take my part in again whenever the occasion is offered. That is one thing, as I wrote above. But to join in one organization, particularly one dedicated to

(Turn to last page)

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

when certain types discuss the Russian totalitarianism.

Franco needs a dose of "collective leadership" to maintain the continuity of the dictatorship, in particular. The problem of the succession has been bedeviling the Spanish rulers: *after Franco, who?*

"Should the monarchy be restored in Spain," says the *Times* dispatch, "a step many believe to be General Franco's long-range goal, a monarch would be incapable of filling all the roles that General Franco has played since 1936. The prior creation of a working cabinet system is viewed as essential to the eventual calm transmission of political power."

That would still be true, incidentally, even if it is not an anointed monarch that replaces the butcher of the Spanish civil war. There is no fascist successor who has been built up to step into all of Franco's shoes.

Any more than any of the Kremlin guard was able to replace Stalin in the one-man *Vozhd*-ship when the old boss died.

TIGHTENING THE SCREWS

"Collective leadership," "decentralization"—it is clear that to use these nice words interchangeably with "democratization" is a deception, unless they really can be shown to have a democratic content in any case.

In the case of Franco, fortunately, there are no Deutschers or other Stalinoids squeezing the living significance out of these terms in order to prove that the Franco regime is reforming itself into democracy from above.

As a matter of fact, this turn by Franco is taking place in conjunction with changes designed to tighten up the dictatorship, not to ease it.

On March 22 (as we are informed by the Spanish socialist POUM) Franco signed two decrees changing the Spanish penal code on crimes of internal security, that is, political opposition. Now anyone accused of actions tending to "weaken the hierarchy or prestige of the state, or of the institutions in existence" cannot be released on bail and can be kept in jail as long as deemed necessary (without a trial). The right of habeas corpus is abolished for them.

This change was made, it should be noted, by a simple decree by the head of state, without even bothering to consult the puppet Cortès. Although the decrees were published in the *Boletín Oficial del Estado* on March 30, the press did not report them to the public.

THE REAL FEAR

Actually, of course, as everyone knows, the right of habeas corpus has regularly been flouted by the regime, even though it is on the books. Political opponents have languished in Franco's jails indefinitely at his pleasure. Franco's new decrees only institutionalize the real practice. They give a permanent and juridical character to the "suspension of constitutional guarantees." They legalize *de jure* what the dictatorship has been doing *de facto*. If we mention it at all now, it is only to underline the nature of the changes brewing in Francoland.

There is an inner connection between these two totalitarian decrees on the one hand and the so-called "decentralization of responsibility" on the other. Both are equally explained by the fact that a crisis is upon Franco. There will have to be changes; that is clear to everyone in Spain. Franco wants to ensure that the "transmission of power" be indeed "calm" and controlled—above all, controlled—from above.

For at a time when power is being "transmitted," there is no dictator that can be sure where it will go. Franco need only look east to be sure of that.

LABOR ACTION • 17th YEAR

May 27, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 21

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: MAL DRAPER. Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH. Associate Editors: GORDON WASKELL, BEN HALL.

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

Socialist Regroupment: A Discussion

As was announced in Challenge for March 18, the YSL National Executive has adopted the position of favoring the creation of a broad, Debsian socialist party in the United States, and advocating the unity of the YSL, the ISL and the SP-SDF as a step in that direction. A minority of the NEC opposed the perspective favored by the NEC, which is the YSL's highest body between conventions. The question will be decided by the forthcoming YSL national convention.

Preparatory to the convention, discussion is now taking place in the League on this and other questions which will be on the convention agenda. This discussion is being conducted in YSL units throughout the country, and in the pages of the Young Socialist Revue; YSL discussion and information bulletin. Interested Challenge readers may obtain copies of the YSR at 10 cents from the YSL national office for a thorough airing of the issues involved.

For the information of the readers of Challenge, we present below summary statements of the two views, as part of this discussion now occupying the attention of the YSL. First the YSL minority presents a summation of its views. This is followed by a reply from the YSL National Action Committee, summarizing the views of the NEC.—EDITOR.

Minority: For Independent Youth Group

Today, for the first time in decades, the majority of American radicals are seriously looking for a way to regroup themselves into a stronger, more militant, unified socialist movement. The Left Wing of the Young Socialist League believes that American socialists can and should unite. A united socialist movement would make it much easier for socialists to take effective action to promote their common political ideas. A united socialist movement would provide a much better framework for discussion of the important political disagreements current among socialists.

The possibility of socialist regroupment did not fall from heaven. American radicals today have an important chance to unite because of the world-shaking historical events of the past year. The disintegration of Stalinism provides the context for socialist regroupment. Many sincere socialist-minded individuals have, until quite recently, identified the cause of socialism with the ruling group in Russia. The "Khrushchev report" on the crimes of Stalin, and the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, have shown many of these individuals that the actions of the ruling bureaucracy have, in fact, nothing in common with the cause of socialism. Socialists have a clear responsibility to these former and present members and sympathizers of the Communist Party and Labor Youth League. Socialist regroupment should give them a chance to participate in a stronger and more attractive socialist movement than has existed in the recent past.

We in the Young Socialist League bear a major responsibility to work for such a regroupment in the youth field. The YSL has certain unique advantages which give it a chance to play a leading role in uniting American radical youth. The YSL is the only nation-wide socialist youth organization. It is an independent youth group, unaffiliated to any "adult" socialist organization. It conceives of itself as a broad group, and can include as members socialists holding many and varied views and can also include members of differing "adult" socialist parties.

The political program of the YSL can provide the basis for socialist youth unity, for it is a principled socialist program, yet broad enough to include various tendencies. The YSL Constitution states that the YSL strives to "aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism."

