

LABOR ACTION

WHITHER THE GOMULKA REGIME

... page 3

The Greek Labor Movement

**A Heroic Working Class
On the Eve of a New Day**

... page 1

September 9, 1957



TEN CENTS

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL:

Liberals Snatched Defeat From the Jaws of Victory

The denouement of the civil rights issue in Congress took place with the one man filibuster waged by Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina.

It was common knowledge in Washington that the Southern Democrats had decided not to attempt to filibuster or to put up a last ditch fight to prevent the enactment of any bill.

This decision has been attributed to the genius of the Democratic leader, Lyndon Johnson, who prevailed upon his Southern colleagues to be "reasonable." Thereupon he went to the Northern Democrats and argued for reasonableness on their part.

But the picture of Senator Johnson restraining the fireaters in tattered Confederate uniforms is one of the myths out of which Presidential candidacies are furthered.

The Dixiecrats did not filibuster because they suddenly became reasonable men or enamoured with the spirit of compromise and the give and take which is alleged to be the essence of democratic government.

Senators Russell, Eastland and Talmadge accepted a compromise and adopted a posture of reasonableness because they could not help themselves. The compromise in narrowing down the civil rights bill to only an area of questionably enforceable voting rights was not a defeat for the Dixiecrats. In the situation in Congress it represented a victory.

The reaction of Senator Russell to Thurmond's filibuster and the attempt of Representative Smith to tie up the bill in the House Rules Committee, justifies this opinion.

Senator Thurmond's filibuster put the other Southern Democrats on the spot. It made it appear as if they were not militantly fighting to preserve the "Southern way of life" and segregation. Therefore Russell had to publicly justify the non-filibuster tactic.

Russell criticized Thurmond and Smith for jeopardizing the Southern position by their obstructionist antics.

"If I had undertaken a filibuster for personal political aggrandizement, I would have forever reproached myself for being guilty of a form of treason against the people of the South."

The reason Russell, the real leader of

(Continued on page 2)

Arms Talks Draw to Close As Russians Unveil Missile

By GORDON HASKELL

The London disarmament talks appear to be drawing to an end, not with some limited cautious half-step toward arms reduction, but rather with the announcement that one of the contending parties has taken a long step ahead of its opponents in the armaments race. This is so strikingly ironic that it may be deeply instructive to all who have looked with optimism for concrete results from these discussions. Above all, it would appear that this conclusion of the six-month's discussions, points up the futility of basing a foreign policy, let alone a "disarmament policy" on an attempt to achieve or maintain military superiority.

Ever since the collapse of the wartime alliance between Russia and the capitalist powers of the West, the American government has based its foreign policy on an attempt to attain, or maintain military equality or superiority with Russia. This was the idea of the Truman Doctrine, of the rearmament aspects of the Marshall Plan, and above all of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization. This was at the basis of the building of American air bases around the periphery of Russia, and of the doctrine of "massive retaliation," "negotiating from strength," and the like. In large part, it was this policy which has dictated, or at least been used

to justify, the economic support the American government has given the Franco dictatorship in Spain.

With the post-Korean and post-Stalin lull in the cold war, the American government has been visibly casting around, at least from time to time, for a new foundation to its policies. All kinds of groups in this country have come forth with proposals, usually focusing

(Turn to last page)

Auto Workers Challenge Monopoly Power

UAW Leads Cause of Whole People In Fight Against Profit Inflation

By H. W. BENSON

Monopoly prices and inflation have become great social issues upon which people are asked to take a stand. This was the instant effect of the United Automobile Workers' call for a reduction in car prices. Some may imagine that the charges and counter-charges packed into letters and statements exchanged by the union and the companies represent only petty maneuvers designed to serve each side in preparation for the opening of 1958 auto union negotiations. That would be a serious mistake. It hardly matters what the secret motives, if any, of the opposing parties might be; in any case, no one can dig them out. The fact is that a history-making conflict over control of prices has begun, foreshadowed by the General Motors strike of 1945-46 which tentatively raised the issues before they were shelved for a decade.

There are a dozen side issues; related aspects which remain obscure; misgivings that must arise out of the suddenness of the UAW proposal. But what remains uppermost is this: the union movement comes forward as the advocate of the people against monopoly. Labor, represented again by the United Auto Workers, embarks upon a social battle with the capitalist class, in the person of the auto companies, for the minds of the people. And the union has already hit hard at the prestige and morale of big business.

In his letter to the Big Three auto manufacturers on August 16, Reuther made three basic proposals:

1. The auto companies to cut 1958 car prices by \$100.
2. In return, the UAW would take this cut into account in mapping out its 1958 contract demands. It would agree to formulate its demands,

(Continued on page 4)

Companies View Reuther Proposal As Clever Move in '58 Negotiations

By JACK WILSON

Detroit

The sound and fury emanating from this auto center in recent weeks was a prelude to the big events as the United Auto Workers and the Big Three square off for contract negotiations in May 1958.

From Walter P. Reuther's office came a proposal that auto companies cut prices \$100 a car on their 1958 models and that in return the UAW take this action into account in presenting its demands.

Fury came from General Motors, Ford and Chrysler when they realized that Reuther had again out-slickered them in public relations and had won the first skirmish in what will become a major war in 1958.

"Walter is just making a big grandstand play now to soften the blow when he puts the slug on us next spring." This off the record statement of a top auto industry official is a far better clue to the industry's reaction than the fancy public relations department releases that were issued by General Motors, Chrysler and Ford.

What the UAW tried to do—and it succeeded—was to come up with a fool-proof tactical maneuver that would give it some advantage in forthcoming negotiations, especially since the political cli-

mate in this country isn't exactly favorable to labor at the moment. Far too many people believe, for example, that inflation is caused primarily by increasing labor cost.

The fish hook in Reuther's proposal was its second feature. If the UAW and the companies couldn't agree on a bargaining package, an impartial three man committee would be set up to review the bargaining proposals of both sides.

An industry spokesman put it this way: "Any way you look at it the panel would be stacked in Reuther's favor. Reuther proposes that industry pick one member and the union the second. The third person would be picked jointly."

"Now what about the third person who holds the balance of power. He would either come from the government or

(Continued on page 3)

Two Men Represent Different Kinds of Unionism

Walter Reuther and James Hoffa

By JACK WILSON

Detroit

By a strange coincidence Detroit's three daily papers were shut down during the week that Jimmy Hoffa appeared before the McClellan committee when the Teamsters union here honored a picket line put up by a split off group from the International Typographical Union. The strike was settled Friday night by Hoffa upon his return from Washington. Purely coincidental, of course. Meanwhile, during the fateful week Detroit got very little of the hearings in Washington. Glimpses on TV, brief radio reports: TV films beginning at 11:30 p.m. when most working people are already in bed. However it didn't help Hoffa; when the daily newspapers resumed publication this week end, all the highlights were printed, all the sordid facts became known. Hoffa's good press had disappeared. The publishers are doubtless irritated at him for backing a wild-cat strike.

For most Detroit labor leaders, the remarkable feature of the hearings is how easy Jimmy got off. "He's a smart guy, and he's still got drag" is a common reaction.

Can anyone imagine what would have happened if Walter Reuther testified that he had borrowed \$50,000 cash from auto company officials with whom he negotiated? Imagine the screaming headlines, the speeches in congress. And how quickly he would get kicked out of the UAW? This, by the way, illustrates the difference between the democratic UAW and the racket-controlled Teamsters.

Imagine if it was shown that the UAW called a strike at a parts plant, forced its owner to bankruptcy, so that Mrs. Reuther and Mrs. Mazy could buy control for \$4,000 and make \$125,000 in seven years! Such union leaders would be lucky to get out of Solidarity House alive.

Contrast the treatment Reuther would get compared to the kid gloves treatment Hoffa did get and you begin to understand what's going on. Hoffa's gag about "loans" from employers is so old that the late Umbrella Mike Boyle of Chicago used it as far back as 1910 in Chicago. He used to come to a bar, with an umbrella hanging over his arm. Employers would loan or donate money to him by dropping it in the the umbrella. Umbrella Mike never considered that a bribe. Hoffa's gag is just as crude.

There are so many phases of Hoffa's

career that haven't been touched by the Committee that one can only wonder at possible behind-the-scenes influence. Even part of the top leadership of the AFL-CIO is going after "Jimmy."

Nevertheless, the hearings did bring out enough material to give the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee solid ground for going after him, and his cohorts in the Teamsters Union. Reluctantly, the AFL-CIO must consider serving an ultimatum upon the Teamsters: Either clean up and get rid of Hoffa et al., or else be expelled. Obviously, with the mixture of gangster, racketeer and Hoffa control, Hoffa is a cinch to win the presidency. This leaves the labor movement little choice. It must act swiftly, and decisively, or it will be itself scarred with the same brand.

The McClellan committee hinted that

it might open an investigation of Walter Reuther and the UAW. It could "charge" them only with aiding strikes, spending union money to aid starving people; fighting sweat shop conditions and union political action. The very fact that it could even consider pointing the finger of suspicion at legitimate union action speaks volumes on the social and political climate in America.

As a tough guy, Hoffa held his own only because he had friends on the other side of the table in the Washington hearings. But Reuther would easily dispose of his adversaries quite differently. The UAW is clean and decent, and acts in behalf of the working people of all America. Not even a hostile press, and a reactionary Senate clique could smear it successfully.

