

# LABOR ACTION

## Mao's Regime vs. The Chinese Peasantry

... page 7

### FRENCH SOCIALIST PARTY CONGRESS

... page 6

### Issues Facing the British Labor Party

... page 3

AUGUST 12, 1957

TEN CENTS

## Is the Real Issue in Congress Civil Rights or Partisan Gain?

By SAM TAYLOR

Passage by the Senate of the modified jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill left a gutted hulk of the original bill already shorn of its broader civil rights protections. It represented a set-back for all those who worked for and looked, as a minimum, toward a reasonably effective enforcement of existing civil rights.

When the Senate placed a jury trial between the right to vote and criminal contempt of court trials for those who seek to prevent the exercise of this right, it left in question whether the bill would even be workable. It compromised the moderate bill originally presented by the Eisenhower administration and overwhelmingly adopted by the House.

The original bill was limited or moderate because it did not seek to enact any extension of legal rights such as a FEPC, anti-poll tax or discrimination in housing. It only sought a means to enforce the existing legal rights, some of which have been on the books since the Civil War.

The emphasis has been on how to enforce, and thus make meaningful, only some of the rights of the Negro people. The Southerners who control the Democratic Party were determined, even in face of the unprecedented pressure, to emasculate the enforcement provisions and limit them to as narrow an area as possible. In this they succeeded.

Starting with an isolated minority, the Southerners, Dixiecrat and liberal alike, whipped a majority into being which first limited the bill to only the right to vote sections and then weakened the enforcement sections with the jury trial amendment. Their purpose, as Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina said, was to defeat the entire bill if they could and otherwise to make it "the least effective measure possible."

### WORST WHERE MOST NEEDED

They have succeeded in getting the Senate to go along with a bill which will be least effective in those areas of the South where the civil rights protection is needed the most. In states like South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana, the greatest pressure is being raised to prevent Negro voting. There it is least likely that juries will convict local and state officials who refuse to permit Negroes to vote.

In other areas where there is less resistance to Negro registration and voting, it is also more likely that juries will move to convict officials who violate the court injunctions.

The Senate bill thus provides a type of "local option." If the racists and reactionaries are strong enough and can browbeat, if not terrorize, the white Southerners and Negroes in a particular area, the chances are they will be able to avoid conviction of criminal contempt. In fact, this jury trial amendment encourages the racists to pull out all stops in their activities, since the more virulent the fever of race hatred, the better the chances of flouting the law.

The casualty in the Senate battle was

not only the civil rights of the Negro people but also the claim of the Democratic Party that it represents democracy and freedom in America. On the most important democratic issue facing the American people today—civil rights—the Democratic Party as a party stands as a roadblock. When the test came in the Senate—for or against a reasonably effective enforcement of civil rights—the Democratic Party voted 4 to 1 against.

After the vote, liberal Democratic senators have charged that the defeat was the fault of the Eisenhower administration's vacillation, and that Eisenhower did not put sufficient pressure on Senate Republicans to assure a majority against the jury trial amendment. Senator Mc-

(Turn to last page)

## SPOTLIGHT

### For the First Time

The civil rights debate in Congress brings to mind an interesting bit of American history. Back in 1865, the Negroes of North Carolina petitioned President Andrew Johnson for the right to vote. Their plea is recorded in a fascinating book (Pictorial History of the Negro in America, written by Langston Hughes and Milton Meltzer, Crown Publishers, \$5.95):

"In many respects we are poor and greatly despised by our fellowmen; but we are rich in the possession of the liberty brought us, and our wives and our little ones."

As Hughes and Meltzer point out, this was the first time since slavery was introduced in America that Negro wives "belonged" to husbands, and the little ones—children of these former slaves—belonged to their parents and not to some master.

### Along Freedom Alley

When Local 38 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers denied membership to electrician Theodore Pinkston, it started a whole series of chain reactions. Cleveland's Community Relations Board, claiming that Pinkston was barred because he was a Negro, appealed to AFL-CIO President George Meany for help. Meany, together with Gordon Freeman, IBEW president, met with officers of Local 38 and gave them until July 1st to cease its discriminatory acts. The local then gave examinations to five Negro applicants to test their craft skills. Three passed the test and

### World-Wide Demand to London Conference:

## STOP BOMB TESTS!

By GORDON HASKELL

The disarmament talks have been going on in London for over five months. Official optimism on their outcome has waxed and waned during this time like the periods of the moon. Yet the governments on both sides appear no closer to an agreement today than they have been at any time during these protracted "negotiations."

The general reason for the impending breakdown of the disarmament talks at this stage is or should be apparent to every interested observer. What animates both sides is far less a desire to begin the reduction of armaments than to bring the onus of world opinion to bear on the opponent when the conference reaches the deadlock toward which it has been proceeding from the first day. To the extent that there is any sincere desire on either side to actually begin a reduction of armaments (and we are willing to believe that both sides would gladly lighten their armament load), such a desire is decisively subordinated to a determination by both sides that if and when any plan is agreed upon, it will be a plan which favors them and puts their opponent at a disadvantage.

Thus, the great powers are not nego-

tiating disarmament; they are jockeying for military and political position. That is why the talks in London have been so prolonged, so tortuous, and the differences between them so obscure, vague, shifting, and yet ineradicable. And all this on a question which involves the very fate of our civilization, if not of the human race itself.

Throughout the world there is a rising demand that the great powers stop all nuclear bomb tests. The massiveness and universality of this demand is attested to by the recent statement on the subject issued by the World Council of Churches, which is not usually a pioneer on such issues. The demand shows every sign of increasing in scope and intensity until it becomes one of those popular movements which no government, at least no government which can in any sense be called a democracy, can resist.

### POLITICAL POTENTIAL

The Russian rulers have sensed the political potential of this demand, and have made it the central if not the only concrete point in their disarmament proposal. Thus, a government and a world movement which have been exposed and discredited by the Hungarian Revolution, seeks and begins to find a new avenue of popular prestige and acceptance.

The fact that this has become the central point in the Russian program does not in any way invalidate it. The American government has sought to counter this point by a whole series of proposals with regard to stopping nuclear weapons production, aerial and mobile ground inspection as a guarantee of mutual fulfillment of any agreement reached, and the like. To the extent that these proposals have been made public, they all seem entirely reasonable and desirable subjects for international agreement. But they become an obstacle to any step in the direction of the limitation of nuclear armaments when they are counterposed to the idea of a suspension of nuclear bomb tests.

The position of the Russian government has tremendous political appeal because it corresponds to the most ardent wishes of a growing section of mankind, including Americans. Although they have indicated what their attitude is or may be on a whole series of related issues, they have not made acceptance of their proposals on these conditions for willingness to suspend nuclear tests. "Let us agree to that," they say in effect, "and we can continue to argue and negotiate about the rest."

There is absolutely no ground in logic, politics or morality on which the American government can refuse to accept this challenge. This country claims to be way ahead in its nuclear weapons development program. If no new nuclear devices can be tested, the old ones can be pro-

were admitted into membership. Ironically, Pinkston failed the test. But he expressed pleasure that his efforts enabled three other men to win union cards.

When Horatio Alger said, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again," he must have been thinking of San Francisco unionists. Last month, after four successive failures, San Francisco labor and civic groups won passage of the first fair employment practices ordinance in the state. The new law, opposed by the California Association of Employers, makes it illegal for employers or unions to discriminate in hiring, promotion and employment benefits "because of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin or place of birth." It provides injunctions against those guilty of discriminating, and reinstatement with up to ninety days back pay for employees.

—Let's Be Human by Harry Fleischman, National Labor Service, Aug. 1957

### Will Strikes Be a Crime In Nehru's India Too?

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's government has introduced a bill in the Indian Parliament which would outlaw strikes in "essential services." If the bill is passed, strikers in such industries could get up to six months in jail and a fine of 200 rupees (\$42), or both, and persons convicted of "inciting" or "giving financial support" to an outlawed strike could be imprisoned for as much as a year and fined 1,000 rupees (\$210) or both.

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued on page 4)

CHICAGO

# Mob Attacks Negroes While Police Stand By

By D. MEIER

Chicago's tense race situation has finally burst open and while the rioting of July 28-30th has been quelled, considerable uneasiness continues to exist.

Actually the riots which hit the newspapers were a follow-up of a smaller "warning" riot a week earlier. On Sunday, July 21st, a group of Negro picnics in Calumet Park, (a park incidentally, which has been used by Negroes for some time) were attacked by a group of whites. This forerunner was hushed up and none of the Chicago papers carried any accounts of it. One week later at the same spot another group of Negro picnics was attacked by a still larger mob of whites.

The riot which began in the afternoon gathered momentum and spread for a considerable distance. The rioters moved from the park onto the highways, and began attacking automobiles with Negro drivers, especially as the drivers slowed up coming off the big expressway coming into Chicago. Cars were overturned, drivers dragged out and beaten.

The mob moved on from this pastime and over to one of Chicago's tensest racial spots—the Trumbull Park public housing project, a sore spot for many years. Here they invaded the project, entering the apartments of Negro tenants, setting fire to one, throwing out furniture and smashing everything in sight. The Negro tenants fled. Some tried to go to the homes of friendly white tenants, but most of these were too afraid to give shelter. In one family the report is that stones thrown in the windows came close to badly injuring a newborn infant. By the end of the melee several Negroes were seriously injured, although none apparently were killed.

The attitude of the police seems to have been very bad. It ranged (with few exceptions) from passivity to encouragement of the rioters. For example, witnesses at Trumbull Park indicated that Police Headquarters downtown kept informing them (when they or their friends called downtown for help) that the "situation was well in hand" and "rioting had been halted" even while the mob was howling outside their doors! Several hundred policemen apparently

were in the neighborhood at the time walling the rioters in and helping out, but making no move to come to the aid of the victims and to make any meaningful attack upon the rioters. The same attitude of turning their backs was in evidence all over the rioting section of the city. In several cases witnesses testify that the police went further and yelled out to the rioters to "git them."