We of the left wing believe that the YSL should take the initiative on regroupment in the youth field. We urge that it offer itself as a possible center for the

unification of radical youth in the U.S. We propose that the YSL call upon all radical youth today who find themselves in general agreement with the YSL's program of militant opposition to capitalism and Stalinism to join the YSL regardless of their adult party affiliations or theoretical differences. This would be fully consistent with the constitution of the YSL and the resolutions passed at its conventions.

This invitation would specifically include, but not be limited to, members of the SP-SDF, Socialist Workers Party, Libertarian League, members and sympathizers of the former LYL, sympathizers of the magazines *American Socialist*, *Monthly Review*, and *Dissent*. We of the left wing of the YSL propose that the YSL invite the comments of these groups and individuals as to the possibility of joining together in the task of building a socialist youth movement.

In all cases where regroupment is not immediately possible, the YSL should nevertheless carry on the widest possible program of discussions and united actions with radical youth of all tendencies. Even if our differences with some group are too great to permit immediate unity, we should still seek out all opportunities for common action on those issues which unite us with other radical youth: defense of civil liberties, support to the struggle of the Negro people, etc. Open political discussion and joint activity can lay a sound basis for a future unity.

SP THE CENTER?

We counterpose this proposal for a socialist youth regroupment to the proposal of the YSL Right Wing. The political essence of the Right Wing proposal is that the ISL and YSL dissolve themselves and that their members join the SP-SDF and YPSL as individuals. The only condition the Right-Wingers place upon this dissolution-and-entry is that the SP-SDF be willing to accept them as members. This is spelled out in the NAC Draft Resolution on "Perspectives for American Socialism" as follows: "The YSL does not make changes in the program or leadership of the SP-SDF a precondition for affiliation. On the contrary, it is ready to unite with the Socialist Party as it stands today."

We do not believe that the SP-SDF, "as it stands today," can be the center of a healthy socialist youth regroupment. We consider the political position of the SP-SDF and its "youth section," the YPSL, to be anti-socialist on some of the most important issues of present-day politics. For instance, the SP-SDF "Memorandum of Understanding," the basic programmatic document of the SP-SDF, endorses "the democratically established military agencies of the free world." A leader of the SP described this document as "full support for the worst, most shameful policies of the State Department and John Foster Dulles." In its

(Turn to last page)

Majority: For a Socialist Regroupment

The Young Socialist League has officially adopted the position of favoring the creation of a broad, Debsian-type party of socialism in America, and looks to the unification of the SP-SDF, the ISL, the YPSL and the YSL as the first step in this direction. This decision, adopted by an overwhelming majority vote of the National Executive Committee, will, we are sure, be ratified by our forthcoming convention.

We believe that a whole series of events have resulted in a change in American life: the disintegration of the American Stalinist movement which so long disoriented radical youth; the lessening of tension on the international scene and the consequent diminution in the pace of the witchhunt in the United States; above all, the magnificent struggle of the Negroes for equality, a movement which has ramifications far beyond the area of civil rights. This is not to say that the basic determinants of the political, economic and social life of the United States in the past decade have changed. Prosperity continues, the war economy remains in force, the cold war is still very real. Thus, the socialist movement in America today is confronted by limited possibilities, but possibilities which must be seized.

For us, the next step in America is the creation of a labor party. That is the decisive question. Until the American workers organize themselves politically as a class, it is the sheerest utopianism to expect that the labor movement will adopt socialist positions, or assess tendencies within the labor movement on the basis of their attitudes toward a series of issues which are peripheral to this central question, the labor party.

Given such a perspective, it is clear that the entire American socialist movement stands to the left of the labor movement, for all American socialists favor the creation of a class party of labor. There are many differences between the various socialist tendencies, and they are not unimportant. But our common cause, that of the labor party, transcends them today, and makes it necessary that all democratic socialists unite to work for the aim that is common to us all.

That is why we propose a broad Debsian-type party. Such a party will contain sharp differences on a range of political questions, but it will agree that these are not decisive, that they do not justify the continued fragmentation of the socialist movement in a series of sects. We project a party in which these disagreements will be democratically debated, but in which they will be subordinated to the overriding necessity of fighting for the creation of a labor party and of joining in the immediate struggles, such as the movement for civil rights, here and now.

FAVOR UNIFICATION

We are, of course, determined to influence those sincere socialists who have come or will come to realize that the Stalinist movement is a travesty upon the socialist ideal. But we do not believe that the way to do that is by creating some "half-way house," mid-way between Stalinism and democratic socialism. We believe that a democratic socialist organizational alternative is the only way to win these people to democratic socialism. Moreover, we know that any American socialist movement which equivocates on the issue of the totalitarianism in Russia will, by that fact, alienate itself from the crucial areas of movement in our society, a point which was clearly demonstrated by the rejection of any Communist support for the recent Prayer Pilgrimage by A. Philip Randolph and Martin Luther King.

As a first step in the direction of cre-

ating such a broad, Debsian-type party, we favor the unification of the ISL, the SP-SDF, the YSL and the YPSL. We believe that the SP-SDF can serve as a framework for democratic socialist regroupment, that its identification as the party of Debs and with the American tradition of socialism grants it unusual opportunities in this period.

In such a unified socialist party, the YSL along with the YPSL would constitute the youth affiliate. And within this framework, we will maintain the real traditions of the YSL—in a broad, non-sectarian democratic socialist youth group. Thus our proposal is not for "dissolution" as the minority claims, but rather for the YSL becoming, or participating in the creation of, a broad socialist youth group affiliated to a united, "Debsian" socialist party.