LABOR SCOPE

You Can't Win Nohow

UAW leaders insist that they really and truly do want to maintain the capitalist system but these professions do them little good with the Society of Skilled Trades. The Society was formed two years ago in an attempt to split skilled workers away from the UAW and organize them into separate craft unions. At this point, it claims no more than 6,000 dues paying members. As a curiosity, we report its ignorant comment on the UAW officialdom:

"In regard to Mr. Woodcock (a UAW vice-president), who has a proven background of activity in the Socialist Party, it must be pretty galling to stray even slightly away from the Socialist doctrine that says all workers should be paid equally because it costs each the same amount of money for a loaf of bread. It must also irk Brother Reuther no end to have to finally admit that those who learn a craft must be worth more. We would suggest that their basic doctrines of socialism have not changed. They may have undergone a face-lifting operation to change their exterior, so a 'new look' is displayed."

Speed-up Problem Has Many Aspects

The whole approach of the UAW still lacks enough emphasis on one decisive factor that bothers the rank and file and makes life hard in the plants: the problem of work standards and speed-up, to which the UAW has no adequate reply. Give the auto companies their work standards clauses—and thus a chance

to get more work from the men—and they can easily afford a fancy looking package.

As an illustration of the kind of problems the UAW faces in this field—and to which little if any attention is being paid by top UAW officials—the Big Three have an agreement to build parts for each other and to charge the same price for any company. In practice, this means a GM plant with high work standards—there hasn't been an improvement in the GM work standards clause for years—bids for Dodge harness work. It takes 300 jobs away from Dodge local three. To keep their jobs, Dodge workers agree to do more work, to come up to GM standards. This saves their jobs for a while, until GM efficiency makes itself felt again. GM gets the contract again. Dodge workers get laid off.

The UAW organizes a plant which builds cushions and backs on a piece work basis. Productivity is higher since this plant hires young people; gradually Chrysler work goes to that plant. 1,800 workers, many of them with lots of seniority are laid off from the former Briggs plants, now called Chrysler's Automotive Body division. Local 212 officials try to get the jobs back. Perhaps, if they promise to get the workers to put out much more work per man in 1959, Chrysler will bring the job back.

Surely, if the Big Three can keep Local Unions and autoworkers bidding against each other to do more work—and there are more examples—then to that extent any economic package in 1958 will come out of the workers' sweat and not from the fabulous profits of the Big Three.

Not in the Headlines

Businessmen's Utopia

If the conservative businessman could have his way what kind of an economy and government would we have?

The more you study the pages of newspapers and magazines reflecting the business point of view, the more you find a kind of Utopian dream that shapes up like this:

- The federal government would keep out of business affairs but would subsidize business with the taxpayers' money when needed.

- There would be rigid government economy when it comes to the social services but nobody would worry about adding billions of dollars to service on the national debt through increased interest rates.

- The federal government would turn over most of today's federal responsibilities—except for national defense—to the states but at the same time would exert strict federal control over labor unions.

- Federal taxes would be cut sharply so as to lessen the impact of a progressive tax system on individuals and corporations while the burden of taxation would be shifted to the states, where regressive sales taxes hit the low income groups the hardest.

- Profits should be left free to climb as high as they can on the grounds that profits produce investment and investment produces jobs.

"Washington Window, AFL-CIO News, Aug. 31
To the picture painted by the AFL-CIO News we might add a few items which were overlooked:

- "Right to Work" laws would be adopted in every state. Federal laws would prohibit industry-wide collective bargaining. Laws limiting union pickets to one, half a mile from each factory gate would become universal.

- All political activity by unions would be strictly banned.

LEFT NEWS

American Forum Plans Fall Expansion

American Forum-For Socialist Education has announced its fall program. The A.F. proposes to establish local committees in "a number of major cities, as well as to charter student and labor groups."

"The criteria for affiliation, according to Rev. A. J. Muste, President of A. F.," says the organization's press release, will be acceptance of the statement of principles on which the Forum was established. Before chartering a new group, Forum leaders will meet with it to assure that it is well-balanced and serious.

"Muste noted that the American Forum must guard jealously its character as a vehicle for free discussion and also against becoming a united front or an action group of any kind. The purpose of the Forum, he said, is limited to the study of problems of democratic socialism and to the stimulation of exchange of views between persons of diverse opinions. Muste also reiterated the principle of non-exclusion of anyone so long as he is willing to adhere to the spirit of free discussion.

"It is expected that the subordinate groups will be of the same character as the national committee, with independent and non-partisan elements playing a leading role."

The A.F. announces its decision to publish a pamphlet "Questions for the Left" sometime in September with an article by Sidney Lens and critical comment by others. It also hopes to hold a two-day Forum in New York on the subject of "Socialism in the age of automation and atomic energy."

Comment: From the A.F.'s press release it would appear that there are pressures inside the organization to transform it into a "united front or an action group" against which it must "guard jealously" its "character as a vehicle for free discussion."

The development of a structure with "local committees" and chartered "student and labor groups," all supervised by the A.F. as to "balance" and "seriousness" and composition would seem to imply a somewhat elaborate organizational set-up for a group designed only as a "vehicle for free discussion."

SWP ASKS CP JOINT ACTION

The Socialist Workers Party has approached the Communist Party for collaboration and joint activity in collecting signatures for the nominating petitions of the two organizations in the New York City mayoralty campaign.

The SWP is running candidates for most of the top city and borough-wide offices, while the Communist Party is seeking to collect signatures only for Elizabeth Gurley Flynn for councilwoman from the Lower East Side.

The most recent proposal by the SWP for common electoral action with the Communist Party follows earlier attempts to form a joint city-wide ticket for the elections. The press release announcing this SWP proposal says that their "campaign director stated that she considered this offer as a step toward working out an agreement with representatives of the Communist Party for advancing the cause of independent working class political action as against the policy of supporting candidates of the capitalist political parties."

Comment: No Comment.

SP-SDF Nassau Picnic

Local Nassau-Suffolk of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation announces its annual picnic for 2 p.m. on September 14 at Candlewood, 90 Pennsylvania Ave. Massapequa, Long Island, New York.

The picnic will feature a panel discussion on "The Atom and You." Panelists will be Norman Thomas, A. J. Muste and John Lester Lewine, president of the Esperanto Assn. of North America. Invitations have been sent to all socialist radical and libertarian organizations to attend. Contribution will be \$1.00 per person, \$1.50 for couples, children free. For full information call PYramid 8-0778.

Civil Rights —

(Continued from page 1)

the Southern forces, called Thurmond's action "a form of treason" was, according to the Times of August 30, "the fear that such tactics would lead those favoring the bill—who had the votes to win—to make it less acceptable." (Emphasis added)

Another reason was that the Southerners feared that if a filibuster took place, it would bring on the pressure for a change in the cloture rule which makes breaking a filibuster difficult since it necessitates 64 senators voting for cloture.

The line-up of forces in the crucial Senate situation last month was that of an overwhelming majority which was committed in varying degrees to the minimum of the administration's bill. The Southern Democrats, since they were abandoned on this issue by the majority of the Senate Republicans, were reduced to a minority which felt that if it started a filibuster it would be broken and a stronger civil rights bill would have been enacted.

The victory won by Russell and Johnson was that they were able to convince many liberals that a few slices of a civil rights bill is better than a whole loaf. When virtually the entire body of liberals in Congress refused to fight for the stronger House version, they managed to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

Gomulka's Transitional Government and The Conquests of Poland's October

By A. RUDZIENSKI

At the recent ninth plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Polish Unified Workers Party (PZPR) (the ruling party) the Natolin group, under the leadership of the Russian agent Mazur and his friends Mijal, Losiewics, Nowak, etc., was defeated. The sessions were very dramatic. After Gomulka's opening speech, the Stalinists opened the attack, accusing him of capitulating to the Catholic Church, and of liquidating the country's "socialist" policy. They demanded that the priority of the USSR in the "socialist camp" be acknowledged, and that the "Hungarian counter-revolution" be condemned.

As the attack reached its climax, it is reported that Gomulka interrupted abruptly declaring: "Well, we have heard these arguments for years, and they led to the intervention of Soviet tanks in the streets of Budapest. If you want that policy, please say so openly."

At this point, it is reported that Mazur, who is considered the voice of the Kremlin in Poland, backed down, presented a "self-criticism," and acknowledged the correctness of Gomulka's line. This was the signal for the capitulation of the whole Natolin group. Thus the session ended with a victory for the Gomulka leadership, and in the consolidation of his position in the official party.

If we contrast this event to Gomulka's previous collaboration with the moderate Natolinists and with his attack on the left, it represents a cautious step to the

left, dictated not only by the position of the working class and the party's left wing, but in the first place, by the internal crisis of the political leadership and by the activities of the Natolin group itself. To borrow Lenin's phrase, one could speak of one step forward in order to prepare two steps back.

CONQUESTS OF OCTOBER

In spite of the fact that the bureaucracy has reconquered control of political power in Poland, lost partially in the October days, the position of the working class, of the peasants and of the whole people against the government remains sufficiently strong to preserve the conquests of the Polish October revolution.