The rioting continued sporadically through Tuesday. Only a handful of whites were arrested on Sunday, and the acknowledged leader of one of the little raids was merely slapped on the wrists with a \$50 fine by a city magistrate. On Monday and Tuesday a number of Negroes were arrested for carrying concealed weapons in their automobiles! In all cases they were Negroes driving to their jobs in the steel mills who understandably carried weapons to protect themselves with.

A number of leading Negroes hurried to the mayor's office on Monday to confer with him on the matter and got promises of stiffer penalties for rioters, an investigation of police mishandling and prejudice, and steps to prevent further outbreaks. While the Negro leaders expressed tentative satisfaction with the results of their visit, several indicated that the real proof of the City official's good intentions would have to wait until they saw the results of future action by the Police Department and the courts.

In the "strife town" area the racist whites were continuing to organize openly for more "protection of their homes." The area concerned is one with a long record of racial trouble, with one of the city's most reactionary congressmen, with several white supremacist groups and with a local Negro-baiting newspaper.

The city's major newspapers all expressed concern, advocated stiff penalties, etc. However, the reporting on the riots was very meager, and after the one splash over Sunday's events the papers have been almost entirely silent on the matter. And even in their reporting on Sunday's activities they were extremely vague and inadequate. None of the regular papers, for example, made mention of the pogrom in Trumbull Park, and in general very little "eyewitness" material was included. In order to get real coverage one had to read the local Negro press, the *Chicago Defender*, which gave extensive coverage.

## JIMMY HOFFA'S NEW BID FOR UNION POWER

By JACK WILSON

Nothing less than the future of labor unity is now involved in the conflict between Jimmy Hoffa, dominant figure of the Teamsters Union, and the George Meany-Walter P. Reuther leadership of the AFL-CIO.

Hoffa has not wasted a minute in his effort to place himself in a far better strategic position in this struggle that has so much importance to the labor movement.

After the bandwagon rally held for him in Chicago following his bribery charge victory, Hoffa issued a program that will increase the difficulties of his opponents to isolate and defeat him in the union movement.

Look will be strictly that of a working class labor leader, who has gone broke fighting to clear his name in court.

Of course, insiders know the reason for these changes. In order to get the presidency of the teamsters, Hoffa had to agree to share some of the power. Broadening the role and authority of the teamsters' executive board assures the boys that Hoffa won't run a one man show. Also, it is good public relations.

Since the vital records of other years have been destroyed, as for example in the teamsters unions in the Detroit area, publishing records in the future is hardly a new blessing. With the government agencies and the rest of the labor movement watching Hoffa like a hawk, playing it straight is just a matter of common sense and prudence.

Nor are the teamster union officials going to make it easy for the rest of the labor movement by simply walking out and thus taking the onus of a split. Rather, Hoffa, as he has said repeatedly, is going to resist expulsion, including a fight at the next convention of the AFL-CIO to overrule any action taken by the executive council of the parent body beforehand.

### DIFFICULT STRUGGLE

There is no gainsaying the dismay of some of his opponents in the labor movement over these new developments. The struggle will be far more difficult and complicated than conceived of beforehand. Far too many unions and union leaders in the AFL-CIO suffer from a hardening of the arteries, and the complacency of success to cope easily with the lean and hungry Hoffa and his boys. The kind of union cadres needed to beat him in organizational and political struggles aren't easily found in the comfortably situated labor leadership of the American labor movement.

Hoffa's boast that he won't use the Fifth Amendment in his public appearance before the McClelland committee is evidence of the kind of confidence he now has, and it may be that the Committee is in for quite a surprise. Even in the relations between Johnny Dio and Hoffa, proof will be enormously difficult to bring out. And, in a pinch, scapegoats or pawns can always be brought up for sacrifice.

It's entirely true, also, that at least half the McClelland committee would far prefer to get Walter Reuther on the frying pan than Hoffa. Only recently the top Republican of Michigan, Mayor Cobo of Detroit, came to a vigorous defense of Hoffa (before his freedom was won) and called Reuther the most dangerous man in America.

On the positive side of the picture, the competition between Hoffa and Reuther can have only one result: Each will strive to prove that he can deliver the goods better than the other in terms of contracts, etc. This kind of rivalry may work for the benefit of the ranks, unless only the negative features of pure power struggle dominate. Which course will emerge may be revealed in the coming months.

### Bigger Threat

Many businessmen have made a choice between the conflicting personalities and philosophies of Hoffa and Reuther, and this partly explains Hoffa's success as a teamster. He delivers. This was exemplified by the private comment of a United States Senator the other day.

"The thing about fellows like [Dave] Beck and Hoffa," he said, "is that you can make a deal with them. You can't with Reuther." This was an expressed preference for a business type of union leader, for the senator concluded by saying: "In the last analysis, Reuther is a bigger threat to our country than Hoffa."

New York Times, Aug. 4

Hoffa announced that included in his program will be acceptance of the AFL-CIO code of ethics, except for the understandably controversial section on the significance of the use of the Fifth Amendment by labor leaders. Hoffa proposed a financial reform in the practices of the teamsters union, and he gave the impression that new constitutional provisions will be included at the forthcoming teamsters convention to curb some of the arbitrary and dictatorial powers of the president's office in that union.

Last and by no means least, Hoffa announced his severance of business connections where a conflict of interest could be easily proven, and thus Hoffa seeks to drop the business man's role of which he was so proud until recently. The New

## SECURITY RISK

World War II chairman of the War Labor Board, William H. Davis, told this story at a recent conference on industrial security. Seems that able and energetic unionist, Robert Watt, who served as a labor member of the Board, came to Davis one day and offered his resignation. The F.B.I. had informed Watt that it had a dossier indicating "Communist" activity on his part. However, the Bureau refused to reveal to Watt the information it held.

Davis asked Watt to hold up his resignation for 24 hours. Meanwhile he contacted U. S. Attorney General Francis Biddle, who asked that Davis and Watt come to his office the following morning.

On Biddle's desk was the open dossier with just one document in it. Seated in the room was a young F.B.I. agent.

Biddle, long friendly to both Davis and Watt said, "It seems, Bob, that you spoke at a certain Communist-front meeting in Philadelphia." He named the organization.

"Impossible," replied Watt. "I never heard of the group."

The young F.B.I. man apologetically intervened, insisting that Mr. Watt's memory—like anyone else's—could be faulty. The F.B.I., he said, had certain proof that Watt had spoken at the meeting—and he went on to detail the time, place, and subject of Watt's talk.

As he spoke, Watt's face lighted up and he turned to the Attorney General.

"Francis," he said, "I did make that speech. Do you want to know how I came to make it? You were on the Court of Appeals at the time and I got a telegram from you saying that you were scheduled to make a speech in Philadelphia but you were all tied up. You asked me to speak in your place and I did. And this was the group! I didn't know who they were then and I don't know now."

Davis turned to Biddle, saying: "Well, Francis, I guess it's your move now."

It was. The dossier was corrected. Watt was no longer a "security risk."

Let's be Human by Harry Fleischman, National Labor Service, June 1957

### To Understand Russia & Stalinism

- Is Russia a Socialist Community? Debate between Earl Browder & Max Shachtman ..... 50
- Stalinist Apologetics: A Review of Isaac Deutscher, by Max Shachtman. In three issues of *New Internationalist*.... 75
- The New Course, & The Struggle for the New Course, by Leon Trotsky & Max Shachtman ..... 1.50
- Stalinist Russia, by Tony Cliff ..... 2.00
- Stalin, A Political Biography, by Leon Trotsky ..... 4.00
- The Revolution Betrayed, by Leon Trotsky ..... 2.50
- The Case of Leon Trotsky. Verbatim Report of Dewey Commission Hearings on the Moscow Trials ..... 4.00

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

Read the  
**NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
America's leading Marxist review

### HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

Please enter my subscription:  
 1 year at \$2.  6 months at \$1.  
 Payment enclosed.  Bill me.  
 New sub.  Renewal.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## LONDON LETTER

## Chief Issues Before the Coming Labor Party Congress:

**DISARMAMENT AND NATIONALIZATION**

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, July 27

With two months to go before the British Labor Party holds its annual conference the recently published list of resolutions submitted by local Labor Parties and affiliated trade unions reveals clearly the main political issues which currently concern the rank and file. Beyond any shadow of doubt, world peace, disarmament and—above all—the hydrogen bomb, are first priority topics.

The preliminary agenda contains 443 resolutions and 127 of them fall under the category of "Disarmament." According to officials at Labor Party's Transport House headquarters this is the greatest number of resolutions on a single subject ever submitted to a Party conference, and it compares with around 15 on similar issues presented to last year's conference.

Most of the resolutions on disarmament concentrate on nuclear weapons as the major point at issue, and the variety of formulae advanced for ending the present H-bomb arms race indicates the crossed lines of thinking on this subject within the Labor Party.

Many of the organizations submitting resolutions see the halting of the H-bomb tests as the central issue and they urge that Britain seek an international agreement through the United Nations or the "major powers" for the ending of nuclear weapon tests. Others, while still concentrating on the testing of the weapons, urge that Britain take unilateral action and cease making nuclear weapon tests in order to give "moral leadership" to the remainder of the world.

A large number of the organizations, however, realize that merely to call for an ending of tests while ignoring the basic question of the manufacture of nuclear weapons is illogical and unrealistic. Thus a large number of resolutions call for an ending of both the manufacture and testing of the weapons.

**CONFLICTING POINTS OF VIEW**

But here again two conflicting points of view are apparent. Some of the organizations merely demand that Britain seek "an international agreement" of some sort or another to end the making of H-bombs, and thus only reiterate what is already current Labor Party policy—and indeed the policy to which every political party in Britain pays lip service. The contrary point of view is clearly expressed in a resolution from Bromley Labor Party which says, "This conference pledges a future Labor Government to renounce the manufacture, testing and future use of all nuclear devices for the prosecution of war, and to destroy such devices as it may inherit." This theme, in a variety of guises, is repeated by many local Labor Parties.