In our proposal of unity, we have not proclaimed that we will give up those political positions which are distinctive to our movement. We have said that these differences will continue to exist after unity. We believe that they should be democratically debated, but not made the basis of excluding any grouping, that they should be subordinated to the common immediate task of all democratic socialists, that of working here and now to restore the influence of socialism in the American working class. Consequently, we do not seek to "capture" any unified organization, to win it to our complete political program, because we do not believe that the program of any one of today's socialist sects can be the program of a revived movement. Rather, while maintaining our point of view as loyal members of the united party, we want to influence the party itself in the direction of broadness, of becoming the all-inclusive organization of democratic socialism, and on day-to-day issues which arise.

Thus we do not mute our differences with the comrades of the SP-SDF; rather, we say that they are not decisive, that they do not preclude a common organization. And that perspective follows, not from some slogan or quotation of the past, but out of an analysis of the needs of socialism, here and now in this America of 1957.

THE COMMON TASK

To this proposal, the comrades of the minority of the YSL counterpose as their regroupment line a continuation of the YSL as it is—or rather, that is what they say in this document—that is, not regroupment but a recruiting campaign. (Actually, the conception, they claim to have of what the YSL is bears little resemblance to the reality of the organization.) We believe that they are unable to attract those of whom they speak, that the YPSL, the SLID, the former LYSLers who have broken with totalitarian Communism, the youth around *Dissent* and the *American Socialist*, will not be drawn to the YSL as it is. On the contrary, we think that they will be attracted by the youth group of a broad, Debsian-type party, that we can begin, today, to build a real socialist youth organization through the unity of the YSL and YPSL.

The independent socialist tendency, of which the YSL is a part, has a long and honorable tradition, and its fair share of mistakes as well. In the past, there have been sharp rivalries between ourselves and the comrades of the SP-SDF. We do not believe that it is our job to settle all the disputed questions between us before we can work together. We are confident that we can unite with our differences on the basis of that common aim and task which we share.

In summary, we believe that the best

(Turn to last page)

FOOD FOR SOCIALIST THOUGHT—

The Workers Council System In the Hungarian Revolution

By PANNONICUS

The Workers Councils born in the fire of the Hungarian Revolution offer us experiences that deserve to be studied, even though their period of independent and sovereign activity was short.

The Hungarian Workers Councils were not born like Athene from the head of Zeus, in mythological genesis. They came after events which prepared the way for them and without which their extremely rapid formation would have been unimaginable. I refer not to the factors which (so to speak) psychologically prepared the workers for such a course but to those which directly preceded the formation of the Workers Councils.

The existence and nature of these Councils were not totally unknown in Hungary. Although the Yugoslav Workers Councils were not known in any precise way or in detail, still the little that was known was enough to make the creation of such Councils one of the demands of the anti-Stalinist struggle which sprang up very vigorously during the year 1956. It is very understandable that—in a totalitarian, state-capitalist dictatorship where the unions and the self-styled "party of the working class" have become adjuncts and executive arms of the exploitive bureaucratic state which, moreover, betrayed the interests of the country, as was the case in Hungary—the idea of Workers Councils got a big reaction.

That is why, before October 23 and especially in the period which preceded the insurrection, the Peto Circle and the Union of Writers insisted on the necessity of their formation. One of the main slogans of the great demonstration initiated by the students on October 23 was workers' self-government, and one of its aims was to impose the formation of Workers Councils.

As is known, the first response to the demonstration by the Gero clique was rejection, and even provocation. But from October 24 on, in the face of the swelling surge of the insurrection and of the almost total collapse of the party and trade-union apparatus, Gero and his clique changed their tactic. They accepted the formation of the Workers Councils and turned over its implementation to the party apparatus.

The unfolding of events shows clearly what their aim was: to bridle the revolutionary élan and, for another thing, to put pressure on the working class in order to turn it away from revolution and keep it under control. While previously they had denied the need for Workers Councils, now they hastened to organize them in order to mobilize the working class (as they put it) against the counter-revolution.

Of course, they organized the Workers Councils in their own way, that is, in order to ensure their "loyalty"; so these Councils were made up of the manager, the party cell secretary, the trade-union heads, and some domesticated workers.

BORN IN ACTION

But events passed them by. The working-class was already on the way to revolution.

On the evening of October 23, the students had demonstrated, calling on the workers for a general strike. That night they contacted the factories in trucks, asking the workers to quit work and rally to the revolution. The unity of the workers and students, from October 24 morning on, became an indisputable fact and remained the greatest force in the revolution.

Thus, a strangely contradictory situation came to light; the workers took part in the revolution through a general strike as well as by fighting in armed groups, side by side with the students, and, during this time the self-styled "Workers Councils" which had been officially set up sent out appeals for the cessation of the strike and declared against the insurrection. The workers struggled against Gero, and Gero's puppets spoke in their name.

Plainly this situation could not last long.

The workers, seeing the great possibilities of the Councils, took stock of their own power and could not let Gero's men dress up in the prestige of the Workers Councils and speak in the name of the working class. They took over the factories, kicked out the bureaucratic usurpers and set up Workers' Councils by democratic and revolutionary means.

The formation of the Hungarian Councils, then, was not the work of chance; if these Councils were not the outcome of lengthy preparation, they were born out of the direct action of the working class.

DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

Analysis of the elections and constitution of the Workers Councils is an important problem, less from the sociological viewpoint than the political. Although we do not have complete documentation on the Councils, the data we do have allows certain important conclusions.

It can be stated that the election of the Councils, even when it took place under emergency conditions, took place democratically.