What are these conquests?

In the first place, there is the liberation of the peasantry from the yoke of the *kolkhos* (collective farm) bureaucracy. In just a few days the peasants liquidated almost all collective farms, so that the bureaucracy cannot dream of restoring them without a new civil war. In effect, it was a new agrarian reform carried through by the peasants against the bureaucracy. The peasants divided not only the soil, but also the grain, the cat-

tle, and the whole inventory of the *kolkhozes*, which the bureaucracy had collected with so much effort and terror. Today in Poland collective farms do not exist for practical purposes. The large state farms continue to exist. They produce enormous deficits which are paid for by the people.

Poland is the only country of the Soviet bloc where the peasants have won their fight against the bureaucracy. And this is a great revolutionary conquest, for the peasants represent in their poverty neither bourgeois elements, nor the restoration of capitalism. They represent simply hard working and exploited people in their fight against the totalitarian State capitalism and the new reactionary exploiting and oppressing class.

The working class not only avenged Poznan, it also defeated the hated Stalinist leadership in the Party and in the government. For Gomulka was elevated to power not as a representative of the bureaucracy, but as its victim. The victory of the workers was even deeper in the factories than in Warsaw and in the government. In many factories the workers punished the hated bosses and factory directors, running them out of the factories in wheelbarrows, as they did in 1905. There were many cases in provincial cities and hamlets of the public punishment by the people of formerly omnipotent local Party secretaries. The workers won not only the right to strike, acknowledged by Gomulka, but they established the workers' councils in the factories along with their right to participate in factory administration as well as in the appointment of the factory directors.

It is true that the workers' councils do not control the government and do not have a centralized national organization, but they remain as the form of workers' self-government in the factories and as the organ of control over the local bureaucracy. The development of the workers' councils depends on the class struggle between the workers and the bureaucracy. If the bureaucracy wins, the workers' councils will be transformed into new organs of bureaucratic control over the workers, as additional organs of pressure and exploitation. But if the workers can retain their strength, then the councils could develop not only into organs of workers' control over the bureaucracy, but could take over political power itself.

In listing the conquests of the working class one could include the breakup of the totalitarian terror; political freedom; the freedom of criticism and of the press obtained by the revolutionary "intelligentsia" and the youth. In no other country of the Russian bloc has there been so much freedom of the press and of criticism as there was in Poland during the October days. A broad political amnesty, and a review of all political trials liberated practically all political prisoners. For me it was an agreeable surprise to read the Polish press, its audacity and its revolutionary tendency, even if they were mixed with semi-Stalinist centrism.

THAT TIME NOW OVER

But that time is now over. The first task of the Gomulka leadership was to re-conquer control of the press. Today Gomulka controls not only the party press. He also controls the most audacious organ of the October left, *Po Prostu*. The present *Po Prostu* is a correct, loyal paper, dedicated to the criticism of Polish affairs, but only within the limits of the prescribed line. The best writers of the left have been silenced or corrupted by high government posts. Only a few writers retain their independence, criticizing the bureaucracy. Despite the pressure on the independent press, which is exercised, of course, from the Kremlin, the Polish press of the October left still remains the freest in the whole Russian bloc.

The agreement between Gomulka and the Catholic Church gave the people, specially the peasantry and the middle class, religious freedom, which in the concrete circumstances in Poland, represents a part of their cultural and political freedom. The religious oppression was a part of the general political and national oppression aimed at the Russification of the Poles, and their subordination to the Great Russians. The abolition of religious persecution represents a great victory for the majority of the Polish people.

Of course, the introduction of voluntary religious instruction in schools where the children want it represents a danger of the growth of the reactionary influence of the Catholic clergy and of religious intolerance so well known to the Poles. In one school in Krakow a Jewish girl had committed suicide, terrorized by her Catholic school-mates; in another school the religious boys circumcized a boy who did not wish to attend religious classes. There were additional cases of actions against Jews and non-religious elements inspired by Catholic families of the children, or Catholic priests. But up to the present the government has been in control of the situation. The collaboration of the Catholic clergy with the bureaucracy certainly represents a danger of reactionary, religious influence, but it also signifies a limit to the expansion of bureaucratic totalitarianism. Politically and culturally, the suspension of religious persecution represents a victory for the Polish people over the Kremlin and the national Stalinist bureaucracy.

MORE THAN ONE PARTY

After the election, there was a tendency in Poland to organize the Sejm (parliament) according to political tendencies. In Poland, apart from the official party (PZPR) there also exist such shadow parties as the Peasant Party, the Democratic Party, and the Catholic group. Now in the Sejm there is also a non-party club of deputies. The Peasant party has won a certain degree of independence which corresponds to the independent position of the peasants in the Polish economy. The Catholics are divided into the right wing of the former fascist and GPU agent, Piasecki, and the Catholic left.

One could speak of the break-up of the totalitarian political structure in Poland if it were not for the political monopoly of the PZPR, on which Gomulka insists. He also insists on the "iron unity" of the Communist Party, in spite of the strong opposition which demands freedom for political tendencies. He has forbidden political factions, even if he has permitted free political discussion in the party. He could not govern the country without party control, and he could not lead the party without its imposed "unity" and "iron discipline." But the farther the October days recede into the past, the stronger is the tendency to political "monolithism" in the party and in the country.

THE STRIKE WAVE

The wave of strikes stopped the totalitarian tendency in the bureaucracy from rebuilding its positions. The government did not use terror against the striking workers, but limited its activity to political pressure by the Party and the unions. But in the recent strike of the streetcar workers in Lodz, the industrial capital of Poland, the strike was broken by the combined pressure of the Party, the police and the army against the workers, even though the administration promised an increase in wages. We do not yet have full and concrete information on this strike, but if Gomulka used force against the workers, then he has started on the inclined plane toward his own defeat. For he came to power on the wave of revolution, and he stayed in power against the wish of the Kremlin. He can continue in power only by popular support. If the working class passes over to an open fight against the government, Gomulka's regime is doomed either to defeat, or to a change in its transitional character.

For the Polish upsurge of 1956 was the greatest mass movement since 1917, and partially victorious against the Stalinist counter-revolution. The political development of Poland has a decisive weight for the struggle between the growing socialist revolution and declining Stalinist totalitarianism.

UAW Proposals — —

(Continued from page 1)

would be a do-gooder with unassailable reputation. In either case, he would be inclined to favor Reuther."

The Big Three's rejection gave Reuther a victory. Labor and not management has come forward as being truly responsible and concerned about fighting inflation.

One view that is being tossed about here is this: If the Big Three had accepted Reuther's proposal, Reuther would have been behind the eight ball in terms of the politics within the UAW, for any scaling down of UAW demands for the 1958 negotiations in advance of them would have been rather unpopular with the ranks. Reuther gambled and won. His calculated risk was worthwhile. When the *New York Times* devoted its lead editorial to Reuther's proposal and said, "Mr. Reuther's vision of the need of today and of the spirit in which the UAW will meet it imposes on the companies an obligation to give his proposal searching study," the first important objective in the 1958 negotiations had been attained. Of course, the *Times* pointed out that Reuther was asking the Big Three to act now in cutting prices while the union wasn't bound to take any countervailing action immediately, and it showed the other gimmicks Reuther had in mind.

ARBITRATION PROPOSAL?

One question that is being asked here is this: In publicizing so far in advance his willingness to have a three-man board determine the wisdom of the economic package, is Reuther, in effect, proposing to arbitrate the 1958 contract? Perhaps the companies may pick him up on this later in the course of the struggle.

There was an interesting difference in the manner in which the Big Three rejected Reuther's proposals, and it provides a clue to coming events. General Motors suggested, for example, that the UAW renew its present contract for two more years. Although this would include a 6 cents per hour annual raise and other current benefits, General Motors

showed a willingness to prevent the clash from becoming a strike, if a deal could be arranged. This is in surprising contrast to the hard-boiled attitude it has had in dealing with the UAW since Leonard Woodcock took over as GM director for the union.

Henry Ford's angry blast at Reuther, "The UAW puts gasoline on the fires of inflation with its demands," indicates that Ford understands he is target number one. The UAW's strategy for 1958, it seems most probable, will be to take on Ford first. Once Reuther forces Ford to make major concessions, General Motors will have to fall in line as they did in the 1955 negotiations. Chrysler management is scared stiff that Reuther will hit them first, since they are just making a nice comeback, but this isn't likely.

In making his tactical maneuver Reuther won a skirmish but he has also left the UAW open to a counter-attack which the corporations may seize on later, for example, in his professions of the sacredness of profits? Reuther is on far less solid ground than he was in 1946 when he took on General Motors with his "higher wages without price increases" program, and "open the books." His proposal for a three man board directs both sides to present economic data, but this doesn't necessarily mean opening the books.

For the key question on auto workers' wages is not to compare auto workers wage raises to national productivity gains, or car prices, but rather to analyze the actual productivity of auto workers in the various components of auto manufacturing. Those figures are the most sacred of all. They would show the enormous surplus value extracted from each auto worker. They would illustrate how small relatively, the union gains have been.

For example: productivity per man in new plants has risen from 300 to 1000 per cent. Here is where the UAW can find unassailable proof for its economic package arguments.

