

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Productive White Collar Jobs

CHICAGO.

Editor, Daily Worker:

Your recent news reports and columns on the planned AFL-CIO drive to organize white-collar workers suggest a few comments.

I think this project of AFL-CIO is a most worthwhile and important one. We all know white-collar workers need organization; and in the face of big industry, getting ever bigger, labor needs the white-collar worker both for greater strength and unity in dealing with the employers but also in the political field where one big area of activity of the big business politicians is among the office workers, technicians and similar groups.

So I don't feel this effort in the white-collar field would be disparaged or contrasted unfavorably with the need to organize the South and to complete organization of basic industry. It is not necessary to set up any one of these objectives of labor against any other. The efforts in the white collar field would be welcomed by all workers and their friends, while all encouragement and support should be given also for organizing the South.

The other point I would mention at the moment is one that needs some consideration and study. Your reports allude to, and quote labor leaders as referring to, the great growth in employment of "unproductive" white-collar workers as against the decline in numbers of the manual or factory workers. Is it exactly accurate to state that the growth in white-collar jobs is only an increase in "non-productive" or "unproductive" workers?

One of the "new" facts of the American economy is, I believe, the growth in numbers of "productive" white-collar workers. This has to do with the growth in size of industry and the increase of automation and office mechanization. This letter is not intended to present a study of that big question, but just to call attention to it.

There has been a great increase in all kinds of jobs which may be "white-collar" but are quite directly related to production and transportation. In steel, auto, plastics, textiles, rail, trucking and air transport, just look around the plants and offices, look at job descriptions and payroll schedules, and you will note the number of "inventory clerks," production scheduling clerks, office machine operators and technicians, laboratory workers, and of course, engineers and similar workers.

To judge whether a worker is "productive," I suggest two questions: What is the industry?

What is the workers' relation to production? Probably a good many, perhaps the majority, of white-collar workers in such fields as banking, insurance, advertising, etc., are ruled out as "productive" workers because of the nature of the industry.

On the other hand, in manufacturing and transportation, just because a worker does not work at a machine in the factory or on the assembly line does not make him—or her—non-productive.

I tell you why I think this is not an academic matter. In the first place, among other difficulties that arise in organizing white-collar workers is the feeling—instinctive and genuine enough in some cases—among many white-collar workers that they are not productive and therefore have little strength against the boss.

Of course, all white-collar workers, like other workers, do have strength against the boss when united in a good union—but many will be able to see that more readily when, in those cases where it applies, they can be helped to see they are "productive."

In other words, the "productive" white-collar workers can be among the readiest to organize and help show the way to other groups. (Again not at all to imply that the "non-productive" workers do not need organization or will not respond to it.)

Furthermore, one obstacle to the organization of white-collar workers is the feeling among some manual workers and labor leaders that white-collar workers are "non-productive" and thus should be dismissed lightly or even regarded somewhat contemptuously. This does not spur on the labor movement to organize in the white-collar field, nor does it encourage office workers and technicians when they come across it. Among other things, appreciation of the "productive" work of many white-collar jobs can help to change this attitude.

—A Union Member.

Policy Statement Of New York C.P.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I should like to acquaint your readers with the following policy statement adopted by the New York State Committee of the Communist Party on Jan. 17, 1957:

At the last meeting of the State Committee held Dec. 8, action was taken on two statements referred to as the majority and minority positions of this body. These statements were published and circularized in the Party and are part of the record of discussion in New York.

Subsequent to this meeting of the State Committee, the National Committee, at its sessions

on Dec. 17-19, adopted a resolution on unity and several amendments to the Draft Resolution, including the amendment on change of name and form. These documents were published in the Daily Worker of Dec. 24.

The New York members of the National Committee voted for the resolution and the amendments in recognition of the deep desire of the membership to unite around the main direction of Party policy.

This position was facilitated by the proposal of the National Committee on the amendment on name and form to systematically explore further changes without a continuation after the convention of protracted debate and discussion in the ranks of the Party, and that the organized discussion on this question in Party ranks will take place when the incoming National Committee submits its report to the membership for discussion and action.

As our convention discussion is drawing to a close, our aim should be to establish sufficient agreement on fundamental questions of principle and policy which will enable us to effectively participate in the struggles of the American people. The recent attempts of world imperialist forces, particularly our own American reactionary warmakers to perpetuate colonialism and the threat of atomic war, makes it imperative that we speedily reenter the people's movement to help secure world peace, democratic rights, economic welfare and Socialism.

Accordingly, the State Committee goes on record in support of the main line of the Draft Resolution, the statement on unity and the amendments as proposed by the National Committee in its sessions held Dec. 17-19, 1956.