Some of the organizations, in addition to stating a general policy on nuclear weapons give their idea of how opinion and tactics should be organized in order to achieve the general policy. Thus Leigh Labor Party asks for an emergency meeting of the Socialist International in order to discuss ways of mobilizing world opinion against H-bomb tests. Other local parties call for mass demonstrations against either the manufacturer or testing of nuclear weapons. Richmond Labor Party goes the whole hog and asks the National Executive of the Labor Party to organize a nation-wide campaign to force the Tory government to end the manufacture of nuclear weapons. This campaign, says the Richmond Party, should include strike action.

Several of the resolutions on disarmament make specific demands in relation to United States forces now stationed in Britain. Luton Labor Party wants the U. S. government to be instructed to remove all its nuclear weapons and aircraft from Britain, and this demand is echoed by Brighton Labor Party. Ealing Labor Party condemns "the importation of American guided missiles into Britain as an aggravation of world tension." Bolton

Labor Party, seeking to tinge its politics with armchair military strategy, declares that the development of inter-continental missiles and other guided weapons has made the stationing of U. S. forces in Britain unnecessary.

**NO STALINIST TINGE**

In spite of Russian propaganda on nuclear weapons and warfare the resolutions are remarkably free from Stalinist or fellow-travelling sentiments. Not a single local party has swallowed the bait and demanded that Britain agree to Russian proposals on nuclear warfare, and a great many of the resolutions pin the responsibility for the nuclear arms race on the "co-existing" shoulders of Britain, America and Russia without making any distinction. To Third Camp Socialists this is a most welcome sign and one which appears to indicate that events of the past twelve months or so have destroyed many of the sentimental attachments for Russia which had existed in the British Labor Party as a legacy of 1917.

This apparent awakening to the real character of Russia and its satellites is also noticeable in the resolutions grouped under the heading of "Foreign Affairs." Of the 14 resolutions in this section only one displays any Stalinoid tendencies. This is from North Paddington Labor Party and it urges the leadership of the Labor Party to "seize every opportunity and indeed initiate moves for political and general discussions with the leaders of the USSR, China and the Peoples' Democracies." It believes that such contacts would make "an appreciable contribution to the lessening of world tension."

In contrast to this attitude, with its distinct Stalinoid flavor if only in terminology, Epping Labor Party has put down a resolution with a strong Third Camp content, it reads:

"This conference recognizes that it is impossible to pursue a socialist foreign policy as long as Britain is in close military alliance with non-socialist powers. It accordingly calls upon the next Labor government to withdraw from all commitments which link her to such powers and to base the conduct of foreign affairs in future on complete independence from the anti-socialist governments of both the USSR and the U. S."

**OTHER RESOLUTIONS**

Other resolutions in this section also recognize the fact that the world today is confronted with a struggle between rival imperialisms, but they then go up a blind alley by suggesting that the interests of these rival imperialisms can in some way be reconciled. One such resolution comes from Southend East Labor Party which acknowledges that the world is divided into "opposing blocs" but then suggest the old solution of a meeting between the "heads" of the "great powers" with a view to strengthening the United Nations.

A comprehensive resolution on foreign affairs appears in the name of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. It urges, among other things, the withdrawal of foreign troops from all countries; the ending of all military pacts and groups; the immediate cessation of nuclear tests and the ultimate banning of nuclear weapons and the peaceful reunification of Germany on the basis of "a five power agreement." While this resolution has weak points it will probably feature prominently in debates at the conference because the AEU, with a voting strength of some 700,000 at the conference, can command a great deal of attention in deliberations.

Other matters of overseas policy have

been rather crowded out of the resolutions this year, primarily because of the concentration on H-bombs. Thus the tragic state of affairs in Cyprus has prompted only one resolution and the equally threatening state of affairs in South Africa has similarly drawn only a single resolution (which, incidentally, ignores the basic political issues and merely urges all members of the labor movement to refrain from purchasing South African produce).

**ALGERIA**

Another single resolution appears on the subject of Algeria. This, from Stechford Labor Party in Birmingham, asks the National Executive Committee of the British Labor Party to propose the expulsion of the French Socialist Party from the Socialist International because of its policies in connection with Algeria.

On domestic affairs the scene is dominated by some 40 resolutions on the question of public ownership of various industries. Many of these restate in simple but sharp terms the Labor Party's belief in public ownership. Such as the resolution from Norwich Labor Party which "reaffirms its belief in nationalization or public ownership of the means of production and distribution as a fundamental policy of socialism" and calls upon the future Labor Government "to inaugurate a comprehensive nationalization policy."

Other resolutions in this section list specific industries for public ownership. From Coventry Labor Party, in the center of Britain's automobile industry, comes the demand that the Party leadership draw up detailed plans for the public ownership of the motor car industry. The Amalgamated Union of Building Trades Workers calls for the transfer to public ownership of the building and building materials industry. Nationalization of the land is demanded in several resolutions, as is the nationalization of insurance companies, water supply and various sections of the engineering and chemical industries.

Another group of resolutions concerns itself with the form of public ownership, particularly the means of controlling nationalized industries. Demands are made for a consumer representation and "socialist representation" on nationalized boards. The outstanding feature of the resolutions in this category is lack of specific proposals, thus confirming that while most British socialists are aware of the need for different forms of control in order to move from nationalization to socialization, none of them yet appear to have worked this very important problem through in any detail.

All of these resolutions on nationalization and public ownership will be taken in conjunction with two policy statements

recently published by the National Executive Committee and which will be presented to the conference for ratification, rejection or amendment. These are both lengthy documents of great importance and could well determine the orientation of the Labor Party for some years to come, they will therefore be the exclusive subject for the next London Letter in order that they may get the attention they deserve.

The National Executive's plans for a scheme of National Superannuation (dealt with in a previous issue of LABOR ACTION) and general matters of pensions and other welfare matters attract a number of resolutions, most of them displaying the concern widely felt at the way rising prices have eaten into the real value of pensions, and sick and unemployment benefits in the past few years.

**ODD ASSORTMENT**

As is normal, the last few pages of the preliminary agenda are occupied with an odd assortment of resolutions which do not fit into any of the neat categories drawn up by the Standing Orders Committee. Thus three resolutions demanding that the U. S. government allow Paul Robeson to visit Britain rub shoulders with resolutions demanding the abolition of blood sports and a plea that the next Labor Government enact legislation which sets out a standard of "professional skill" for morticians—or undertakers as they are known in Britain—in the interests of hygiene!

Of the 443 resolutions but a few will reach the floor of conference after they have all been through the mincing machine of the preliminary compositing committees. But, in whatever final form they reach the floor of conference, the resolutions on the preliminary agenda show the mood and the temper of the rank and file of the Labor Party and lead one to expect that the forthcoming conference will be livelier than any for the past few years, with nuclear weapons and public ownership dominating the proceedings.

A NEW PAMPHLET, JUST PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND

Russia from  
Stalin to Khrushchev  
by

TONY CLIFF

22 pages

15 cents

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

**A U. S. SATELLITE?**

Forty per cent of Pakistan's budget is met from aid received by the country from the United States.

This confession was made during a heated exchange between Malik Feroz Khan Noon, Pakistan foreign minister, and Mian Iftikhar Din, Muslim League member of the West Pakistan Assembly. The latter had introduced a motion in the National Assembly at Karachi to censure the American ambassador to Pakistan on the grounds that he had made speeches which constituted interference in the internal affairs of the country. The following is part of a report on the debate which appeared in *Africa and Colonial World* for July 1957.

"Speaking for the Government, Malik Feroz Khan Noon accused Mian Iftikhar Din of being a Communist and said little did he know that 40 per cent of the country's budget was met from aid received from the United States.

"Mian Iftikhar Din was soon on his feet to accuse the Pakistan foreign minister of being a tool of imperialists for the last thirty years and a person who had opposed the grant of independence to India which led to the creation of independent Pakistan.

"In support of his accusation, Mian Iftikhar Din quoted an extract from a speech delivered by Malik Feroz Khan Noon at the first session of the U.N. General Assembly held at San Francisco in 1945. Malik Feroz Khan Noon was reported to have said at that session, when the question of India's independence was being discussed, that the country was sufficiently independent and nothing more needed to be done in the matter.

"Several times there were angry outbursts from members and banging of the tables with fists. In view of this angry mood of the House, the Speaker adjourned the Assembly."

# LABOR SCOPE

## Discussion: Direct Elections in Unions?

Just a brief comment on Dave Baker's discussion in the July 1 issue of **LABOR ACTION** on union elections.

He is a strong advocate of the direct election of union officers by a membership referendum rather than by the votes of local delegates at conventions. He thinks that such a direct election is a strong measure in defense of democracy.

### BOOKS AND IDEAS

#### Unionists Discuss Shorter Work-Week

**THE SHORTER WORK-WEEK.**—Public Affairs Press, \$2.50, 96 pages.

On September 11, 1956, the AFL-CIO sponsored a conference of its research workers, economists and union officers on "Shorter Hours of Work." This little book reprints five research papers prepared by union economists and reports the comments of various conference participants. An impressive fund of factual and historical information on the fight for a shorter work week is now conveniently put together.

But not all the participants a year ago seemed to feel any sense of urgency or to sense that this was the beginning of a new round in the campaign to reduce hours. Yet the very convening of the conference should indicate that there is something important in the air.

Speaking as the research director of the United Auto Workers, which keenly feels the impact of technological change, Nat Weinberg could have been pointing to what was lacking at the meeting when he said: "It seems to me that the danger that confronts us is not, as the Chamber of Commerce and those outfits would put it, of shortening the work-week faster than productivity will permit. The danger is that we will not move fast enough."

B. H.

But the very example he cites should warn us against elevating his proposal into a general principle applicable to all unions at all times.