The election date was announced several times, and every worker and every employee of the factory was invited to vote. Thanks to these precautions, 50 to 70 per cent of those qualified were present at the elections. The workers voted in spite of the battles which went on in the streets and even though communications were broken. Naturally the percentages were different depending on the factory.

The elections took place in the full light of day; anyone could take the floor freely; every voter could propose candidates and they discussed the competence, attitude, past and recent activity of each of them.

The unity of the insurrection showed itself on the occasion of these elections, when the different factories unanimously by-passed all party and trade-union organizations. Everyone acted not as a representative of any party whatsoever but as a worker in such-and-such a factory.

SOCIAL COMPOSITION

An analysis of the composition of the Workers Councils also reflects this unity of the revolution, its popular character, and the political maturity of the working class.

This analysis should be made from a social angle as well as political.

The Councils faithfully reflected the social composition of the factories, their majority being formed by workers at the machines who therefore had more right to factory leadership. It was they above all who showed the greatest activity.

In spite of their feeling of superiority, the workers elected numerous white-collar workers and technicians, often even as chairmen. This phenomenon expressed, firstly, the social unity of the revolution where, regardless of class differences, all honest people participated, at least by showing their sympathy. Secondly, the election of technician-intellectuals and economists proves that the workers had a very clear view of the situation: the Councils must not be simply organizations to protect material interests but organizations capable of running the factories and of representing the opinions and general attitude of the workers before other organizations.

Another phenomenon leaps to the eye: the high percentage of youth in the Councils. One explanation of this, "The Hungarian Revolution was the revolution of youth," is not just a poetical expression of the truth; it is equally true on the factory level. If the tremendous

role of the youth in the Hungarian Revolution requires explanation, then so also as far as the Workers Councils are concerned.

The young workers, 18 to 30, were the most active elements in the factories. Even less than the others were they able to endure the horrible oppression, the climate of constraint and terror that reigned in the factories, and they were in no way held back by theoretical considerations if ever such consideration were able to hold back the workers.

The older workers perhaps thought of the possible consequences in the field of international politics and eventual reprisals. It is also necessary to add that the Hungarian Revolution was an armed revolt, and that it was the youth who played the main role in the battle, thus conquering with their blood the right to participate in the leadership of the factories and of the country itself.

POLITICAL WORK

A political analysis of the composition of the Councils is not less significant. There were factories where, immediately after the order given by Gero and his clique to set up Workers Councils, the workers set up Councils which expressed their own wishes and whose make-up was not subsequently changed. This was the case with the Council in the Gamma plant in Budapest and the Workers Council of the Borsod committee.

Those who were elected, generally, were honest worker-Communists, supporters of Imre Nagy, men who had long supported the workers' demands and suffered much harassment and persecution. Elected also were old social-democratic militants who for decades had struggled for workers' rights and been jailed or prosecuted by the Rakosists.

For example, the chairman of the Csepel Council was Jozsef Ivanics, who had fought all his life for the workers' well-being and spent years in Rakosi's prisons. By his life as a militant, by his ability and knowledge, he had won an indisputable reputation not only at Csepel but everywhere else.

Put on the Councils also were workers and technicians who fought for years against the Rakosists, defending workers' rights; good workers; specialists. Also included were those who in the full tide of revolution gave proof that they were valiant fighters, good organizers and real politicals.

The Councils conducted the most varied activities. First, they carried on political work. They organized meetings where political problems were discussed, where the position of the factory was determined, and where they took up what the Councils had to achieve.

This political activity concerned problems of national interest and expressed the views and demands of the working class. The demands from the different factories in the country were so similar, or at least there were so few differences among them, that it is enough to quote the resolution of the Workers Council of Borsod, adopted October 28:

(1) It is necessary to constitute a new government, excluding the participation of ministers who served under the Rakosi regime, which will have to struggle for an independent, self-governing, free and socialist Hungary.

(2) Such a government can be formed only after free general elections. Since the present situation does not permit these elections to take place, Imre Nagy must constitute a provisional government which will comprise only the most necessary ministries.

(3) The first task of the new government, resting on the coalition of the Hungarian Workers Party and the Popular Front, is to obtain the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet troops. The Soviet troops must not return to their barracks but must withdraw to their fatherland the Soviet Union.

(4) The new government must incorporate in its program and carry out

This article, translated from the Hungarian, appeared in the May 1957 issue of the French quarterly Socialisme et Barbarie. It is here translated from that French text, in toto except for a brief introduction re-emphasizing the vital place of complete workers' democracy for the meaning of socialism. While some of its conclusions may come under the head of discussion, its presentation of the genesis and life of the Hungarian Workers Councils is the best account we have seen of precisely those aspects which will interest thinking socialists—Ed.

the demands of the Workers Councils, the workers' organizations and the students.

(5) The State must have only two armed bodies: the police and the Honved [army]. The AVH [secret police] must be dissolved.

(6) Martial law must be ended, and amnesty granted to all who participated in the insurrection.

(7) Two months from now, general elections must be organized with the participation of several parties.

FOR SOCIALISM

Naturally the above-formulated demands were modified and concretized in the course of the stormy events of the revolution, but the principles remained the same.

The Councils did not become the most important organized force of the revolution in order to support demands alien to or even contrary to the interests of the workers. They did not struggle with such boldness and overpowering strength against Rakosi's state-capitalist regime in order to restore private capitalism.

The Workers Councils, contrary to the stupid and distorted attitude of the Rakosi regime which stifled all private initiative, believed that such cases of private initiative were useful, and declared that the state must support the initiative of little men (artisans, for example). But they declared also that they were attached to the socialist results already achieved.