UAW Challenges Monopoly —

(Continued from page 1)

if necessary to modify them, so as to make both the price cut and "reasonable" profits possible.

3. If the union and the companies could not agree . . . specifically, if the companies contended that any union demands imperilled either the price cut or "reasonable" profits, the dispute would be referred to a three-man review panel made up of one representative each of the union and companies and a third public citizen chosen by the other two. This panel would investigate all the facts on wages, prices and profits and would publicly submit its findings, not as a binding decision, but as an opinion. Union-company bargaining would then resume, with all data available in the full light of public opinion.

Six days later General Motors replied, followed by Chrysler and Ford within two days. They were annoyed, indignant, furious. But nothing they said could alter one simple fact which will continue to stand out above the mountain of arguments: the union had asked them to cut prices; they refused.

The companies insisted that car prices had risen less percentage-wise than wages. In a speedy counter-reply, the union pointed out how irrelevant was this argument. It merely demonstrated, said Reuther, that wage increases have only a minor effect upon prices. Total profits, in ten years he revealed, had mounted as follows: Ford 256 per cent; GM, 234 per cent; Chrysler, 166 per cent. On this the union rests its case: wage increases and price cuts are both possible.

COMPANIES OUTRAGED

You demand an immediate reduction in prices, the companies replied, and only then you will consider modifying your demands. Outrageous! Suppose we demanded an immediate reduction in wages on the mere promise to consider prices afterwards, they added, under the impression that it was a crushing retort. But it will do them no good. We notice that they do not dare to demand a wage reduction but the union is quite ready to demand a price cut. In either case, Reuther need only reply as in effect he has already done: submit the dispute to a public review board which will have all the facts and let it judge the justice of each side's demands. The companies have no reply and no one can invent one.

President Eisenhower is juggling the same hot potato. You are against inflation, the UAW told him. Then we ask you to support our call for a cut in car prices. Eisenhower replied: I will submit your plan to a study commission.

Fine! Reuther answered a few days later. Now that you wish to study our plan, we suggest that you assemble all the facts on prices, wages, and profits in order to make a decision on the merits of our proposal. We stand ready to give you all the

data at our disposal; let the companies do the same.

But this is exactly what the companies cannot tolerate. They will not voluntarily permit the setting and control of prices to slip out of their hands even in the slightest degree. Each of the Big Three takes pains to make this quite clear.

General Motors writes: "General Motors is not willing to negotiate the prices of its products with any union. General Motors has always taken the position during negotiations that the prices of its products were not properly the subject of collective bargaining."

AND FORD

And Ford: "To turn over pricing responsibility to government, to a union, or to an outside panel of any sort would be to strike at the very foundations of our free enterprise system."

And Chrysler: ". . . you are proposing that management abdicate its responsibilities and months after sustaining a drastically reduced income, a company would go before the UAW or before a three-man panel to attempt to justify its need for partial relief."

Reuther is careful to note that "we do not challenge that prerogative," (management's unilateral right to set prices) and adds, "We are not bargaining collectively on the setting of their prices." Formally,



WALTER REUTHER

he is correct. The UAW does not insist that it be given a voice in setting prices; it does not demand that the union agreement include clauses to restrict, or determine prices in any form. In that sense, prices are not the subject of collective bargaining under his plan. But nevertheless he is proposing a drastic curb on the rights of private monopolies over prices, if not through a union contract, then in other ways. The companies are well aware of what is at stake.

The UAW asks first that prices be established in the full light of day, with all facts known to the public. Reuther asks that a tri-partite committee sit in judgment over the moral justification of any price or price increase; moreover, that it take into account the level of profits in determining their validity. In other words, he is asking for a moral and social judgment not only upon prices set by monopolies but upon their profits as well!

By that alone, the unilateral rights of monopoly are curbed, not at the outset by law or by force, but by the power of public opinion. But what is public opinion? Surely the companies are ruthless enough to proceed without respect for what people think? But, social action follows in the end from what people think. If the majority of the people are convinced that prices and profit levels are unjust; if they begin to understand that they can and should have some voice in determining them, then in one way or another profits and prices will be curbed: by union action, perhaps; by government action under the pressure of popular opinion, perhaps. In any case, by one

form of social pressure or another. This is the chain of events opened up by the latest UAW plan. This, in sum, is a step forward in labor's great struggle to curb the anti-social power, the "prerogatives," of monopoly capitalism.

A NEW INSIGHT

We have a new insight into the nature of American unionism. Here is a labor movement, at least its leading section, which professes over and over its admiration for the "free enterprise" system; whose official ideology recognizes no "classes." Yet, this union which accepts capitalism strives always to curb the power of the capitalist class and undermines the confidence of the people in big business. This contradiction crops out in more ways than one.

"The UAW recognizes," wrote Reuther, "that management has an obligation to its stockholders to obtain for them a reasonable return on their investment." But that was in his original letter. After the Big Three turned him down he replied: "We again voice our deep regret at this evasion of social responsibility to American consumers by these corporations and their adamant and selfish position that profits are paramount to the interests of the whole economy and to the welfare of all the American people."

Here is a man who is for the capitalist system but bristles at the notion that the economy should depend upon profits. He may emphasize first one then the opposite view, depending upon what is convenient. But the union he represents and the companies which employ its members can never see eye-to-eye on what are "reasonable" profits.

"We can all agree," wrote Reuther, "that in our free society, free labor and free management in addition to having privileges, share joint responsibilities. One of these joint responsibilities is to find a way to raise collective bargaining above the level of a struggle between competing economic pressure groups." But in the name of the mutual interests of employers and workers, the UAW raises collective bargaining into a dramatic struggle between two classes over price control and into a fierce competition for the loyalty of millions victimized by inflation. Every step forward, however, every advance in the thinking of union members is clouded over by an insistence upon due respect to the empty ideology and platitudes of capitalism.

MISGIVINGS ARISE

Undoubtedly, misgivings arise in the minds of UAW workers over what the proposal means to them. This is illustrated in our on-the-spot report from Detroit. It is almost inevitable that this should be the case. Reuther's letter came without notice or explanation in advance. In *Ford Facts*, published by Local 600, Carl Stellato solidarizes himself with Reuther under the headline "Let's Look at the Books in '58." He is careful to add: "We want to make it crystal clear where we in Local 600 stand. Whether prices are raised, lowered, or remain the same we will be seeking the fulfillment of our contract demands as adopted by the General Council and the membership of Local 600. We in Local 600 are prepared to stand firm on the resolution adopted by the 16th Constitutional Convention: 1958 Collective Bargaining, in which the delegates made it clear that the shorter work-week with increased take-home pay will be the key demand for 1958."

Stellato expresses what is probably bothering some unionists; are we going to give up our demands, they ask themselves, and fight instead for a price cut? In his recent letter to Eisenhower, Reuther wrote: "If we are wrong, and lower prices should result in lower than reasonable profits, then our proposal irrevocably commits us to scaling down our collective bargaining demands to the point that will allow a reasonable profit." This, doubtless, is one of the sources of uneasiness.

But the UAW insists that price decreases are possible out of profits and it has amassed a mountain of evidence to prove its case. The companies know its contention is irrefutable, and so they reject out of hand any impartial investiga-

tion. In this period of rising profits, there is little reason to believe that any price cut would even raise the question of scaling down UAW demands. Reuther is just as aware of this simple fact as the auto companies. That is why he can make his "offer" with such confidence.

ONE QUESTION

One question that occurs to us is somewhat different. Now, auto profits are rising and the auto employers are prosperous indeed. But what if some day a decline sets in and the owners come to the union and argue: "Our profits have dropped below a reasonable level. Unless we reject your demands, in fact unless we cut wages, profits will decline even further and perhaps disappear. In the interests of the profit system, which we both support, we ask you to reduce your standard of living. It is the mutual responsibility of labor and management to cut your pay. We regret it, but that is capitalism."

What would the union reply? We are not considering what it might do—compromise, fight, submit—that would arise in any case for separate practical decision. Rather, we wonder what it would say, how it would explain matters to its own membership and to the community.

As socialists, we suggest the reply: "The same machines; the same workers; the same consumers are here today as before. If you cannot provide goods in abundance at low prices and a rising standard of living for your workers at the same time under your system of private profit, then step aside. It is clearly time for a working peoples' government to take over industry and run it, not for private profit, but to satisfy the needs of the people."

UNION ANSWER

But what would the union reply, this union which trumpets its acceptance of capitalism, free enterprise and—above all—of profits? Would it say: "Yes, yes. We understand. Of course, you must have profits. And so, we will do our duty. Bring on your wage cuts; we will accept them; we will explain them like good citizens of the capitalist private wealth." We doubt if the UAW, its membership, or its leadership could react with any such philosophical equanimity. Quite the contrary! They would have to say, as they have done before: "Human rights before property rights." Would that be possible under a profit system?

But as he challenges the auto monopolies, Reuther does not concern himself with such matters. If anything unexpected happens, he will count on improvising. He has a policy for 1958 and not much farther down the road. Right now, the UAW denounces high prices, exposes high profits, and seeks new curbs on monopoly power as it prepares for next year's battles.

Meany Appointed to U.N.