The above statement was adopted with following vote: 20 for, 2 against, 2 abstentions

George Blake Charney,
Chairman, State Committee,
New York Communist Party

Says Poles Relied on Workers

Editor, Daily Worker:

An old friend of mine, Mike D., writes an article in the Discussion Bulletin of the C.P. which distorts, unwittingly I trust, something I wrote in the Daily Worker Dec. 4. Since it was the final issue of the Bulletin, I'm replying in these columns.

Mike says that in "contrasting the Polish and Hungarian situations, Comrade Clark implies that the difference in the outcome of the two lies primarily in one answer—the Poles were able to stop military interference and the Hungarians were not. Says

Clark, explaining the difference, 'And that they (the Poles) moved energetically and in time to prevent the intervention of Soviet troops commanded by Marshal Rokossovsky.'

The reason the sentences quoted by Mike starts with an "And" is that the previous sentence is actually the one that gives my view of the primary reason for the difference between the Polish and Hungarian events. I wrote:

"Another question Dennis left unanswered is why the Polish workers were so successful in defeating reaction and fascism as contrasted with Hungary. Was it not that the Polish Communists placed reliance on their own workers? And that they moved energetically, and in time, to prevent the intervention of Soviet troops commanded by Marshal Rokossovsky? Was it not this type of reliance on their working class which successfully routed the reactionaries and enabled the Polish Communists to win Poland for friendship with the Soviet Union on the basis of a free and equal relationship?"

The whole point of my article was that the Poles were successful in defeating their own reactionaries because they placed reliance on their own working class, not on Soviet troops.

Mike also asks where I got my facts about Soviet troops in Poland, and without waiting for an answer he concludes I got them from the N. Y. Times. Actually I got them from the telephone report from the London Daily Worker, published in our paper Oct. 22. This was an eye-witness account by their Warsaw correspondent, Gordon Cruikshank. That report tells how the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, at its 8th plenum, reproved the Defense Ministry (then headed by Rokossovsky) for moving troops around during the meeting. The Central Committee ordered this to stop and appointed a commission to investigate the matter. Rokossovsky was subsequently replaced as defense minister and now he's back in the Soviet Union.

Mike may differ with my belief that the key to defeating fascists and reactionaries is action by the workers of one's own country, whether in Poland, Hungary or the U. S. But he should at least argue with my views as I state them, even if he has to quote two sentences, not one.

JOSEPH CLARK

Jessica Smith's Article on Hungary

Editor, Daily Worker:

Are friends of socialism deemed too immature to see and weigh the full truth about Hungary?

In the article in the Worker of Jan. 6 entitled "French, Russian

Authors Exchange Opposing Views on Hungary Events," it was startling to note how the lengthy reply of the Soviet writers simply obliterated from history the fact that Soviet troops did fire in connection with the first demonstration. Here is their complete reference to the Oct. 23 demonstration: "When the Hungarian people presented their demands to their leaders, this was received with sympathy in our country." The shooting is magically gone.

Almost the same miracle on the same event is performed by Review article (and pamphlet) view article (and pamphlet) "Hungary in Travail." In a lengthy article well documented from the N. Y. Times and other sources when it suits her premises, this is all she provides on the role of the Soviet troops in the first demonstration. "Martial law was proclaimed, and Soviet troops nearby called in to help." That's all. Not a shot, so far as the reader can tell.

In building up the case for the second intervention against the Nagy government, Miss Smith supplies the following sequences: "On Nov. 1, British and French troops invaded Egypt. And at just this point Imre Nagy took the hostile action of unilaterally denouncing the Warsaw Pact, called on the United Nations to intervene to protect Hungary's neutrality."

The implication is that Nagy's actions were a thunderbolt out of nowhere, or worse, that they were timed with the British and French invasion as part of some overall imperialist plot.

However, the N. Y. Times of Friday, Nov. 2 (two days before the Soviet troops openly intervened the second time) was headlined: "Soviet Tanks Again Ring Budapest; Nagy in Appeal to UN," and the subheading "Nagy Quits Warsaw Pact." So, whether his action was right or wrong, hostile or friendly, it seems it was not made in vacuum, but after the Russians started moving into position to open fire!

The MacCormac story that day from Budapest (unquoted in Miss Smith's apparently chronological pamphlet, though MacCormac is quoted on her things) began, "Two Soviet tank divisions were reported advancing on Budapest this morning."

A great deal of prominence is given the name of one Josef Dudas in Miss Smith's pamphlet, in building up a case that fascism was taking over the government. Miss Smith simply omits to mention that the Nagy government clapped this fascist Dudas in jail, which is quite an omission!

Regardless of one's views and interpretations of the Hungarian events, tailoring facts to fit a certain viewpoint is an insult to those earnestly seeking answers.

M. S.