The Workers Council of the Gyor railway-coach factory thus expressed itself in its November 3 resolution:

"The working class is firmly attached to its essential social demands which are the conquests of the national democratic revolution. We are with all our strength against the re-establishment of landed proprietorship, against the return to capitalist property of the banks and big factories. We are likewise against a Stalino-Rakosist restoration."

The Workers Councils likewise carried on political activities in the factories. This activity aimed at two things: destroy the political and organization remnants of the old regime, and install a new policy based on the work of the Workers Councils.

The old political and trade-union organizations evaporated without the Councils having to intervene against them. However, the personal questions were not the simplest in the world.

SHATTER THE OLD STATE

Lively discussions took up one by one the case of the principal employees in the factories, the leading functionaries of the trade unions and party who had generally been hard executors of the Rakosi regime's terror policy. Generally they were fired and expelled from the factories. Sometimes the hatred and fury of the excited workers were such that they were brutally kicked out and beaten. But in the majority of cases they were sent away very politely.

The objectivity and sense of justice of the Councils are well shown by the fact that in some factories the Workers Councils retained in their post managers who were honest men and able specialists. Everywhere they dissolved the so-called "Personnel Sections" which were stool-pigeon centers. The personal dossiers were returned to the workers.

All this work meant the total destruction of the old state apparatus, in all the political, espionage and repressive organizations.

Analysis of the new political phenomena which showed up for the first time within the framework of the Workers Councils is very important.

First of all, there was the organization of the general strike, with a strength previously unknown in all history. This strike was total, embracing the whole class, ensuring the absolute defense of the fac-

(Continued on page 7)

FRANCE How Mollet Tried to Juggle Party, Press and Pope

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Paris, May 13

A month and a half away from its National Congress, the SP has held its National Council meeting, a more restricted assembly of the parliamentarians and of the Federation secretaries. Guy Mollet wanted to demonstrate that he continues to keep his party well in hand, at a time when the government is facing serious financial difficulties and the Right seems reluctant to vote new taxes.

At the last National Council, on December 16, the minority had been crushed; it obtained only 270 votes against 3247 for Mollet and 78 abstentions. This time the minority polled 401 votes, against 2997 for Mollet and 435 abstentions.

Among the abstentionists, the Federation of the Bouches-du-Rhône is the most important. It is led by Gaston Defferre, the minister of Overseas Territories, who opposes within the government the reactionary delirium of Lacoste.

This progress of the minority can certainly not be considered a victory. However, this vote does not give an exact measure of the strength of the minority, which we will not know until the coming Toulouse Congress.

The spokesmen for the minority were Robert Verdier, Edouard Depreux, both deputies from the Department of Seine, and Professor Charles-André Julien, who strongly opposed the so-called "pacification" policy and spoke for the necessity of recognizing the "Algerian national fact," that is the right to independence.

Workers Council System — —

(Continued from page 61)

forces and organizing the armed struggle of the mass of workers.

This political work had new characteristics. It had no bureaucratic character, for the workers' meetings were the highest organs of discussion and deliberation—uniquely popular organs. Thus the Workers Councils were the free expression of the working class in a new and revolutionary way, a free expression which thus manifested itself, almost without any intermediary organ, on the local level as on the national level.

Among the economic problems the Councils had to take up, it is necessary to mention in first place the demands that were formulated on the national scale; although these were political demands, they also closely affected the economic situation of the country, including of course, the situation of the workers. The Councils demanded the abolition of the labor-norm system, increase in wages, the right to strike, real democratic trade unions, breaking the economic colonization of the country, establishment of commercial relations with the Soviet Union on an equal footing, etc., all demands consistent with the aims of the revolution.

In the factories the Councils organized the economic bases of the strike. They continued to pay wages, with a general 10 per cent increase—so they had immediately begun the realization of their demands; they reorganized the food supply by direct trade with the peasants, with the help of truck convoys, and centered food distribution in the factories themselves. For the poorest workers' families, the Councils gave out immediate assistance.

TOWARD A NEW STATE

During the few days of the revolution, the Workers Council system was organized with unprecedented speed. The Councils were first formed in the factories; the factory delegates designated sectional councils, whose delegates constituted, in turn, the Council of Greater Budapest [which includes the capital and its suburbs, about 2 million inhabitants comprising almost half the Hungarian working class. Note by French translator.]

The Workers Council of Greater Budapest very quickly won immense authority and appeared as the only real political

The Mollet government fell on May 21 as a result of failure to win a vote of confidence on its financial program, involving new taxes. Enough elements of the Right apparently turned against it on this issue to overcome any feeling that Mollet is the indispensable man to carry on the dirty war in Algeria.—Ed.

What this National Council showed most clearly was the determination of Mollet to push on with the war. It is now no longer a question of the "last quarter of an hour," which Lacoste has vainly announced several times. The President of the Council now declared that this war might last three or four years and that Algerian nationalism cannot be recognized under any circumstances. (The National Council being closed to the press, at least officially, these statements did not appear in the papers).

NO ILLUSIONS

Guy Mollet also asserted that it is impossible to govern without the SP and that, in any case, no politician would dare be more "liberal" than his party. The President of the Council recognized that the war will demand more sacrifices from the French working class, but he was confident that the latter is ready to make such sacrifices. He was sure of himself as never before.

At the same time, that very evening in fact, it was announced that terrorist action and military operations had killed

force in the country, especially after the second Soviet offensive of November 4. It demanded for the Workers Councils autonomous representation in the future National Assembly, which means that it attempted to transpose its real political strength into the parliamentary forms.

This demand of the Council expressed the opinion of the working class, which tended to express its political conceptions directly, qua working class, independently of the parties. This opinion also expressed itself in the fact that the workers expressed themselves against the formation of party cells in the factories and they denied the right to form cells to all the parties. Numerous organizers were chased out of the factories.