AFL-CIO President George Meany has been nominated by President Eisenhower as a United States delegate to the United Nations General Assembly. Meany is the first American labor leader to be nominated a full delegate, although union men have been named as alternates or advisors to the U. S. delegation in the past.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council has adopted a resolution congratulating Meany on his appointment, and Eisenhower for making it. It called the nomination "recognition of the forward-looking and constructive role played by the AFL-CIO in seeking to build a world of peace, prosperity and freedom."

By accepting this appointment, the American labor movement's leadership accepts responsibility for the foreign policy of the Eisenhower government, as it is expressed in the political sparring at the UN. Though it has been clear for some time that the labor leadership has not been able to develop a distinctly different foreign policy from that which has been followed, basically, by both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, the appointment of Meany as a full U. S. delegate formalizes labor's acceptance of responsibility for the government's foreign policy.

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

September 9, 1957

Vol. 21, No. 32

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

September 9, 1957

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

Intergration in South Gains — But Slowly

Ever since the momentous Supreme Court decision of 1954, each September has marked the advent of a new stage in the struggle for racial integration of America's schools. This year, progress continues to be made, though at a slower rate than before. Inexorably, the process of integration is moving closer and closer to the heartland of the South which has taken an intransigent position of refusing to abide by the Supreme Court decision.

In Nashville, Tennessee and Little Rock, Arkansas, the first steps in integration are being taken this year. In Nashville, it is the first grade which is being opened up to common classes of Negroes and whites; in Little Rock, the high school. These cities are following the border state pattern of adopting a full-fledged integration program after an NAACP court case resulted in an injunction. Like St. Louis, where integration proceeded in stages from the City Teachers College down to the grade school, the initial step establishes the principle and the complete accomplishment of integration is a matter of time.

At the present time, the school authorities in both cities feel that they will be able to achieve this integration without serious trouble of the kind which required state troopers at Clinton, Tennessee, last year.

Simultaneously, another pattern is developing. It is actually a form of evading the court orders for integration on the basis of a "Pupil Placement" program. This procedure has been adopted by some cities in Virginia, and in the Carolinas. Under it, one or two individual Negro students are admitted into a white school system of thousands. The "principle" of integration has been served—the schools are, after all, not completely segregated—but no real step has been taken toward making integration a reality. In such situations, tremendous courage is also required on the part of the Negroes who are chosen to be sent into an overwhelmingly white system more or less alone.

This technique of "Pupil Placement" is itself the result of NAACP legal action. Needless to say, the Association is challenging the white procedure. A series of extremely important cases will thus develop in the course of the next year, and may well bring integration to the cities of Virginia and the Piedmont.

Indeed, the situation where the "Pupil Placement" gimmick is being adopted is a curious one. In Virginia particularly the cities are probably prepared to integrate almost immediately. But they are stopped from doing so by the political weight of the rural areas in the State legislature. Thus, in Virginia an omnibus bill of seven sections was passed aimed at keeping all integration out of the state. The old common law doctrine of "barratry" (bringing a suit in which you have no personal interest, presumably for the purpose of harassment) was resurrected and will obviously be aimed at the NAACP in an attempt to knock it out of the legal fight by legislative action. But here again the Southern resistance is almost inevitably doomed. The general pattern of Supreme Court decisions in the last three years makes it plain that the justices are ready to sweep aside all kinds of technicalities in order to implement the basic principles of the May, 1954 decision ordering integration in the schools.

In addition to the integration in Tennessee, Arkansas, and the "Pupil Placement" in Virginia and Carolina, other states will be going ahead and completing integration already begun. Various schools in Delaware and Maryland will be integrated this year and will bring the educa-

tional systems of these states a big step closer to complete integration.

The border states are thus giving in to the Supreme Court decision. The long-drawn-out, gradual process of integration will obviously win a total victory in these places. It is only a matter of continuing the progress that has already taken place. But that leaves the central issue untouched. For the "fortress South" still holds out in the five intransigent states. There, the public authorities have vowed massive campaigns to keep racism in

force. They have passed laws, and even set up Jim Crow public relations offices—Mississippi has a "Sovereignty Commission" whose job it is to convince Northern newspapermen and radio and television commentators that a complete denial of the basic rights of the Negro is somehow an expression of the "sovereignty" of the state.

It is in these areas that the crisis of Civil Rights is most marked. September after September goes by and nothing is done. And it is plain that as long as the present political situation remains in force, as long as the forces of integration on the federal level are penned up inside of the present party system, nothing will be done. The Powell Amendment has become an annual gesture and not much more because of this. If all democrats can view the gains made in the border state with optimism and can feel that it

is possible to work through to integration in the schools (not, of course, to full citizenship) within the framework of the present situation, it is obvious that the possibility of the most minimal gains is ruled out in the deep South.

How many more Septembers will go by with the core of the racist South untouched by the Supreme Court decision? Even the most determined gradualist has to admit that this intolerable situation will persist as long as the log-jam in the Congress on Civil Rights goes on. For here, the way to the merest reform lies through a basic realignment of the party system in America. Once more, it points up the fact that the creation of an independent party of labor, the Negroes, the farmers, is the *sine qua non* of progress in America today, not only in Civil Rights but on practically every major issue.

YSL Plans Tours for Denitch and Rawick

There are many new possibilities opening up for socialists and their ideas on the campus. As Bogdan Denitch reported in *Challenge* on his tour last spring, everywhere in the country he found new prospects: students more interested in socialist ideas, more willing to commit themselves to active political life.

In line with these new developments, the Young Socialist League is sponsoring two major national tours throughout the country for the Fall season.

Bogdan Denitch, member of the National Executive Committee of the YSL, will tour the Mid-West and West Coast from Sept. 13-Nov. 2. He has prepared three major addresses on topics that will be of particular political interest on the campus this fall.

The first topic is "Civil Rights: The Struggle and the Sell Out." This talk will pay particular attention to the recent Senate situation which pulled the teeth out of the Civil Rights bill, the new reactionary alignment between the Southern and Western Democrats, and the impasse that the liberal-labor wing of the Democratic Party finds itself in as long as it remains in that party.

Denitch's second topic is "The Russian Block Since Stalin," dealing mainly with the Eastern European Revolutions against Stalinism as well as analyzing the recent developments in Russia itself.

The final topic that he is prepared to speak on is "Disarmament and the H-Bomb," with the emphasis on the maneuvers of Russia and the U. S. and the real struggle for peace.

The second major tour will be undertaken by George Rawick, editor of the student socialist magazine, *Anvil*. He has consented to tour the East and Mid-West areas for the YSL during the month of October.

On his tour, George Rawick will concentrate more on general socialist talks, such as "Socialism and Democracy," "A Socialist Analysis of U. S. Foreign Policy," and "The Next Step in America: The Labor Party."

Following is a complete breakdown of the two tour schedules.

Bogdan Denitch's schedule:	
Pittsburgh	Sept. 13
St. Louis	Sept. 15
Denver	Sept. 17-19
San Francisco-Bay Area	Sept. 21-28
Los Angeles	Sept. 30-Oct. 6
Portland and Seattle	Oct. 8-12
Bay Area and Los Angeles	Oct. 16-22

Albuquerque	Oct. 24-26
Denver	Oct. 28-30
Chicago	Nov. 1-2

George Rawick's tour will be for the period of Oct. 6-24, although the exact dates he will be in each area has not yet been definitely decided. The areas he will visit are:

- Pittsburgh
- Yellow Springs—Dayton—Columbus
- Ann Arbor—Detroit
- Chicago
- Madison
- Minneapolis
- Oberlin—Cleveland
- Buffalo
- New Haven

The tour schedules show that the YSL will be represented in many areas of the U. S. where it has never been before, as

well as locations where we have only recently made our ideas known. This indicates again both the new thaw that exists on campus and in the country, and the outward orientation of the YSL as it attempts to reach young people who are only beginning to become interested in politics.

At the same time the tours do not forget the old established centers of the YSL, and in these areas, large public meetings are already planned for the speakers. They should be highly successful and help in the building of the YSL.

At no other time in the recent past have the opportunities for a socialist youth movement been as great: these tours will aid both in terms of the present opportunities and in creating new ones for the future.

CHALLENGE LETTER BOX

QUESTIONS REPORT ACCURACY

To the Editor:

Chicago, July 22nd
At least one point in Mel Stack's report on the YSL Convention (*Challenge*, July 15, 1957) requires public comment and correction.

This is the paragraph which reads: "Murray Weiss of the SWP, who was present through most of the convention, was granted the floor to comment on a statement he had made several years ago calling for the smashing of the YSL. He once again reiterated the SWP's hostility to the YSL, and left in force his previous statement that 'our only interest is how to smash' the League."

This paragraph is dishonest—in effect, if not in intention. By quoting a portion of Comrade Weiss's statement it distorts what he actually said.

Weiss's statement, both originally and at our Convention, made it clear that he was speaking of "smashing" the YSL ideologically. That is, with political ideas as opposed to organizational manipulations.

The paragraph quoted above conveys the impression that Weiss advocated the latter. This impression is reinforced by the fact that the preceding paragraph mentions the SWP in connection with "raids and splits."

Comrade Stack has every right to disbelieve what Weiss said. He also has every right to present his characterization of the SWP.

He does not have the right, however, to distort what Weiss actually said (by

quoting him out of context) and use this distortion to back up his characterization.

