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Three Wins Boost British Labor’s Drive

Ghana: On This Continent a New Nation

Take a Hard Look at South’s “Ghettos” Racists

by Sam Tafel

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

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

As Southern legislators begin their sessions this year, nearly all of them will be concerned with plugging the holes in their systems of segregated schools by resorting, where not outlawed, the gerrymandering of districts for the Advancement of Colored People.

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

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

The former is roughly the approach of the White Citizens Councils and the more radically racist groups who want to build a movement committed to the defense of all Jim Crow institutions.

The latter are the moderates, the more “liberal” and far-sighted groups who are trying to proceed head-on clash with the federal government as the present time.

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

INDUSTRIALISTS’ VIEW

At a January meeting of the Committee of 100, an organization formed several years ago to induce Northern industries to establish plants in the Birmingham (Alabama) area, this problem was taken up.

William F. Engel, former head of the committee, added up the costs from a businessman’s point of view of what he called “hoodlumism” in the recent bombings in Birmingham and in Montgomery, 100 miles away.

“Birmingham is particularly more firing in our defense and strike them squarely,” he said.

The hoodlumism that has occurred in Birmingham is in no way isolated; in recent months it has hit the headlines all over the country. This unfortuatable public
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The Racket Probe: A Threat to Unions?

by Ben Hall

In just a few days, Senate hearings have turned up a staggering mess of corruption in unions whose officials were linked up with enterprising underworld characters. And the sessions are to go on for at least a year; some say two years; others think they may last indefinitely. The vast majority of unions are honestly run and it is going to be difficult to imagine if anything comes to the labor movement of a continuing phase of crime enacted before the eyes of the nation.

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

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

What is more ominous is the possibility that anti-union politicians will be emboldened by the newly charged atmosphere to press for sterner laws restricting the freedom and economic and political rights and activities of labor organizations.

In the N.Y. Times, labor reporter Joseph Lefstein writes: “Labor’s political drive may be blunted by the Senate investigation that anti-union forces in the legislatures and in Congress will find it easier to put repressive labor laws on the books. At least labor will find it harder to enact its own program. And in such a climate, organizing, especially among the unorganized, will be more difficult than it has been in years.”

PROTEST?

With this in mind, some commentators maintain that the unions should have cooperated more closely against any government investigation, taking their stand against any state interference in unions in general and denouncing the current investigation in particular in a more open way. But it is hard to see how they could have succeded.

The register of crookedness inevitably unfolded, it would have been too easy for every union to appear in any way to endorse a suppression that might result in a call for the dirty tricks开局.

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

What DW’s Clark Said in Columbia Debate

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

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

The speakers: Joseph Clark of the Daily Worker, and Gordon Haskell of LABOR ACTION. The tone was strictly within the confines of political debate (Clark insisted on referring to Haskell as "my colleague")

In the course of the debate, and in answer to questions and remarks by his opponent and from the floor, Clark asserted the following:

The establishment of one-party regime in Eastern Europe "set the clock back" there... He is opposed to one-party regime, not only in those countries but in Russia also. . . . In his opinion, the Soviet forces had no right to interfere in Hungary. . . . He, for one, will continue to "fight for democracy" in Hungary in his paper and in his party.

Although he refused to use the term "imperialism" to describe Russia's actions in Hungary, he described it as the imposition of a will of a great power on a small one by force, as the suppression of the national and democratic aspirations of the people of this small country. He described the Russian invasion in Hungary as a "slavitudinal-type" action, and attributed it to the fact that "vestiges" of Stalinism still exist in Russia and express themselves in Russian policy.

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

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

PREDICTIONS

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

He predicted flatly that by the summer of 1958 there will be another "Genex Conference" at which the United States and Russia will either reach agreement over the unification of Germany and the joint guarantee of "security" in Europe, or will go far toward such an agreement.

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

Though both speakers agreed that the united front in Eastern Europe should not have intervened in Hungary with its armed forces, Clark described Haskell's assertion that socialists and especially the German Social Democrats should have encouraged the Poles and East Germans to support the Hungarian revolution with the purpose in mind of overthrowing the Communist regime in Russia itself as "immoderate" and a policy which would have brought World War III.

When asked why a man with a views such as his should sit down and work out the adoption of his party, Clark stated that he intended to study, write and work for the adoption by the party.

Haskell asked him when, since the convention of the Communist Party at which "compromise" on Hungary had been reached between the Gaits and Tari factions, he had given?more present-ice attacking the Kadar regime and the Russian suppression of democracy in Hungary.
Family Farms Squeezed Out

(Continued from page 31) Scanty fight is always put up in Congress to continue the exemption of farm labor from the social security law. Socialists are often asked what they would "do about the farmers" who, even in the opinion of the NBF, have been one of the chief factors in strengthening America's "private enterprise" economy. One of the charges made against the Independent Progressives, besides its status as a basis of including it in the "conservat- ives" category, is that it is the agent of the propertied interests of farmers. It would seem to the Department of Agriculture, always interested in doing something about people who are actually "exploiting" the rest of us, that every year, right now, they should go after the Independent Progressives, leaving them out and taking over their land. The question of these happens to belong to the ISL.

The fact is the matter of which is this in the Bulletin is that those who work on the farms, as well as others, is being partly "sold" for the social security law. There is no single sector of agriculture which is now corporate-owned and is worked by large firms and lends itself to socialization like any other industry. None of the central questions which do present themselves in the family farm sector of agriculture arises in that sector. Farming is no more a "way of life" to the 35 cent-an-