It is true that the opposition candidate got one-third of the votes in the steel union. But Dave McDonald himself could be lifted into the presidency in the first place, even though a large section of the top union leadership resented his rise, under exactly the method of election suggested as a cover-all by Baker.

There are cases where a democratic opposition is aided by direct elections. But they can be retarded, too, under the same system. If, for example, they can rally sections of the active secondary leadership to their point of view but have not yet been able to find a candidate of national prominence known to the ranks, they can be at a disadvantage in a membership vote. The old officials have the advantage of appearing every day before the public, an opportunity denied their rivals.

Under other conditions, a national referendum permits an entrenched bureaucratic officialdom a wide leeway for pure vote manipulation. At conventions, however, the balloting usually must take place in the open before the eyes of all.

Some unions which elect their officers in national referendums are models of democracy, e.g., the International Typographical Union. But others? John L. Lewis built one of the most undemocratic machines in the whole labor movement under the system of direct elections and at critical moments had the counting of ballots in a closely contested election in his own hands. The National Maritime Union elects its officers in referendum; that didn't prevent Curran from wiping out his critics.

The UAW elects officers at a convention; it is among the most democratic of all.

Generally speaking, the method of electing officers in American unions has not had a significant effect on the status of inner democracy.

H. Benson

## SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

The bill defines "essential services" as including the telegraph, telephone and postal services, the railroads and operation and maintenance of aircraft. It also includes the handling of port cargoes, the government minting operations, and any service associated with the military establishment. But that is not all. The bill would also empower the government to declare illegal any strike that would "prejudicially affect the maintenance of any public utility service or would result in the infliction of grave hardship on the community."

The bill has been introduced in the face of a strike threat by an estimated total of 400,000 government workers. It should be born in mind by readers in the United States that in India the communications and transportation industries are mostly government owned.

### Breathless Ike

One question which continues to mystify liberals is why American foreign policy seems unable to seize and hold the political offensive against Russia, despite many golden opportunities. There has also been the problem, puzzled over by many a psychologist and sociologist, of the difficulty encountered by American soldiers in standing up to Communist propaganda, specially in the Korean war.

The following may cast some diffuse light on both problems. Even though President Eisenhower may not be a leading capitalist ideologist, there is no reason to believe that his grasp of social theory is significantly more feeble than that of the men who staff the State Department,

or even of the average GI.

In a press conference last month, Eisenhower said that during World War II he had many conversations with Zhukov.

"We tried each to explain to the other just what our two systems meant, to the individual, and I was very hard put to it when he insisted that their system appealed to the idealistic, and we completely to the materialistic, and I had a very tough time trying to defend our position."

Later in the press conference, Eisenhower added that in encountering the kind of strong belief in Communism held by Zhukov "you run against arguments that almost leave you breathless, you don't know how to meet them."

### 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

# Stop Bomb Tests — —

(Continued from page 1)

duced in large volume while the test truce continues. Thus an end to the tests cannot worsen America's position in the arms race.

The United States insists that it does not propose to impose by force the political demands it makes on the Russians. Then there is no argument for enhancing its relative military position, since its chief military spokesmen have proclaimed for some time now that America nuclear arms give her the possibility of utterly destroying Russia in the event of aggression from that source.

Is this another Russian political bluff, made with the certainty that it is safe because the American government will not call it? There is no way of finding out without calling it.

In its very judicious statement, the World Council of Churches discusses the complexity and interdependence of a whole series of issues in the field of international disarmament. They approach the problem, formally, from which the same point of view as the Western powers in the current negotiations. Since the church leaders who adopted the statement are not socialists, they do not seek to trace the roots of international conflict to the interests of the ruling classes on both sides, but rather find them in the sinfulness of man.

Despite their acceptance of the American point of view which stresses the necessity of taking a whole series of inter-related steps, the Council statement asserts: "It is important to stress all of the objectives in their interrelationship. Yet simultaneous progress toward all of them seems improbable, until there is a much greater degree of international confidence. Is it safe to advance toward one or more without the others? Choices will have to be made, and they are hard choices. Any decision involves risk. But to make no decision may be even more dangerous."

And in conclusion, after weighing and balancing some more, the Council advises the communicants of its member churches: "They can urge their governments to declare their resolve to forego tests for a trial period, in the hope that others will do the same, a new confidence be born, and foundations laid for reliable agreements."

Socialists can certainly urge no less. We have, and can have, little confidence in the ultimate realization of "reliable agreements" for disarmament or for peace among the two war blocs as they are now constituted. But we are for every step which retards or inhibits their movement toward nuclear war; for every popular demand and political struggle aimed at slowing down or reducing the weight or the arms race on the people.

## Andre Philip's "Socialism Betrayed" A MORAL JUDGEMENT ON MOLLET

**SOCIALISM TRAHI**, by Andre Philip, Plon ed., Paris, France.

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Andre Philip has always been a "character" in the French Socialist Party and forty years of party work have not mellowed him. He is well known for odd pastimes and untidy clothes which give him, at an advanced age, the mannerisms of an adolescent. He is a French Protestant without the usual coldness of his coreligionists. He is a former minister of National Economy, a talented teacher of law, a brilliant speaker; he constantly comes up with new ideas, sometimes curious ones—such as codifying by law the internal life of political parties. Also he is completely devoid of the slightest sense of organization: he is not a "machine" man, not even a party man.

He has now written a new book, hastily but brilliantly, called "Socialism Betrayed." He hoped to make its publication coincide with his expulsion from the Socialist Party, which he expected and, perhaps, hoped for, as a result of his campaign in *Le Monde* and *L'Express* against the insane policy of the Mollet government. But at the time he was only suspended for three years from all delegations. It is probable that now the General Secretariat will make up for lost time!

Before turning to current events, Andre Philip tries to clear the ground for his view of a modern socialist doctrine by defining what socialism is. His considerations are closely related to Anglo-Saxon political thinking. Philip is an idealist, a humanist, a personalist and completely alien to Marxist thought. He writes: "Socialism is a political choice on the basis of an universal moral ideal which we shall have to find elsewhere than in the analysis of social facts." It is impossible here to describe his analysis in detail. It has many weak and superficial points, but it has the merit to stimulate thinking at a time when socialism is particularly short on thinkers.

What he says about the problems of the under-developed areas will certainly attract the most attention, even if he concludes in support of his long-standing thesis on the need of building a "Little Europe," which he considers as an embryo of a socialist Europe.

But, important as they are, these points only lead up to the one main case on which the book is centered: the Mollet government has betrayed socialism and the Party, gagged or assenting, has allowed this treason to happen.

To begin with, the government has made a *mistake* on the economic level, by failing to establish a real balance-sheet of the previous administrations, and by lacking the courage to devalue the franc, a necessary measure to restore the French economy. Then, it committed an error by undertaking the insane expedition of Port Said. Finally, it committed a *crime* by continuing the "pacification" of Algeria. This treason is the present tragedy of the SP.

### NEW RICH OF POWER

How did it come about? Philip denounces the "complete absence of doctrine and of intellectual concern" in the leaders of the Party and of the government. "What is serious, is that instead of being conscious of their limitations and inadequacies, they boast of them and systematize them." This whole attitude, which Mollet calls "intellectual realism" has led to moral cynicism. What can be more damaging than Philip's judgment when he says that the "government team has conducted itself as the *nouveaux riches* of power..."

Philip denounces the vassalization of the Party by the government. Never since Pétain, he writes, has the governmental power been able to take over so completely the means of mass-communication for its propaganda. Recalling that the whole chain of events started with the capitulation of February 6, 1956 in Algiers, he judges Mollet in these terms: "It seems clear that the capitulation was due to the internal collapse of this one man."

In his conclusion, Philip suggests that French socialism could renew itself by means of a French "laborite" regroupment. We shall not discuss here the lack of seriousness of such a proposal. What matters at the moment, is to recognize in the author of "Socialism Betrayed" a free and courageous conscience who has contributed to restore a sense of dignity to French socialism.

### LABOR ACTION • 18" YEAR

August 12, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 30  
Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

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

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL  
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN  
SAM BOTTONE

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 12, 1957

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

## Petitions Against Nuclear Bomb Tests Go Well at U. of Chi.

By N. W.

Chicago, July 30

Some 1400 students and faculty members of the University of Chicago have signed a petition urgently calling upon President Eisenhower to "take vigorous steps to effect a ban on the testing of nuclear bombs." The petition, drawn up by the American Friends Service Committee for national use, was circulated on campus by the Committee To Stop All Bomb Tests.

The very fine response to the petition campaign—considering that this is the summer session—is a sign of public distress about the continued testing of nuclear bombs. Not for some time has there been a controversial issue which has received so much support on this campus. It is estimated that two out of every three who stopped to look at the petition signed it.

The American Friends Service Committee has planned a meditation and memorial march for Hiroshima Day, August 6, to be held in the Loop. The local AFSC has gotten the signatures of over 50 prominent Chicagoans on its petitions. Those who signed include Dr. David Riesman, of the Univ. of Chicago; Dr. Edward J. Sparling, President of Roosevelt Univ.; and Patrick Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO Butchers union, along with many other well known names.

In Hyde Park, the area in which the Univ. of Chicago is located, Maynard Kreuger (Independent Voters of Illinois), George Watson (AFSC) and William Davidson (president, Atomic Scientists of Chicago) spoke against the tests at a meeting which ended in the formation of a community action committee. Along with these other groups, and those forming in the area now, the U of C student committee will continue activity through the summer and fall.

## Thousands of Youth Drawn to Phony Moscow Peace Festival

By MEL STACK

The "Sixth World Youth Festival for Peace and Friendship" is now taking place in Moscow. There are 60,000 delegates from Russia and another 30,000 youth—including 160 Americans—from 102 countries attending this gathering

in the heart of the Stalinist Empire.