I am not concerned with "defending the SWP." The only point I am attempting to raise is the rather simple one of elementary socialist morality.

Fraternally yours,
SCOTT ARDEN

REPLY

Comrade Arden believes I distorted Murray Weiss' statement to the effect that the only interest the SWP has in the YSL is to smash us. The distortion occurs, comrade Arden maintains, because I omitted the word "ideologically" before the "smashing of the YSL." So that what Weiss really meant was political defeat, and it is a slander to accuse him of organizational maneuvers designed to wreck the YSL.

The difference between "ideological defeat" and "organizational wrecking" is clear, even though sometimes the boundary lines become blurred. But in the case of the SWP, the differences do not exist: that is why I simply referred to their desire to smash the YSL. Let me cite a few examples.

In *The History of American Trotskyism*, Cannon simply reveals in the destruction of the SP through the Trotskyist's split and maintains that all other tendencies must be smashed so that the anointed revolutionary party, the SWP, will maintain its proper leadership of the working class. This view has never been repudiated

(Continued on page 6)

SPOTLIGHT

Stock Market Reacts

Since the middle of July the stock market has been in the doldrums. Partially it is the result of the not too optimistic estimates for business in the last quarter of the year.

But more important, it would appear, is the increasing business apprehension over the cut in military orders. The Department of Defense has announced cut backs in the present level of military expenditures to about only (sic) \$38 billions from the present \$40 billions.

Consequently in August the market, according to the N. Y. Times' 50 stock average, took the steepest plunge on a monthly basis since 1940.

However on August 27th, the Russians announced that they had fired an inter-continental ballistic missile a "huge distance."

The stock market reaction was instantaneous. The next day saw Wall Street turn in the second best performance of the year.

The biggest gains were made by these corporations in the aircraft and missile fields. The Times reported that "Martin, General Dynamics and Douglas, all heavily engage in missile development, scored gains of 2 or more points."

Gains were also registered in other military-oriented industries such as steel, metals and oil spurred on by the announcement of Russia's rejection of the U. S.'s disarmament proposals.

Who Are Colonialists?

The ease with which the Senate liberals collapsed on the attempt to enact

the original Administration Civil rights bill evoked a gleeful response from the French newspaper, *L'Aurore*. In the Senate's action they found justification for French colonial policy in Algeria.

"With the strong majority of 51 to 42 the American Senate has just taken a vote which practically empties of its substance the civil rights bill. . . . If there ever was a legislative act of colonialist (and some will even say racist) inspiration this is it. May we therefore hope that the accusation of colonialism which has been too often and too rashly aimed at France by our American friends will be definitely shelved and particularly so when we shall talk together of North Africa?

"Does the United States, which is so hostile to the civil rights of the Negroes, know that France's third-ranking political personality, Monnerville, President of the Council of the Republic, is a colored man and a very eminent one? Does it know that the Negroes of the French Union have the right to vote and that their representatives, white and colored, sit with their colleagues of metropolitan France in our Assemblies? Let it therefore examine its conscience and tell us on what shore of the Atlantic are living the last colonialists."

Comment: Though it is clear that whatever else may have been wrong with it, the final Civil Rights bill was not a "racist" measure, it is also clear that the emasculation of the original bill has given heart not only to the racists in this country, but to colonialists everywhere.

FROM THE PERIODICALS

MYTH OF THE HAPPY WORKER

The current issue of *The Nation* (Aug. 17) features an article by Harvey Swados "They Myth of the Happy Worker" which is well worth passing on to any of your friends who don't happen to be industrial workers. It is a simple and straightforward discussion of the myth that the American working class has been absorbed into the middle class. Swados writes neither as an economist nor sociologist, but rather as a writer who went to work in a factory for a while and talked to his fellow-workers.

Most of what he writes is "so obvious that one feels ashamed at laboring the point," as he says himself. That is, it is so obvious to anyone who knows the American workers as they are, and not as the American Celebration pretends they are.

Do the workers, in the midst of our boom, now have "middle-class expectations?" Swados thinks not:

"I had been under the impression that this was the rock on which socialist agitation had foundered for generations: it proved useless to tell the proletariat that he had a world to win when he was reasonably certain that with a few breaks he could have his own gas station. If these expectations have changed at all in recent years, they would seem to have narrowed rather than expanded,

leaving a psychological increment of resignation rather than of unbounded optimism. . . . The worker's expectations are for better pay, more humane working conditions, more job security. As long as he feels that he is going to achieve them through an extension of existing conditions, for that long he is going to continue to be a middle-class conservative in temper. But only for that long."

And he concludes as follows: "If we conclude that there is nothing noble about repetitive work, but that it is nevertheless good enough for the lower orders, let's say that, too, so we will at least know where we stand. But if we cling to the belief that other men are our brothers, not just Egyptians, or Israelis, or Hungarians, but all men, including millions of Americans who grind their lives away on an insane treadmill, then we will have to start thinking about how their work and their lives can be made meaningful. That is what I assume the Hungarians, both workers and intellectuals, have been thinking about. Since no one has been ordering us what to think, since no one has been forbidding our intellectuals to fraternize with our workers, shouldn't it be a little easier for us to admit, first, that our problems exist, then to state them, and then to see if we can resolve them?"

SAD, BUT TRUE

The "Militant" Finds an "Irrepressible Issue"

An editorial in the *Militant* (Aug. 12), organ of the self-styled "Orthodox Trotskyist" Socialist Workers Party points up a contradiction in Russian policy.

Recently a number of leaders of the Ceylonese Lanka Samasamaja Party, a Trotskyist organization, were official guests of the Moscow government as part of a parliamentary delegation. They were given the red-carpet treatment along with the others. Colvin R. de Silva, leader of the LSSP wrote later in the *Samasamajist*: "The Soviet authorities knew well that I am a Trotskyist. Nevertheless they put me on the Moscow radio three times. . . . They also made me appear on their television beam which is said to reach three million people."

Now, says the *Militant*, the Soviet leaders have got themselves into a real jam. "According to official Kremlin dogma, as established through the device of the Moscow trials in the 1930's, Trotskyism is a counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet tendency. While the entire world knows that these charges and the trials from which they sprung are frameups, the fact remains that the charges have never been officially rescinded."

If the charges are true, how can the Russian leaders invite such people to their country and put them on the radio, and treat them like a legitimate political tendency? If they are not true, how about "granting to Soviet Trotskyism its legitimate rights?" "Khrushchev and his associates," says the *Militant*, "cannot long maintain so contradictory a stand. The issue is an irrepressible one."

That may be. But with respect to the visit of the Trotskyist delegation to Moscow, it is clear that the *Militant's* Ceylonese co-thinkers did their best to repress it, at least as long as they were in Russia. Here is what Colvin R. de Silva has to say about his TV appearance: *ASamasamajist* May 23)

"That master of political silliness who is known as the political correspondent of the Daily News has suggested that I committed some crime or other which is not clear to me by failing to make an onslaught on the Soviet government when I appeared on television. I had been asked to give a message of greetings to the Soviet people on that occasion and I did so. How in the name of good sense an onslaught on Stalinism could be fitted into

a message of greetings to the Soviet people beats me. Besides, do these absurd people really think that the Soviet government would give me their radio to attack the government when no Soviet citizen even is given a legal opportunity to oppose the Communist Party or the Soviet government? They do not seem to understand the meaning and conditions of a single party dictatorship which closely controls everything in the Soviet Union with a view to preventing opposition."

Please do not conclude from the above that the Ceylonese Trotskyist leaders confined themselves solely to greeting the Soviet people, laying wreaths on Lenin's tomb (which, incidentally, happens now to be Stalin's tomb also), and similar acts. In a subsequent article, de Silva describes and discusses a searching line of inquiry pursued by the LSSP delegates while in Russia.

What they wanted to know was this: is the government of the U.S.S.R. taking any steps to transform the collective farms into State farms? Does the government have any definite policy on the subject?

In a word, the answer was "no." The Russian rulers regard the collective farm system as the basic form for the organization of their agriculture, for the foreseeable future.

Why were the Ceylonese Trotskyists so deeply concerned with this question? Even at this late date, it is a little hard to believe the answer, but the truth must be told, and they can tell it best themselves. Colvin R. de Silva's article on this question states:

"It will be appreciated in the light of the above that the collective farm system can become the means of a smooth transition to a socialist form of organization only to the extent that the collective farmers are kept functioning in the clear perspective of their ultimate transformation into State farms. It is clear that no such perspective exists in Soviet policy today. . . ."

And his article concludes: "The perspectives of socialism require in the realm of agriculture the perspective of a planned passage from the collective farm system to a general State farm system."

Samasamajist, May 30

This was the burning issue on which the Ceylonese Trotskyists saw fit to press their hosts to the wall.

YOUNG Socialist CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

by the SWP. And of course, there is no careful distinction between ideological attack and wrecking operations.

Or take that famous ideological attack of the SWP at the 1955 YSL convention. A number of SWPers and their sympathizers were members of the YSL. A statement of resignation from the YSL, with the signatures of the entire group attached, was presented to the convention with no prior warning or discussion. Further, *Some Of The SWP-YSLers Were Not Even Told By The SWP That The Statement Was To Be Submitted To The Convention; In Fact, The First They Heard Of Their Resignation Was When They Walked Into The Meeting Hall That Afternoon!* Is this "ideological" attack or simply a smashing technique?