The birth of the Workers Councils and their activity proves the popular and socialist character of the Hungarian Revolution and offers experiments, new phases in the search for forms of socialism, direct management, workers' self-government.

Among the conclusions to be drawn, the very first place should be given to this: the revolutionary self-leadership of the workers is the indispensable condition for any uprising, every popular battle—a fact which unfortunately was not recognized by the Hungarian politicians, writers and intellectuals.

Secondly: under any regime at all, a system which excludes the direct participation en masse of the workers, or which sets itself up in spite of them, is a swindle if it calls itself socialist.

Thirdly: the experience of the Workers Councils showed that a calm and wise policy and the work of economic organization can be achieved only with independent and free workers, who lead themselves.

Fourthly: the leadership of a country can be entrusted to workers who are equal to the other social strata and can collaborate with them.

Fifthly: the history of the Workers Councils must be studied in detail, because, without the knowledge of these experiences in general and in particular, no one can call himself a socialist any longer.

I hope that the present article, which is only an essay at sketching the history of the Hungarian Workers Councils, will stimulate all who are interested in the fate of Hungary, and more broadly in the fate of world socialism, to a deeper study of the problem.

over a hundred people. No matter! Like Clemenceau, Mollet wants to earn the title of "Father Victory." Who cares if socialism dies in the process?

As to Lacoste, he dared to accuse the dean of the Algiers law school of false testimony. Since the time when the minister dared to lie in Parliament about the suicide of Ali Boumendjel, it is known what value can be attached to his words.

Consequently, there cannot be any illusion left. The Mollet government will not modify its policy in a reasonable direction. Politically and morally, the break between the party leadership and the minority is complete.

For a number of reasons, which may appear justified or not according to one's estimate of the probable evolution of the French working class in the coming months, the cohabitation of the two elements in the same party continues. After the Congress, it will be seen more clearly whether or not it is possible or necessary to maintain this cohabitation.

A clear position by the parties of the International, and by the Socialist International itself, might help to clarify this equivocal situation.

Club Over the Press

Claude Bourdet, speaking of the French government's blows against the freedom of the press and referring specifically to the case of *France-Observateur*, wrote last week in the *London Tribune*:

"The charge against us, for the article which caused the September 1955 seizure, has not yet been brought before the court and possibly never will be."

This supposition was confirmed last Saturday, not in the case of *France-Observateur* but of the Trotskyist paper *La Vérité*. A trial against the editor, Daniel Renard, which was to have taken place Saturday, was postponed until October by the president of the court who pleaded lack of time.

The charges against *La Vérité* were based on articles published in the issue of November 25, 1955 which, according to the prosecution, contained "insults and defamations against a public administration" (in this case, the police). The articles were based on a release of the Algerian National Movement (MNA) denouncing police brutality against several Algerian militants, on a quote from the weekly *L'Express* denouncing a similar case, and on a comment on the situation in the Algerian concentration camps.

Daniel Renard declared at the preliminary hearing that he would prove before the court that the facts reported in the paper were true. The prosecution is zealously trying to prove the contrary, with documents from Algerian functionaries and from Lacoste himself.

BAD CASE

But if the president of the court has refused to judge, after more than one year and a half, it shows unquestionably that he does not consider the case to be either good, or favorable to the lying thesis of the minister of Algeria.

In spite of the atmosphere of illegality and of oppression which the government has established in France, there are some honest judges left who find it repulsive to do the government's dirty work.

On this subject, it should also be mentioned that other Trotskyist militants who had charges of subversion brought against them had been sent before the military court when a civilian court, under the pressure of Minister of National Defense Bourges-Maunoury, declared itself incompetent to try their case. However, the Court of Appeals has just reversed this decision.

This ruling will create an important precedent. From now on, the cases of

Read the NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review

"threat against the security of the State" will be tried exclusively by civilian justice. This first victory does not, however, permit us to relax our vigilance in the defense of basic democratic liberties.

Soliciting the Pope

The most surprising events continue to happen under the reign of Mollet: the president of the Republic, M. Coty, has gone to bow to the pope on his visit to Rome. Since Charlemagne no French sovereign has humbled himself in this manner—only Charles VIII had been in Rome, and he had met the pope as a conqueror.

It is true that it was not possible for M. Coty to do otherwise. A treaty of 1920 stipulates that "If the President of the Republic should visit Rome, he will first call on the Quirinal [i.e., on the Italian president] and then on the Vatican, taking the Embassy to the Holy See as his point of departure."

But was it necessary for M. Coty to go to the Italian capital at all? His visit to the Quirinal had no political content: relations between France and Italy are good, and the "misunderstandings" brought about by the Suez affair are not serious enough to warrant a visit of State. In fact, M. Coty did not go to Rome to see the president of the Italian republic but to meet Pius XII.

For the last fifty years, the Catholic Church in France has been separated from the state. In spite of this separation, of the lay character of the state, and of the existence of strong anticlerical currents in the country, the Catholic Church has no reason to complain of the republican regime. It enjoys both financial and representational privileges; it has obtained recently, on the school issue, some tangible concessions. In fact, it has no demands to make and needs no bargains; it feels that the means at its disposal within the framework of French democracy are fully sufficient to defend and consolidate its positions.

The French government, on the other hand, is highly dissatisfied, and would like to obtain from the Holy See a change in policy on colonial questions.