While this is another obvious attempt by the Russians to masquerade before the world as the champions of "Peace and Friendship," the Festival has attracted many thousands of youth from areas outside the Russian camp, and especially from the Asian countries. Although many of these young people are

also Stalinists, the fact that so many have come to Russia indicates how the Communists, by their demagogic use of socialist-sounding ideology, can still appeal politically to the uncommitted peoples of the world.

On the other hand, the U. S., being more interested in military containment than in ideological conflict, took only a negative attitude towards the Festival. It says, "we disapprove of any Americans attending this Festival," but the State Department has nothing more constructive to offer the peoples of the world. And so, with this political bankruptcy (apparent anywhere outside of the U. S.), the American government stands little chance to gain the allegiance of men in the battle for their minds.

Socialists also warn against participating in affairs such as this "World Youth Festival." The Stalinists rule, as well as support, one of the war camps, and thus regardless of their hypocritical pretensions as defenders of "freedom and peace," fundamentally they have nothing in common with either freedom or peace. To participate in their ventures would give them too much legitimacy. But these reasons for opposition to a pseudo-peace rally are diametrically opposite the reasoning of the State Department: one flows from an imperialistic power orientation based on militaristic politics, the other is the result of socialist analysis which can present a democratic alternative to the demagogy of the Stalinists.

### INTERESTING EVENTS

Some of the events at this latest "World Youth Festival" are of interest. For instance, it was reported in the N. Y. Times that some of the American youth in Moscow read excerpts from the United Nations report on the Soviet intervention in Hungary to groups of Russian youth. With the entire Communist empire convulsing in the aftermath of the events in Eastern Europe and with the slanders spread in Russia concerning these events, the facts about Hungary and Poland are bound to make a deep impression on the Russian youth and people. A democratic socialist analysis could have helped to deepen and strengthen the UN report, could have helped convince the youth present that the Russian rulers imperialistically butchered the Hungarian people, that these rulers have nothing in common with freedom or socialism.

The Russians tried to make as much capital out of the festival as possible, sometimes going to ridiculous lengths. One of the Americans present reported that he was introduced to some Russian youth by an interpreter as one of the "new comrades." He replied that he and the others were "newcomers," not "new comrades." Whereupon the Russian answered, "Oh, when in Rome, do as the Romans do."

The Americans were also paraded through the streets in order to give the impression that they were new comrades, and not simply visitors. Continuously the Russians attempted to delude the people with the impression that this was an authentic festival representing the youth of the world and that the Communists were the most ardent peace-loving people. To the extent that there was no other point of view expressed, to the extent that Eastern Europe was conveniently forgotten by delegates and observers, some youth may have fallen for the deception.

### The Young Socialist League

invites you to its

## ANNUAL NATIONAL CAMP

Enjoy a delightful week in the country!

swimming—sports—hiking—excellent food—educational program—and just plain fun

### Discussion Leaders

Mike Harrington . . . Gordon Haskell . . . Cy Jackson . . . Gerry McDermott  
Max Martin . . . George Rawick . . . Sam Taylor . . . and others.

TIME: Monday, September 2 through Sunday, September 8.

PLACE: Mountain Spring Camp, Washington, New Jersey.

RATES: From \$35.00 for the week up. Special rates for weekend. Reservations required. Five dollar deposit. For full information write Max Martin, 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor, New York 1, N. Y., or Call Watkins 4-4222.

Young Socialist League, 114 West 14th Street, New York City

Enclosed find \$.....deposit for the following number of reservations:

.....Full-Period .....Weekend only .....Other (please specify)

NAME ..... ADDRESS .....

## So-Called Youth "Forum" Appears in New York

A new venture in the socialist youth field calling itself the "Young Socialist Forum" which appeared in New York on July 30 recently turned down a Young Socialist League proposal that it turn itself into a genuine forum.

This undertaking, which has no connection with the Young Socialist League, describes itself as a "group of young people who represent different socialist views," seeking to take advantage of the regroupment ferment. In actuality, however, the "Forum" is a vehicle for the American Youth for Socialism (AYS), a New York organization of the young members and sympathizers of the Socialist Workers Party. More precisely, it is an instrument being used by the SWP in its efforts to raid and split the YSL and to create a Cannonite youth organization through the fusion of the AYS with those members of the YSL whom the SWP hopes to split from it.

The YSL was told of the existence of the "Forum" after all the arrangements had been made, in part by members of the YSL. Confronted with this fait accompli, the League's National Action Committee decided to lean over backward so as not to become responsible for stifling any real discussion. Even though the method of setting up the "Forum," and the role in particular of YSL members in it, was viewed as irresponsible and indicative of the fact that the "Forum" venture was a maneuver and not a genuine attempt at promoting

an exchange of views, the NAC delegated a sub-committee to report on the structure and composition of the "Forum," and to suggest a policy toward it.

The "Forum," as set up, was, the sub-committee found, actually the form under which cooperation between the "Left Wing Caucus" of the YSL and the American Youth for Socialism was taking place. Of the six members of the Forum Committee, three were YSL members of the "Left Wing Caucus" and two AYS members.

Both the YSL "Left Wing Caucus" and the AYS were acting "officially" in the "Forum," though the formal structure was one of "individual participation." The "Caucus" had endorsed the move; the AYS gave up its meeting night, turned over its mailing facilities, and in general made the "Forum" its central concern for the next period. This is in keeping with the attempts of the AYS and the Socialist Workers Party to split the YSL, a purpose which has been proceeding through a series of maneuvers stretching over the last several months.

The League's resident committee still did not want to completely rule out the possibility of the "Forum" becoming a center for discussion. Even though it was set up in a provocative and irresponsible manner, the committee felt that the "Forum" might still serve a function in furthering discussion among radical youth.

The YSL therefore proposed to the "Young Socialist Forum" that it live up to its name and become a real forum. Specifically, the League suggested an expansion of the political representation, the adoption of a schedule of controversial topics, the use of a discussion or symposium format. By these means, the NAC felt, the "Forum" would lose its narrow, sectarian maneuveristic character and could become a driving force in the process of socialist regroupment.

"The Forum," however, turned down the YSL proposal. It also rejected a proposal by the YSL that the "Forum" adopt a statement saying that it stood for democracy throughout the world. This body apparently is determined to keep its present form as a front for the politics and organizational tactics of the Socialist Workers Party. The members of the "Forum" sub-committee had indicated to the YSL subcommittee that they regarded the "Forum" as a joint educational venture by those feeling that they had enough of a common political basis to organize such an undertaking, and

(Turn to last page)

## REPORT FROM FRANCE:

## The Socialist Party Congress

By LUCIEN WEITZ

Paris, France

The National Congress of the Socialist Party in Toulouse has come to an end. The brightness of the old but very active Southern city did not affect the socialist delegates. From the beginning to the end, the atmosphere of the Congress remained both dull and tense, overshadowed by the Algerian drama.

To understand this Congress, it is necessary to recall the events which preceded it, especially the circumstances under which the government crisis was resolved after the fall of Guy Mollet.

It took three weeks to find a solution to an apparently unnecessary ministerial crisis: unnecessary, since the new government cannot but continue the reactionary policy of its predecessor. Guy Mollet no longer holds a cabinet post, but nonetheless bears a direct responsibility for the present government.

## THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

The National Council of the SP has decided to subordinate any participation of the party in a future government to a series of specific economic and social measures. After long negotiations with a leader of the Christian-Democratic MRP, M. Pflimlin, the party leadership declared that it had not obtained sufficient guarantees. But when the turn came for Bourges-Maunoury, the former minister of National Defense in the Guy Mollet cabinet, he was accepted without conditions.

After the parliamentary group of the SP had voted in favor of participation by a small majority, Mollet decided that the party would participate in Bourges' government. He even compelled Albert Gazier, who had voted against participation, to take the Ministry of Social Affairs for the second time. Gazier is intelligent enough to realize that none of the social reforms to which the party is committed can be carried out in the present financial and economic situation; he also knows that even if passed, these reforms would remain on paper because of an inflation that cannot be stopped. He nonetheless accepted—a tribute to the peculiar idea of party discipline which reigns in Mollet's organization.

In reality, Mollet sought to prevent a solution along Pflimlin's lines. His opposition to Pflimlin is not based on an "anti-clerical" reaction against the MRP: on the "Little Europe" issue he has collaborated with that party enough to dispel all doubts on that count. But it became known that Mr. Pflimlin was trying to find a solution to the Algerian question, and that he would oppose the return of Lacoste to Algiers. The Algerian issue dominates the question of participation: the liberal Mitterand and the socialist leader in Marseille, Gaston Defferre, deliberately stayed out of the Bourges-Maunoury government because they would not take the responsibility for

his and Lacoste's Algerian policy.

At the beginning of the crisis, it seemed as though Mollet would succeed himself. If this hasn't been the case, it is because Mollet will attempt this operation only after having demonstrated that, given the present Parliament, nobody can govern without him.

The present government is unstable and provisional; it passed Parliament by a very small number of votes—the MRP, dissatisfied with the failure of its leader, abstained.

Since its investiture, the government has confined itself to expediting matters that cannot wait. Among these, Bourges-Maunoury has managed to pass the new taxes. In order not to antagonize the employers too much, he made lesser demands on the industrial and commercial corporations than Ramadier had done, but he levied a higher tax on gasoline, which becomes the most expensive in Europe. Secondly, he is about to pass the "European" treaties of the Common Market and of Euratom. He will end the session of Parliament with a debate on Algeria.

On this occasion, he will demand the renewal of the government's "special powers"—discretionary powers which suspend the operation of ordinary law in Algeria in police matters. Bourges even

## Mao's Demons

"Demons can be wiped out only when they are let come out of the cage and poisonous weeds can be got rid of only when they are let come out of the soil... there is no harm in keeping such a handful of persons ("rightists") in a great and stable country after the broad masses have seen their errors."

—editorial in *The People's Daily*, July 12 organ of the Chinese Communist Party.