But not to dig into the dim past—take the last YSL Convention when SWPers, and particularly Murray Weiss, engaged in tactical discussions with members of the YSL minority. Both parties had the right to do so, of course, but it is not exactly the way in which an open ideological struggle is waged.

The SWP—by past actions which it refuses to repudiate, by present policies which it has carried out toward the YSL—is interested in raiding, splitting,

and the like. We have experienced the "ideological" opposition of the SWP before: both in its open maneuver at Chicago two years ago, and in its more recent shadowy role, when its spokesman acted as secret participants in our 1957 Convention deliberations. So I continue to call a spade a spade. I describe this tactic for what it is: an attempt by the SWP to smash the YSL in whatever way possible.

MEL STACK

NEW BOOK OFFERS

The New Class

"An Analysis of the Communist System"
By Milovan Djilas

List \$3.95

our price \$3.50

The Roots of American Communism

By Theodore Draper

List \$6.75

our price \$5.75

Orders must be accompanied by check to
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14th Street, NYC 11, N.Y.

STALINIST RUSSIA

A
MARXIST
ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

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

A Heroic Working Class Suffers The Effects of Stalinist Policy And American Union "Assistance"

The Greek Labor Movement

By A. GIACOMETTI

For the past ten years, the labor movement in Greece has offered a picture of authoritarian control and of corruption almost approaching Spanish conditions. Few other countries have been so ravaged by war and civil war, by occupation and economic depression as Greece; the labor movement was set back more than a decade.

Before the war, trade-unions and working-class parties had a strong position in the country. The trade-unions could look back on an old tradition of militancy and integrity. There also developed in Greece the oldest revolutionary opposition to the Comintern: the "Archeo-Marxist" movement. For a time in the thirties, before the Metaxas dictatorship, this party occupied a leading position in the Greek working-class, more so than the official Communist Party itself.

This situation was completely reversed by the dictatorship and the war. During the war, the Stalinists succeeded in taking control of most of the resistance movement, largely because of the abstentionist position of the Archeo-Marxists, who realized the political importance of the movement a year too late. In the course of the fighting in the underground and during the civil-war, the Archeo-Marxists suffered tremendous losses, both from the Germans and from the Stalinists, who were out to exterminate them. About 1,500 members of the party were killed; close to half of the total membership. From the end of the war until now, the decimated and semi-illegal remnants of the party have been in no position to initiate or lead important working-class struggles.

No one else was in such a position, either. At the end of the war, the Stalinists had also taken control of the trade-union movement. When Greece was "liberated" for the second time by the British army, the capitalists and the court, the Stalinists were in turn evicted and replaced by a trade-union apparatus completely controlled by the reactionary government.

Roving Statesman Appears

It is necessary here to stress once again the role of the AFL's roving statesman, Irving Brown, who at the time was preparing World War III by making the Mediterranean ports safe for American arms shipments. As has been pointed out in LABOR ACTION before, Irving Brown, like the rest of the clique he belongs to, is a man who conceives his role to be one of "fighting Communism" in the labor movement on terms acceptable to the Right and actually on the political basis of the Right. He has no political answer to Stalinism.

In Greece, Irving Brown produced a man named Fotis Makris, to whom he handed over the whole trade-union movement. All opposition to Makris was brutally suppressed with the help of the police. Just to make sure, a law was passed which is a little masterpiece of the kind: union dues are taken out of the workers' pay by the employer (check-off) and are turned over directly to the Greek Federation of Labor (i.e., Makris) who in turn does them out to the industrial unions affiliated with the GFL. If an industrial union or local group develops independent tendencies, it is called "Communist" and cut off without a cent. No union, no union functionary, gets any money without the personal agreement of Fotis Makris.

It is not certain that Greek ports have become safe for American arms shipments. What is certain, on the other hand, is that Makris has been supported by every Greek government up till now on the grounds that he was the providential man who had sown up the Greek working-class in a bag, and the only man who could be trusted to keep it that way. For the first time in the history of the Greek trade-union movement no significant strike or wage-raise occurred for about ten years. In the meantime, the drachma has been devaluated, slashing real wages by 45-50 per cent, and the price of olive oil (an essential staple) has doubled in two years, all of this without opposition or reaction from the GFL. Makris also approved law Nr. 2053 which enables the minister of labor to cancel any wage-raise obtained by collective bargaining on the plant-level, as well as law Nr. 3239 (passed in 1955) which enables the minister of labor to change the provisions of any contract on the plant level. In other words, even if workers succeed in wresting some small, local advantage from the employers, it can be

nullified by the government. Today, over two million Greeks have an income under 5 dollars a month. The Greek working class has been one of the poorest in Europe.

Resistance to the common front of employers, government, police, Makris and Irving Brown has never ceased. It came, on the one hand, from the Stalinists, who suffered from the repression but were always able to capitalize on the reactionary policy of the government and of the Western powers. If Greek Stalinism is in a serious crisis today, it is not because of anything the government has done, but because of the crisis in Russia and in the satellites, and because of its own responsibilities in the massacres of the civil-war. Since the middle of 1956, however, the Stalinists have been supporting Makris in the name of "peaceful coexistence."

Opposition Rises

On the other hand, opposition came from the sectors where the Archeo-Marxists had succeeded in maintaining themselves, and from a new generation of independent, young trade-unionists. The Stalinists and, more so, the independent opposition received constant support and new strength from the mass of workers who were again and again driven into opposition to the government: poverty led to economic demands and every economic demand becomes a political demand when employers, State and trade-unions are undistinguishable. Under the pressure of the opposition, Makris and his apparatus have weakened.

One focal point of the opposition has been the Greek Federation of Miners (OME) with a membership of about 40,000, which was expelled from the GFL about two years ago for refusing to accept Makris' directives. In spite of the usual reprisals, and of great material difficulties, it was able to maintain its independence because of the special conditions under which miners live: the geographical isolation, the strong community feeling, the tradition of violence against scabs. Also, it now has the full support of the International Federation of Miners (ICFTU), which at its 37th Congress last June strongly condemned the GFL.

The "general strike" of last June is significant for the present situation of the Greek labor movement, not least because of the curious sequence of events that led up to it. In the course of last year, the government was beginning to get worried about signs of discontent in the working-class: a discontent which had become a political threat. In February 1956, before the general elections, a "Popular Front" was formed by the liberal opposition and by the EDA (legal front for the CP) which came close to winning the elections on the basis of social issues and of the neutralist feelings generated by the Cyprus dispute. To undercut some of the social unrest, the government decreed a general wage-raise of five per cent. The employers' federation opposed this raise and brought suit against the government in the State Council, an institution roughly comparable to the Supreme Court in the U. S., which decides on the constitutionality of laws. Like its American counterpart, the Greek supreme court is unpredictable. It took the occasion to review all labor legislation; it decided that the wage raise was unconstitutional, but also that the law on check-offs was unconstitutional and hence invalid.

General Strike Threatened

As soon as the decision became known, Makris began maneuvering to have another law passed that would re-establish the compulsory check-off under a different form. But, for reasons of its own, the government was reluctant to comply. Consequently, Makris threatened the government with a general-strike, and started prep-

arations for it in May. First there were to be several 24-hour "demonstration strikes" in different regions, leading up to a general strike in the whole country on June 18.

The publicly stated strike aims were legitimate ones (they involved different wage raises) but in fact they were only used to bring pressure on the government to maintain the check-off system. As soon as Makris started agitation for the general strike, the Stalinists rallied to it, and began supporting it. Stalinist streamers and signs began appearing in Makris' meetings. The rest of the trade-union opposition also supported the strike, but clearly dissociated itself from Makris. Early in June, the first installment of the strike began in Athens and Piraeus, with middling success.

At this point, Irving Brown, oblivious of everything but the Stalinist support for the strike, took a plane to Athens and asked Makris to call the whole thing off. Makris, who felt that he was fighting for his job, refused, and Irving Brown intervened with the government to have the strike of his own protégé broken.

On this point an unforeseen thing occurred: the ICFTU sent down one of its representatives, Schevenels, to take a position in favor of the strike, thus disavowing Brown. But the Greek government, which had accepted every conceivable form of foreign intervention and foreign operation on its soil, now decided that it could not accept "meddling from outsiders" and asked Schevenels to leave. Schevenels, whose integrity is more widely recognized than his intelligence, left declaring that "under the circumstances the ICFTU might have to reconsider its stand in favor of independence for Cyprus."

Makris Calls Strike Off

Before June 18 came around, Makris had called off the general strike and was mysteriously hinting that negotiations with the government were in progress.

Who is the loser in this mess? Above all Makris, who has proved his impotence as soon as he is no longer fully backed by outside support. What this means, is that in the months ahead Makris and his boys will have trouble holding down the Greek trade-union movement, and that independent working-class action has again become possible.

A good illustration of the militancy of which the Greek workers are capable if they have only the employers and the police to contend with, is provided by the strike in the Kalogreza coal mines—near Athens—last May.

The mines of Kalogreza contain very rich lignite, which is relatively easy to extract. Nonetheless, mismanagement had driven the company to the verge of bankruptcy. Wages had not been paid for two months. The workers heard that the company was going to declare itself bankrupt, and that the mine would continue to operate under a court-appointed trustee, in which case there would be practically no hope of recovering the wages the company owed them.