VATICAN'S MOTIVES

For decades, colonialism has provided a good conscience for itself by encouraging the activity of Catholic missions in the colonized countries. The work of the missions in these territories cannot be underestimated, even though it was not disinterested. But for some time now, the Roman Church has been aware that colonialism cannot last forever and that it would be unwise to tie the future of the Church to a mode of exploitation condemned by history.

The present pope, Pius XII, recently stated: "The Church which has seen the birth and the growth of many nations through the centuries, cannot but follow with particular attention the accession of new peoples to political responsibilities."

This means that henceforth the doctrine of the Roman Church will impel its priests in the colonies to separate themselves from their national interests and to orient themselves increasingly toward the growing nationalist movements.

In Madagascar, the Catholic bishop, Mgr. Rolland, approved the Malagasy spokesmen who demanded independence; also in Algeria, Mgr. Duval took openly a position against Lacoste's policy and enraged Mollet by justifying the activities of the Left Catholic militants.

What is it, then, that Mollet and Pineau were trying to obtain from the Vatican? A certain control over the nomination of bishops in the colonies. It is hard to see what they hoped to offer in exchange, other than the guarantee that all the privileges of the Church would be maintained. But the pope knows very well that the government, dependent as it is on a reactionary majority in Parliament, is incapable of making the slightest move against Catholicism and its institutions.

The pope considers that the policy of the French government in Algeria can only favor his enemy No. 1, Russia and Stalinism, and he is strongly determined to maintain the freedom of action of the Church in the colonial revolution. The very Catholic M. Coty might have won paradise by bowing to the Holy See, but he did not win a political victory; the bishops in Africa will remain faithful to an opportunism which is the secret of the Church's survival, and will continue to follow the national liberation movements of the colonial peoples.

Prayer Pilgrimage to Washington:

Peaceful Day in Congress...

CHALLENGE

Minority --

(Continued from page 5)

"Unity Statement" the SP-SDF endorsed the policies of its "comrades" in France who, led by "Comrade" Guy Mollet, are engaged in genocidal slaughter of the Algerian people and a steady offensive against democratic freedoms in France itself.

The YSL Right Wing has not only stated that it wishes to unite with the SP-SDF on the basis of that organization's present politics; it has also declared that it will not attempt to gain a majority for its own political position inside of the SP-SDF. It has stated that the SP-SDF is the necessary center for a reinvigorated socialist movement in this country precisely because of its right-wing social-democratic politics.

Comrade Hal Draper has described the political perspective of the ISL-YSL right wing as "a systematic political adaptation to social democracy." This characterization is rigorously exact. The right-wingers deny that they are "capitulating"; they claim that, on the contrary, they intend to retain their political ideas to the end. But ideas merely retained in one's head, or kept on the shelf, are meaningless. Whoever is serious about his ideas will struggle to implement them and will attempt to "take over" the responsibility for carrying them out—precisely what our right-wingers have refused in advance to do!

TWO PERSPECTIVES

The YSL Right Wing has claimed that the liquidation of the YSL and the entry of its members into the YPSL would lay the basis for a broad reinvigorated socialist youth movement and would be a "center for further realignment and unification of the American left." In our opinion, the opposite is true. This proposal would be a block to the unity of socialist youth.

The conditions that give the YSL a chance to become the center for socialist youth regroupment would be totally lacking in the YPSL. The YSL is an independent youth group whose members can make their own political and organizational decisions. The YPSL would be the "youth section of the SP-SDF" under the "control of the NEC of the SP-SDF," according to the present YPSL constitution. The YSL can contain representatives of diverse political viewpoints, members of differing "adult" socialist organizations. "Membership in the YPSL shall be incompatible with membership in any rival political organization," according again to the YPSL Constitution.

Thus are counterposed the two perspectives before the YSL.

The right wing is for a regroupment whose political basis would be the politics and program of the SP-SDF. The Left Wing is for socialist unity on a broad but principled basis.

The Right Wing is for a narrow regroupment, consisting inevitably only of itself plus the few youth of the SP-SDF. The Left Wing has a perspective which could include the big majority of American socialist youth.

The Right Wing is for a youth organization that would be under the control of the SP-SDF, a youth organization in which only the position of the SP-SDF would have free and public expression. The Left Wing is for an independent socialist youth movement in which all tendencies would enjoy freedom to develop and express their views.

These are the choices before the YSL, and before all socialist youth in America.

—LEFT WING CAUCUS, YSL

By SAM TAYLOR

Washington, May 19

The Prayer Pilgrimage on civil rights was held here in order to put pressure upon Congress for the passage of civil-rights legislation. But there were no plans to send large delegations up to Capitol Hill to visit congressmen and senators. The only demonstration planned was the pilgrimage itself, none before the White House or at the Capital building.

While this huge meeting was taking place on the mall before the Lincoln Memorial, it was virtually boycotted by congressmen and senators. Only two congressmen, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell of New York City and Charles Diggs of Detroit, spoke at the meeting.

Senators Paul Douglas of Illinois and Jacob Javits of New York were also scheduled to speak. A. Philip Randolph announced at the meeting that Douglas had sent word he was unable to attend. But no reason was given why Javits did not appear.

As a normal process the elected representatives in Washington welcome visiting delegations from their home areas. Long statements are often inserted into the Congressional Record extolling obscure businessmen or country editors. White House appointments can be arranged for a wide range of visitors from Boy Scouts to foreign dignitaries.

But not to the representatives of millions of Negro people. They were welcomed nowhere. The boycott was all but official.

Leaders of the Pilgrimage tried to arrange an appointment with congressional leaders but they were rebuffed. The attempt fell through when Democratic leaders Johnson and Rayburn let it be known that the pressure of other business would make it difficult to squeeze an appointment into their tight schedules.