Thus we can all see the wisdom of the Chinese saying: "The flowers of spring are the poisonous weeds of summer." Also, we are reminded of the old Russian saying that in that country there is plenty of room for more than one party: one in power, and the rest in jail.

intends to demand that the special powers be extended to all natives of Algeria residing in France. This bill, which is as discriminatory as the Nürnberg laws, might be dropped since a majority in Parliament considers it as too dangerous for the future of democratic institutions. In any event, the government will try to obtain new juridical weapons to fight the Algerian nationalists in France.

## POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE

This is the political atmosphere in which the socialist congress was prepared. The minority, which had formed the "Socialist Study and Action Committee for Peace in Algeria," made a considerable propaganda effort. If nothing else, it caused the party Secretariat to demand the dissolution of the Committee on the

grounds that it conflicts with the party statutes which prohibit the organization of tendencies.

The Committee had prepared a motion signed by 81 party members, including 20 members of Parliament and personalities such as Robert Blum (son of Léon Blum) and the historians Labrousse and Charles-André Jullien. Their motion advocated negotiations on the basis of the recognition by the French government of the "national calling" of Algeria. The word "independence" was not used, even though the authors of the motion believe that independence will have to be granted and that the negotiations should concern the forms of the new state. Also, the minority holds that negotiations cannot succeed without the cooperation of the Moroccan and Tunisian governments. The expression "national calling" of Algeria seems sufficiently elastic to them to serve as a starting point for fruitful negotiations.

But this minority was not alone in opposing the Lacoste policy. The former minister of Overseas Territories, Gaston Defferre, and his Federation (Bouches-du-Rhône) also drafted a motion sharply critical of the government's Algerian policy. However, Defferre's positive proposal remained very ambiguous; his position was inspired by the political methods of Mendès-France.

## DEFERRE'S MOTION

For one thing, his motion advocated secret negotiations; for another, it set out to limit the range of negotiations to "internal autonomy," refusing to even discuss independence.

It should be remembered, however, that Mendès-France said the same thing in the early stages of negotiations with Tunisia and that, during negotiations on Indo-China in Geneva, he threatened to order a general mobilization if his conditions were not accepted. It is safe to assume that the main purpose of Defferre's limitations was to humor in the same way the chauvinist susceptibilities of the French petty-bourgeois, of which the Socialist Party is full.

At the beginning of the Congress, three outcomes were possible, depending on Defferre's attitude: he could move to his Left, and could come to an agreement with the real minority, perhaps losing the support of many hesitating elements; he could move to the Right and capitulate to Mollet after obtaining a few formal concessions; he could maintain his positions, and the party would be split three ways.

In the end, the latter situation prevailed, without preventing a victory of Mollet-Lacoste, i.e., of those who obstinately praise and continue to follow an obviously bankrupt policy. Their motion polled 2547 votes against 779 for Defferre and 498 for the Verdier-Depreux minority.

It is true that formally the text of the majority presents a more flexible position. But it still talks of "democratizing the political structures on the local and regional level" as opposed to the national level (in Algeria). It still supports "pacification," which it hypocritically differentiates from warfare pure and simple.

The result of the voting was hardly a surprise. For years now, the outcome of an SP Congress is well known in advance. The Federations naturally vote before the Congress, but the delegates have binding mandates. Moreover, three large Federations have a totalitarian conception of voting discipline, insofar as they never take into account their own minorities and always vote as a bloc with the General Secretariat: the Nord, with Augustin Laurent, the Pas-de-Calais, with Mollet, and the Haute-Vienne with Le Bail. The three of them represent about 25 per cent of all mandates, and they rule the party with the help of a few smaller federations.

Compared with last year, the relationship of forces within the party has no doubt shifted towards the Left. But the

lagging pace of this evolution is discouraging if compared with the speed of the events from which the party activists are supposed to learn. This sluggishness shows the extent to which the French Socialist Party is congenitally stagnant and deeply corrupted by a petty-bourgeois and chauvinist conformism.

## TWO SPEECHES

Two speeches at the Congress were particularly significant in this connection. The first was delivered by Max Lejeune, the present minister for the Sahara. It was outstanding for its crude and vulgar language, and relied on the favorite themes of fascism: attacks against "intellectuals who give themselves over to revolutionary fantasies"; appeals to militaristic and chauvinist feelings: "what we need is a French government supported by Frenchmen"; heavy-handed irony against the British Labor Party and Aneurin Bevan, "who would give us lessons in anti-colonialism and who would be better advised to tell us what they did in Kenya, etc. . . ."

(The following day, Bevan brought the fraternal greetings of the BLP to the Congress: in moderate terms, avoiding direct interference in French matters, but insisting on the BLP's fears of the French party's policy, and referring to the methods by which the Labor Party seeks to solve colonial problems in Britain.)

The second revealing speech was Guy Mollet's. In a falsely dispassionate tone, also dispensing irony about "tired intellectuals," the former President of the Council explained that the right of peoples to self-determination is not a socialist principle. He has discovered that Marx and Engels were not "unconditional" supporters of that right. This is true, if one refers to their writings about Poland on the one hand, about the Southern Slave on the other. But does it follow that there is a socialist right to perpetuate oppression over a people that wants to be free and could be free?

According to the pseudo-theoretician Mollet, the "liberation of individuals," not of nations, is the only socialist goal, and constitutes the basis of his Algerian policy: liberation from fear, from terrorism, from poverty, etc. The "Marxist" Guy Mollet does not stop to consider how the individual can be liberated in a capitalist society, ruled by the colonialists and their ruthless state apparatus. All these sophistries, as well as others, which were enthusiastically received by the majority of the delegates, cover criminal errors and increasingly bureaucratic methods of party administration. The party is poisoned to a point where rehabilitation seems unlikely.

## MOLLET ACCLAIMED

After his speech, Mollet was loudly acclaimed by his admirers, who sang the Internationale. Bevan was quietly sitting at the speakers' tribune, amazed by this display of stupidity and servility. It was a fine prelude to the confrontation now taking place at the Congress of the Socialist International in Vienna.

How can the minority save what remains to be saved in a prostrated and degenerated party? The SP will allow the Bourges-Maunoury experience to proceed. War will continue in Algeria. But Senator Kennedy's stand shows that the deadline is approaching. Before Fall, the turn will have to be made. Consequently, it is possible that the French Parliament will have to shorten its vacation. When it meets again, a handful of socialist representatives might yet save the party's honor.

## THE COLLECTED STORIES OF ISAAC BABEL

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

\$5.00

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

## YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

Schedule of Summer Classes in  
SOCIALIST THEORY

Tuesdays at 8:00 P.M.

Aug. 13: IMPERIALISM AND WAR  
Discussion leader: Sy Landy

Aug. 20: ECONOMICS OF CAPITALISM  
Discussion leader: Sam Taylor

August 27: THE STATE  
Discussion leader: George Rawlings

September 10: DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM vs. STALINISM  
Discussion leader: Bogdan Denitch

Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14th St., 3rd floor

Read and subscribe to  
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL  
The Marxist review for serious  
students of social issues

50 cents

\$2 a year

# The Mao Regime vs. The Chinese Peasantry

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

During the last year and a half, the events of the Twentieth Party Congress, of Poland and Hungary and now of the shakeup in the Kremlin, have shattered the myth of Russia as a "worker's paradise." But many who are confused, or even disillusioned, by their new knowledge of Stalinism in Russia have simply shifted the focus of their faith. Now China occupies the first place among those who wish to believe that socialism can be created by a tyrannical bureaucracy behind the backs of the people.

China, according to the new legend, is not making the errors of Russia. True, Mao admits that nearly a million "counter-revolutionaries" were done away with, but at least he now argues for "persuasion" and announces that the terror is at an end. In this perspective, the Chinese development is seen as less brutal, more humane than the Russian. And, above all, there is also the comparison to the past. The people, the argument goes, may not have freedom, but at least they are better off than they were under Chiang.

This new legend persists, in part, because the documentation for a thorough and careful analysis of China's development is not available. Yet the data open to us does allow for generalization: that this is one of the most tyrannical regimes in the history of man, indeed that its Stalinism is, almost of necessity, more virulent than the Russian. In this regard, the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practice (an organization founded by veterans of Hitler's camps and presided over by David Rousset) has published a wealth of valuable material on Mao's unrelenting war against the peasantry. Assembled by Leon Triviere, it should end, for once and for all, the illusion that China is embarking on a fundamentally different road from that followed by Russia under Stalin.

Briefly, the evidence indicates that, after an initial period of hesitation, the Chinese Communist Party plunged ahead on a program of forced collectivization which dwarfs the Russian transformation of the First Five Year Plan. At every step, this policy has encountered the resistance of the peasantry who, far from desiring to build Mao's "socialism," must be prodded, forced and herded into the collectives.

## From Government Sources

Most of the information which we have on this process is from official Chinese government sources. It should provide a key for understanding the recent campaign of "persuasion" announced by Mao this year. The patent hypocrisy of "a hundred flowers blooming in our garden" (Mao's formula for the new freedom of criticism which he almost immediately modified, in his Shanghai speech, by stating that it must take place under six "conditions": that no one attack the Party, divide the country, oppose "socialism," etc.), is undoubtedly a reaction, in part, to the massive resistance of the Chinese peasant to the Communist Party policy.

The peasant policy began in terms of moderation. "The Chinese peasants are individual producers," a leading government spokesman told a conference in 1951. "They admire individual agricultural property. They like the system of private property. . . . The best means of remedying this situation is the method indicated by Mao Tse-tung, which consists in incorporating the peasants into the mutual assistance teams and agricultural co-operatives." And later in 1951, Kao Kang (subsequently deposed as an enemy of the people) warned both of the peasant tendency toward capitalism and of the use of force in establishing co-operatives.

Thus, in October 1952, Li Shu-ch'eng, speaking for the government, boasted that 40 per cent of the peasants had joined some form of mutual assistance teams. By 1956, after the major turn in line, it was announced that 80 per cent of the peasants had "voluntarily" joined collectives, and that the 100 per cent figure would be reached in 1957. The contrast between the two sets of figures is the barest indication of the massiveness of the upheaval which was part of the Chinese Communists' frontal attack upon the peasants. The statements of 1951 and 1952, recognizing that peasants would not voluntarily join collectives were, of course, accurate. They make a fitting (and official, governmental) perspective in which we can assess the claim that Mao's policy was carried out with the enthusiastic support of the peasant masses.

But even the "moderate" policy of the early fifties was resisted by the peasantry. By the middle of 1953, the government proclaimed that "Between the autumn of 1952 and the spring of 1953, there occurred a deviation regarded as a blind, hasty and rash advance in the organization of agricultural cooperatives." The People's

Daily in Peking gave the clue to why the authorities were so concerned over the "blind advance": "All this is a serious discouragement to the peasants in their zeal for work, it endangers output and is having a direct influence on the ploughing campaign for the spring of 1953."

It was in this period that the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party adopted a new line (on February 15, 1953). "On the basis of present economic conditions," the document went, "the individual economic system of the peasants will necessarily continue to exist and expand for a long time to come. It is even necessary to permit the continued development of the economic system of the wealthy peasants." Thus, even the slow policy of 1951 and 1952 had proved itself incapable of containing the resistance of the peasants. And Party members were told in March of 1953 that they "must therefore explain to the peasants that their individual holdings will be safeguarded; they must strive to reawaken their enthusiasm for work and they must help all peasants without distinction, even those who refuse to join either the mutual assistance teams or the agricultural co-operatives."

## Peasants Win a Victory

The Party had bowed; the peasants had won a victory. But the situation was transient. The motive force of the change that came is clear enough: the brutal exploitation of the peasantry in order to accumulate capital for heavy industry. In the various pacts signed with Russia during 1953 and 1954, the price of Kremlin assistance to China was agricultural produce. Mao himself put the idea succinctly enough in his famous speech of July 31, 1955: ". . . socialist industrialization cannot be separated from the development of agricultural co-operatives, not be undertaken by itself. For one thing, everyone knows that in our country the production of marketable grain and of raw materials for industry is at present at a very low level, while the country's needs in this respect are increasing every year." (Emphasis in original text.)

In short, the forced industrialization of China could only be accomplished by an increase in exploitation, above all of the peasantry. The moderate policies of the early fifties had been resisted, to be sure, and the government had retreated. But following from the most fundamental dynamic of Stalinism, that of building heavy industry in a backward society, the halt could only be temporary. Stalinist "socialism" could be built in China, as in Russia, only by the repression of the most fundamental aspirations of the people. And the totalitarian state apparatus, far from being the product of a demented mind of a man like Stalin, is the necessary corollary of this kind of a development.

## Forced Collections of Grain

So it was that in late 1953, the Party turned to the inevitable weapon: governmental force. The decree which announced that "All peasants must sell their grain to the state at prices to be determined by the latter," and illegalized all private possession of grain, hoarding, etc., was passed on November 19, 1953. But it was not published until the end of February, 1954. Clearly, the Party was aware of the resistance which their new policy would inevitably meet. And just in case anyone did not understand the seriousness of the situation, the order proclaimed: "Counter-revolutionaries who sabotage the planned purchase and distribution of foodstuffs will be punished in accordance with the regulations of the People's Republic of China concerning the punishment of counter-revolutionaries," i.e., under the most severe and draconian coercive procedures available to the state.

As could easily have been predicted, the peasants resisted. By early 1954, the Party Committee in the province of Hopei had announced that it was not going ahead with any more collectivization. And yet, this new failure was only the prelude for an even more violent turn, the one which was proclaimed in Mao's speech of July, 1955. The policy of building heavy industry in China could not concern itself with the misery of the people, and after five years of failure, the government proceeded to launch an all-out war against the Chinese peasant.

In July of 1955, Mao announced the massive shift in line. The 1953 directive of the Party which assumed the continuance of peasant property and even the growth of the middle peasantry was decisively contradicted. A line of collectivization was adopted which went far beyond the Russian development of the First Five Year Plan in its fantastic tempo. So sharp was the turn, that there was obvious dissatisfaction within the Party itself. A great part of Mao's report was given over to arguing with "pessimistic" Party members who had turned their backs on the collectivization policy: "The firm policy of reducing the number of co-operatives is

inspired by alarm and fright, hesitation and indecision. . . ."

Without knowing a single report on the actual response of the peasantry to Mao's new policy, it would be possible to predict the reaction in a general way. Millions of peasants—and over four hundred million were involved—do not voluntarily give up their individual holdings, especially in a period when there is a shortage of consumer goods. The most sketchy acquaintance with Marxism and a passing familiarity with the Russian experience of the late twenties is argument enough against Mao's later claims that the transition was accomplished "voluntarily."

## Dizzy from Success Again?

(Those who are determined to maintain their illusions on this count might go back and read Stalin's "Dizzy With Success" speech of March 2, 1930, and his "Reply to Comrades on the Collective Farms" of April, 1930. Stalin, like Mao, emphasized that the Russian peasants voluntarily went into the collectives; and he too excoriates the "over-enthusiastic" Party bureaucrats who used force in the process. Of course, it is now demonstrated beyond doubt that Stalin's collectivization was met with fierce and bloody resistance.)

But fortunately, we do not have to rely on even the soundest conjecture. In November of 1955, the Canton Secretaries of the Communist Party revealed the tremendous difficulties of the Mao policy and the resistance which was being encountered. The *Nan Fang Jih Pao* of Canton editorialized, "many of us have lost our sense of direction from time to time and have become incapable of carrying on the new revolutionary and socialist struggle in country districts. . . ." By the end of 1955, the *Pekin Daily* was admitting that enormous numbers of peasants had fled to the towns. Deportations of peasants back to the countryside had numbered 550,000 in Shanghai alone between April and October 1955.

Indeed, the report in *Political Studies*, No. 9 (September, 1956) sounds like a repetition of the events of the Stalinist collectivization in Russia. This report discussed pro-private property attitudes among Party members. "This erroneous tendency expressed itself in the following manner: when the co-operatives were formed, certain members of the Communist Party began cutting down trees and slaughtering their draught cattle; others concealed their property or fought for managerial positions when the co-operatives expanded."

But more than that, we have it on the authority of Mao himself that all is not going well in the collectivization policy. In his famous speech "On Contradictions" of February, 1957, he devoted himself to the agricultural question. The brunt of his attack is against those in the Party who oppose the collectivization line. "And so, some people have stirred up a miniature typhoon around what they call the cooperatives having no superior qualities." This dispute, Mao held, would only be settled in the future as the success of the land program became apparent to all. Indeed, Mao's attitude in this speech on the collectives is much less aggressive than when he announced the change in line in 1955.

Thus, the development of Chinese Communism as documented by the Communists themselves: after a period of hesitation, of retreat, of meeting peasant resistance, when it came, with "moderate" programs, the Party embarked on a collectivization policy unparalleled in history. By their current boast, well over four hundred million peasants will have been completely collectivized in a period of three years. This policy has, of course, met great resistance, and it can be carried through only by strengthening the totalitarian apparatus of the state.

Mao says he is building "socialism" and many who are disillusioned with Russia believe him. Yet as time goes on, this faith will necessarily turn to ashes. For the dynamic in China is not in Mao's words, not in his talk about "persuasion" and his magnanimous admission that there are "contradictions" between the people and the Party. The dynamic is in what he is doing, the line of the state, and the class struggle which continues in China in sharp form.

## An Obvious Fraud

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that they are industrializing at the expense of the peasantry, that they are accumulating capital out of their surplus produce. They have put into effect the greatest campaign of collectivization in history. And they would have us believe that the peasants like it, that they voluntarily give up their plots of land, that there is an "alliance" between Party and village whereby the country people enjoy being exploited. To a Marxist, such a fantastic claim is the most obvious fraud.

But more than that. As long as this process continues, the growth of a monolithic totalitarian state—and not socialism—is made inevitable. For the strengthening of an arbitrary state power is the only way in which Mao's goals can be carried out, it is the only means which renders possible the repression of the aspirations of nearly six hundred million people. Stalinism in Russia was not the creation of a single, demented man. It was the result of a social process. And the same social process is taking place in China. Only the rhetoric is new. Those who are now disillusioned in Russia but who believe in China, they are moving inexorably toward another shattering of their faith. For they mistake totalitarianism for socialism.

# The Civil Rights Fight — —

(Continued from page 1)

Namara of Michigan accused the President of having "done civil rights more harm than good with his incomprehensible vacillation and equivocation."

While there is no need to glorify the role of the Republicans in voting overwhelmingly against the jury trial provision, the fact is that the Eisenhower administration did deliver the bulk of its votes in favor of a stronger bill. That the Republican motivation is to win away a sizable bloc of Negro votes from the Democratic Party is certainly less base than voting to weaken the bill in the interest of preserving party unity with Southern racism.

It used to be the argument of liberals in the Democratic Party that a strong civil rights bill can be passed anytime the Republicans severed their alliance with the Dixiecrats. The implication was that there were always enough Northern liberal Democratic votes around to form this new civil rights majority, and that the fault lies with the Republicans.

But the basis of this line of reasoning, whatever its validity in the past, has now been destroyed. When the test came the

The method is flexible and the political issues to which it can be applied are infinite as long as compromise, moderation or the middle of the road is held to be the political goal in sight.

The hard core of non-Southern Democratic senators who favored the weakening of voting right enforcement came from the West and Northwest. The spokesman for this group, which is part of the liberal bloc of the party, was Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming. O'Mahoney presented three different versions of a jury trial amendment, and only the last was the one centering about criminal contempt of court.