There were also reports that some representatives of the Jewish Labor Committee conferred with White House Assistant Maxwell Raab in an attempt to set up a White House invitation for Rev. King, Roy Wilkins and Randolph.

But it is known that the leaders of the Pilgrimage would have refused to attend such a meeting, and that they did not solicit it. The White House has refused to see Negro leaders on civil rights in the past, and the feeling was that the president should agree to meet with the Negro leaders from the "State of the Race" conference held in Washington last year.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

Needless to say, Vice-President Nixon did not send the invitation to Rev. King which he promised when the two met him in Ghana in March.

But if nothing could have been expected from the White House, something more might have been forthcoming from the liberals in Congress. Was it perhaps the pressure of important debates and committee hearings which accounted for the almost total lack of congressional support from liberals and other "friends of labor"?

A look at the Congressional Record for May 17 should dispel that notion. While there were some important hearings—for example, the House Rules Committee finished hearings on the civil-rights bill—this does not account for failure to issue any statements of support sometime during the day.

On May 17, the House of Representatives was not in session, although there were some committee meetings which are usually held in the morning. However, on the previous day Rep. Powell addressed the House for close to an hour in commemoration of the third anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision.

Not one other liberal took the floor on

civil rights or inserted into the Record any statement on civil rights. (But Rep. Howard Smith of Virginia put into the Record a resolution adopted by the Board of Arlington County, Virginia opposing the civil-rights bill.)

The Senate did meet on Friday. But no senator took the floor on civil rights.

BUSINESS AS USUAL

Senator Javits and Senator Clark of Pennsylvania inserted a lukewarm statement in the Congressional Record expressing "deep regret [that] our schedule prevents addressing the pilgrimage today."

On the Senate floor where such liberals as Neuberger and Morse of Oregon, McNamara of Michigan, Javits and O'Mahoney of Wyoming were present, various subjects did manage to hold their attention.

McNamara, for example, asking for unanimous consent, inserted into the proceedings a letter from Gov. Williams of Michigan to President Harlow Curtice of GM in answer to GM's threat to locate plants in other states because of high Michigan taxes. This is an important problem, but surely it could not have stood in the way of speeches on civil rights.

Democratic Senators Chavez of New Mexico and Neuberger, in the course of the debate on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, got into a friendly exchange as to who created a tree. Within a brief few moments they firmly agreed that it was the work of the "Creator." After resolving this issue, they went on to extol the scenic beauties of both senators' states. It is difficult to see how civil rights could be interjected into this scene of pleasant banter.

And so it went. Senator Morse inserted into the Record a long speech on the need to preserve our national forests, and Wiley of Wisconsin inserted a statement in "Celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the Milwaukee Journal's Stock Ownership Plan."

Business as usual; the meeting at the Lincoln Memorial was a million miles away.

Letter --

(Continued from page 4)

"Socialist Education," with individuals or groups which, especially since the Khrushchev speech, since the monstrous butchery in Hungary, since the events in Poland, are not able or ready to agree that the common organization is committed in an equivocal way to the democratic rights for all which I referred to—that is another thing altogether.

Because you have not made it possible to keep these two things apart and to distinguish between them, you have not made it possible for me to take the responsibility for the American Forum which membership on its National Committee implies.

Sincerely yours,

MAX SHACHTMAN

May 18, 1957

ISL FUND DRIVE

Final Report: Goal at Hand

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

The Box Score on this final report shows total contribution of \$9,771.50 or \$228.50 short of the goal in this year's drive. Committed pledges run it way over \$10,000, and we can therefore say with certainty that we have completed our 17th Annual Drive.

It is true that the drive began slowly, a pace that caused some discomfort in the early weeks. But the momentum really picked up in the last weeks and some

Majority --

(Continued from page 5)

way to propagate our views is not through the continuation of an independent organization with our program, but rather inside of a broad, democratic party which will contain a range of democratic socialist tendencies. Our disagreements will remain after unity, but they must not be allowed to divide us (and if we thought that the unity which we propose were leading toward a new split, we would abandon the perspective). For us, the decisive fact is that the American socialist movement today is weak, isolated from the mainstream of working-class life, and that it is faced with the most fundamental task of re-establishing the influence of socialism in America. And that task is common to all democratic socialists of whatever tendency; it should serve to unite them.

We see now opportunities, a new beginning. They are limited, to be sure, but if the sectarianism of the past will still divide us, if it postpones the inevitable regroupment of the democratic socialists until the actual creation of a labor party brings them together, then the loss will be great. But we are hopeful. We believe that unity is possible, that a broad, Debsian-type party is possible, and that through it, America can be brought one step closer to our goal of democratic socialism.

—NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE, YSL

of the areas really did admirably. For the Political Committee, I take this opportunity to thank the ISL branches, our sympathizers and friends, for their fine support to the drive.

Ten areas finished with percentages of 100 and over, with three additional areas almost over the mark. St. Louis, as usual, did a fine job and finished at the top of the drive. But it was Detroit and Bay Area that did a really bang-up job. In some respects they were outstanding in going beyond their heavier quotas.

A glance at the box score leaves no doubt that Los Angeles and New York will also go over the top. We have been advised by both that their pledges will certainly carry them beyond the quotas assigned to them—New York, which had the largest sum to raise in the drive, is certain that it will match Chicago's successful campaign in passing its quota of \$2000.

So we can wrap up another successful fund drive that will help our work for the coming year. Such a campaign is never easy and it certainly wasn't this year, but our successful campaign attests to our vitality, as it does, to the strength of our appeal.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

Table with 4 columns: City, Quota, Paid, %

World History—Year by Year

The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

1950-54.....\$3 per vol.

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

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Order ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.