There seems to be a strong case for the belief that some kind of deal was worked out between Senator Johnson and the Westerners. The first and most widely held basis for this belief was the public power vote in the Senate last June. Five Southern Democrats voted for the Hells Canyon Dam who voted against it the previous year. In return, when the vote call to bypass Senator Eastland's Judiciary Committee and bring the House civil rights bill directly onto the Senate calendar, most Western Democrats voted to send it to the Eastland graveyard.

Another facet of this Southern-Western deal was given by James Reston of the N. Y. Times of August 3:

"On many practical matters, the South and West tend to collaborate, even though this coalition brings together men of vastly different political philosophies.

"The South needs Western votes in maintaining supports for cotton, tobacco and peanuts. The West looks to the South for protection of its wool, silver, lead, zinc, and beet sugar industries. The West helps the South on rivers and harbors legislation, and the South can be of great help to the West on irrigation projects, especially since the South dominates the chairmanships of most of the key Senate committees involved in these matters.

## SPECULATION

"What part these considerations played in the decision is a matter of speculation, but there is no doubt that these things were being talked about in the Senate cloakrooms today, especially when men discussed how it was that Lyndon Johnson managed to get so many odd fellows together."

The other means of rubber-hosing senators was through Dixiecrat control of Senate committees. This in turn played an important role in winning labor union support for the amendment. First to come to the support of the Southerners was John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers, and this reportedly swung the vote of West Virginia Republican Rivercomb.

Then came support from the railroad brotherhoods and the AFL-CIO postal workers, both of whom actively lobbied for the amendment. Earlier in the debate James Carey of the IUE opposed the jury trial provision in a letter to Senator Johnson stating that "labor will not barter

## CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

Flushed with victory, Senator Olin Johnston of S. C. addressed a meeting of the Young Democrats of North Carolina on August 3. He cited the Senate action on civil rights as a reason why the South should stay in the Democratic Party:

"When wild advocates of civil rights legislation this very year came closer than since Reconstruction days to passing legislation in the Senate that would make the South nothing better than a puppet state ruled by an iron-fisted Attorney General, it was not the Republican Party that helped to water the bill down into a simple right-to-vote bill. It was the Democratic Party leadership from the West, some from the North and some from the Eastern states that joined the Southern ranks. Quite frankly, the South alone would have been beaten to death on this issue without help."

The only question which remains is whether labor and the Negro people ought to stay in the same party which Johnston and Eastland find good enough for their purposes.

away effective protection of the right of a Negro to register and vote in return for the very dubious advantage" offered it.

How the Southerners cashed in on their control of key committees is pointed out by William Shannon in the N. Y. Post of August 2:

"The railroad brotherhoods are interested in a bill which would exempt the

## The South—Western Deal

The Southern-Western deal over public power produced a sizable bloc of Western Democratic senators for the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill. Its effect upon a bloc of mid-West Republicans provided the additional votes needed to eliminate Section III and to emasculate the right to vote enforcement section. The following account of the Dixiecrat maneuver appeared in the U. S. News and World Report of August 2:

"In the Senate on July 24, a group of Republicans from the West and New England joined Southern Democrats to defeat, 52 to 38, a plan to use federal power to police race relations in the South.

"Why this break with the White House by 18 Republican senators?"

"The answer, some senators point out, is clear: There was threat of a breakup of the so-called 'conservative coalition' in the Senate.

"If 'conservative' Republicans of the North insisted upon forcing the 'conservative' Democrats of the South to accept federal policing of all race relations in the South, then they must face the consequences.

"Southern senators put the bill for a Hells Canyon dam through the Senate. They threatened to give support to other so-called 'radical' bills that Northern 'conservatives' opposed. Two could play at that game. A number of Republican senators got the point and a drastic civil-rights bill was modified."

accrued portion of their retirement fund from federal taxation. Did Johnson offer them his assistance with this bill?

"The postal workers want a federal pay increase. Johnson's goodwill could be decisive.

"Moreover, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is headed by Olin Johnson of S. C. The railroad pension bill is in the Labor Committee of which Lester Hill of Alabama is chairman."

It is certain that the Senate will pass the amended bill. The question is what happens when the bill has to go to conference with the House's stronger bill; and then whether the president will veto it. Of all the considerations which enter into deciding one policy or another, one will be decisive: which tactic will best enable either party to retain or capture the Negro vote. Of minor importance will be

the simple justice and rights of the Negro people.

The big question hinges around the jury trial amendment. During the course of the debate, the liberal Western democrats justified their position by arguing that no person should be subjected to criminal prosecution or charges without a jury trial. The difference between criminal and civil contempt is that a criminal contempt charge attempts to punish someone for violating a court injunction, while civil contempt merely attempts to enforce the court's decision. The line is tenuous and it is up to the judge to decide when the line has been crossed in violating an injunction.

Therefore the amendment was written in such a way as to provide for jury trial in all criminal contempt cases in federal court, including the Taft-Hartley law and anti-trust cases, 28 laws in all where the tradition has been not to have jury trials.

Now there is talk of compromise on the jury trial provision by eliminating it from all other laws but that applying to voting rights. This is the cynical deal now being hatched with the House conferees by both the Republicans and Democrats.

At the same time there is talk by some of the liberals who refused to compromise on the amendment that it is better now to take half a loaf rather than no civil rights bill at all. In other words, they are ready to press for the emasculated Senate bill as against the stronger House version.

Senator Humphrey seems to have taken the lead in this new form of the compromise with racism. There is no reason why the large Senate minority has to supinely accept the present bill. The interest of the Democrats is to avoid a filibuster, at almost all costs, in the interest of preserving party harmony. But the question is: unity for what purpose; and who pays the cost?

## RACISTS ON DEFENSIVE

There is no doubt but that the Southern racists are on the defensive. They have conceded more ground in merely accepting some form of a civil rights bill, without a filibuster, than would have been expected several months ago. But it is a weak bill. Senator Russell of Georgia, leader of the Dixiecrats has said that "this bill is not going to work any hardship on the people of Georgia."

Once again it is the Republicans who are pressing the issue and talking about a possible veto of a meaningless bill, while it is the Democrats who have the gleam of compromise in their eyes. Liberal Democrats are concerned that a filibuster would sharpen the differences inside of the party and allow the Republicans to make more political capital than they already have out of the issue. But the one way to guarantee the greatest possible Republican gain would be for the liberals to accept in advance half a loaf or a few crumbs when a determined fight could bring the full loaf within reach.

## Dept. of Half-Truths

From the department of half-truths comes this bit from the August issue of the *Democrat Digest*, official publication of the Democratic Party's National Committee.

"No one pretended that the Democrats were united behind a legislative program on civil rights—least of all the Democrats in Congress. But the Democratically-controlled Senate had voted to place the bill directly on the Senate calendar without Committee hearing."

However, the record of this "Democratically-controlled" Congress does little to support the sly implication that it is Democratic congressmen who have been straining at the leash in their determination to write a strong civil rights law.

On the House bill, the Democrats voted 118 to 107 for the bill, while the Republicans 168 to 19. A majority (113 to 112) of Democrats voted to include a jury trial amendment, while the Republicans voted against it 139 to 45.

In the Senate, the record is even less distinguished. On placing the bill directly on the Senate calendar, Democrats vote against by-passing the Eastland committee 34 to 11. Democrats supported striking out Part Three which would have allowed the proposed injunctive power to be used for school integration 34 to 13. On the jury trial amendment, the vote was 39 to 9.

Democratic votes were not there. The majority of the so-called Northern and Western liberals voted with the Southern racists.

Eisenhower's timidity and vacillation, and the Presidential ambitions of Nixon and Knowland cannot obscure the fact that the Democratic Party is on record as the party of racism and that the liberals stand as an isolated and compromised minority in Congress. Nor can it obscure the fact that the acknowledged liberal leadership outside of Congress — Adlai Stevenson, Harry Truman and Eleanor Roosevelt—did not once raise their voices or seek to intervene in the interests of a stronger bill; nor that Dean Acheson played an important role in writing the jury trial amendment.

The reasoning of those liberal Democrats, who have announced in advance that they are willing to accept the emasculated Senate bill as against the stronger House one, is the unhappy adjunct of the crackpot realism which is ready to make any compromise or "lesser evil" into a positive good, if not the desirable end itself.

The logic goes something like this: Nothing would be better than a strong civil rights bill.

A weak compromise is better than nothing.

Therefore a weak compromise is better than a strong civil rights bill.

# Youth "Forum" — —

(Continued from page 1)

that they felt that it constituted a step towards the kind of "regroupment" they favored. The "Forum" refused to change in regard to these aspects.

It is yet another example of the fact that the SWP considers the current regroupment discussion as the pretext for raids and splits. Not too long ago, the defection of one member of the SP-SDF to the SWP was carried in headlines in the *Militant*. And now, the same game is being played with the YSL. Through these tactics, the SWP has undeniably won over two or three new members; it may stand to win ten or twenty in the course of time. This is the SWP's conception of "socialist regroupment."

One further item which should be noted by Challenge readers is the apparent use of the New York YSL mailing list by the "Forum." Friends of the YSL whose names are not on any other mailing list have received notices in the mail, often to their great personal embarrassment. How the list came into the hands of the "Forum"

has not yet been determined.

Thus, the "Forum" is a phony set-up seeking to cash in on regroupment, but actually representing the efforts of one tendency, the SWP, to raid, wreck and split other groups. The YSL tried, as well as it could, to get the "Forum" to become a genuine center for discussion, but apparently the politics of raiding don't allow for that.

The YSL therefore must announce that it has no connection with the "Forum" and that no member of the YSL who is participating in it does so in his capacity as a YSL member, or in any way represents the YSL. The Young Socialist League regrets particularly the complicity of some members of the YSL in these maneuvers of the SWP. Those members of the YSL "Left Wing Caucus" who are acting as the collaborators of the SWP in these various maneuvers are bringing discredit upon themselves, upon their mentors of the SWP, and—what is really regrettable—are hurting the cause of socialism.