The Kalogreza Strike

On May 7, about 120 workers went into the mine and started a hunger-strike; the secretary of the independent Miners' Union, George Vroustis, went down into the mine with them. They held out for five days. The police surrounded the mine pit, so their families came out and surrounded the police. Some of the miners' wives and children went to Athens and demonstrated with black flags before the Ministry of Labor. Then they collected money on the public square for the return trip, and when they found they had collected more than they needed, they returned the money to passers-by. In the mine, some of the strikers were beginning to faint from hunger, and ambulances started lining up outside the mine. The strike became a national scandal.

The government decided the strike had to be stopped by all means. Makris came down to Kalogreza in person, along with the secretary of his yellow "miners' union" and the boss of the Athens Federation of Labor to plead with the strikers to get out and collect a down-payment of 100,000 drachmas on the 700,000 drachmas the company owed them. The strikers refused. The government then offered to pay the full amount out of the unemployment compensation fund—if they would come out first. The strikers again refused: first all their fellow-workers outside the mine would have to be paid off; then they would come out in small groups, and when each group was paid, the next group would come out.

On the fifth day, at 11 o'clock at night, the government and the company gave in. A miner sat on a motorcycle in front of the mine entrance, and flicked his headlight as many times as strikers had been paid. Thus notified of the payment of their comrades, the strikers came out of the mine one by one. By 1 o'clock in the morning every miner had been paid the full amount.

The potential that this strike brought into the open is of a kind that could make the Greek labor movement one of the best in Europe, once the present leadership is removed for good and the Federation of Labor reorganized along democratic lines. Who can do it? Without doubt, the Federation of Miners (OME) will play a leading role in such a re-organization. There are honest and militant elements in other unions as well: the transport workers, in the metal-workers, the union of social-security users. If they get a chance, they will rebuild a clean and militant movement. It is up to the international labor movement to see that Lovestone's clique not be allowed to interfere with this struggle.

BOOKS ARE WEAPONS

The Communist Party at the Crossroads, by H. W. Benson25
The New Course, & The Struggle for the New Course, by Leon Trotsky and Max Shachtman	1.50
Stalinist Russia, by Tony Cliff	2.00
Is Russia a Socialist Community? Debate between Earl Browder and Max Shachtman50

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

Disarmament Talks Fold — —

(Continued from page 1)

around the idea of economic and technical aid to underdeveloped countries. Yet every time relations between the American and Russo-Chinese camp got a bit strained again, such proposals were submerged under the rush back to the good, safe (if barren) old ground of military strength.

It is also these considerations which have dictated Washington's approach in the disarmament talks in London. The Russians have put forth one, simple, understandable proposal: suspend nuclear bomb tests for a few years as a first step toward a reduction of arms. The American delegates have put forward at least eleven interlocked, interdependent points as a whole package. They are willing to suspend nuclear tests if the Russians agree to stop production of nuclear weapons, and to allow the setting up of a foolproof system of inspection to insure that no further nuclear weapons are produced by either side.

The American proposal contains other points, such as "open skies" inspection and the like. At times the Russians have shown a willingness to accept one aspect or another of the American proposal, but they have never indicated that they are even interested in negotiating over the package as a whole. In spite of intermediate apparent wavering, and repeated conferences between Stassen, the American representative, and the State Department, it can be said that the American side has never shown any sustained inclination to consider the Russian proposal either.

For several weeks, neither side had shown any signs of budging from the positions they had taken. As a matter of fact, as the rigidity of the positions became apparent, the Russian representatives and the Russian press adopted a tone which was clearly directed to the propaganda war for support from the peoples of the world rather than to the reaching of an agreement in London. In Washington the speculation was no longer on whether something concrete might develop out of the talks, or how much, but rather on when and under exactly what circumstances they would come to an end.

RUSSIANS FIRE ICBM

It was in this atmosphere that the Russian press triumphantly announced the successful firing of an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile. Since the race for this weapon has been an open secret in this country, Washington could do nothing but feign relative indifference to the Russian announcement. They claimed to have known for some weeks what the Russians had achieved, and sought to belittle the importance of the achievement.

No ordinary citizen knows whether the Russians actually fired a practical production prototype of the ICBM or not. We do not know how close American engineers and scientists are to the production of such a missile. But the clear fact remains that in this field, in which there has been the most intense

competition, the Russians are at the very least even with this country, and probably considerably ahead. Since no competent authority doubts that they have also produced highly effective nuclear weapons, it is clear that they have achieved, or at least are very close to the fatal combination: unlimited power of nuclear destruction plus unlimited ability to deliver it over any target in the world.

Does this mean that the day is now clearly foreseeable when a "hard" faction in the Kremlin may issue an ultimatum to the United States: yield Europe to us, or we will blow you off the map? Or, if one prefers a modified version of this: that the day approaches when Russian land armies, armed with conventional weapons, will sweep over Europe and the rest of Asia, while the United States is held at arm's length by the threat of nuclear destruction?

THE EQUALIZER

It is such images or some very like them, which have been used to explain and justify American foreign policy to the American people for some time. But they did

Whose Ox Is Gored

According to a dispatch from Keyes Beech of the Chicago Daily News from Tokyo, Dr. Homer Jack of Evanston, Illinois, was dropped from the steering committee of the Third World Conference against A and H Bombs when he criticized Russian as well as American and British bomb testing.

Jack, who is the coordinator of a U.S. Committee to Stop Nuclear Bomb Tests, is reported to have said that the conference was dominated by Communists largely because the Western nations refused to send delegates.

Dr. Jack was accompanied to Japan by his twelve-year-old son. He said he was "isolated and ignored" by conference planners after he indicated his position about the Russian government.

The Peacemaker

not even point in the general direction of the main problem then, any more than they point to it now.

First of all, one need not be a military strategist to realize that even if the Russians are close to having the ICBM, this does not necessarily give them overwhelming military superiority. Just a few weeks ago, General Norstad, commander of NATO, informed the American people that this country has the power of absolute destruction of Russian military and production targets from the air. It is no secret that American bases overseas have already been equipped with atomic cannon, and with limited supplies of intermediate rocket weapons. Were it not for the political vulnerability of the American bases which ring Russia, one could say that the development by that country of the ICBM tends to bring it even with the American potential rather than to take it far into the lead in the arms race.

So this leaves the situation, as far as the disarmament talks are concerned, pretty much in the position it was in before the Russian announcement—in all but one respect. The American insistence

on the suspension of further production of nuclear weapons is based on the assumption that at the moment the United States is ahead in this field. On that basis they are willing to freeze the production. But the Russians have forged ahead in their ability to deliver nuclear weapons over the American continent, or at least that is the impression they seek to give to the world. This has not led them to change their line on disarmament. Their posture is now something like this: "See, we are now ahead in the arms race. But this does not mean that we are any less interested in disarmament than we were before. Let the Americans, who thought they were negotiating from a position of superior military strength accept our terms. We have not made them any harder since we have shown that the American claim is false."

Immediately after the Russian announcement on their missile, their representative in London, Zorin, adopted a very hard, challenging tone. In this he was following the lead of Khrushchev in his speeches in East Germany during the summer. It is impossible to predict whether the Russians will moderate their tone so that when the disarmament talks break up they will not appear to have failed due to Russian "hardness." But one thing is clear. The simple Russian proposal for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests immediately and unconditionally gains in popular appeal when made by a power which has just demonstrated that it has not lagged behind in the arms race.

"PEACE LOVING" RUSSIANS?

Do the Russians make their simple proposal because they are "peace-loving," and deeply concerned about the consequences for the future of humanity of more tests? Or do they make it simply because they realize that such a proposal finds the widest echo and support in public opinion everywhere?

Since the Russian rulers have shown themselves to be skilled political operators, it is reasonable to assume that they assign greater importance to the political side of the question than do their American opposites. But that is far from the whole story. The simple fact is that both sides now have the "big bomb," the great thermonuclear weapon which no one dares use because they know that it means the utmost of destruction for the whole world, themselves included. To this, the United States has been seeking to add a whole family of

small "tactical" bombs which can be used in the field against armies, and which can offset the superior weight of conventionally-armed men the Russians and Chinese can bring to bear on the areas on their periphery. The need for more tests is essentially linked to a further development of such "small" bombs. Since the Russians do not need these nearly as badly as do their opponents, they would gladly end their further development by ending all tests.

Socialists and real democrats who live in the capitalist world cannot possibly base their policy on the fine points of their government's military strategy. They must be concerned with the development of a political policy which can prevent war, and at the same time which can aid in the process of democratization and eventual socialization.

AN IRONIC NOTE

The ironic note on which the disarmament talks draw to a close re-emphasizes the importance of placing political considerations at the top of the list in the realm of foreign policy. Thus, even though most of the Western proposals for mutual inspection and the like seem reasonable enough and could, if adopted, tend to limit the arms race, it is clear that no political pressure for their adoption can be generated throughout the world until and unless the capitalist camp first agrees to an unconditional suspension of nuclear tests.

We are for such an agreement from every point of view. It is necessary in the biological interests of the human race. It is necessary as a brake on the arms race. It is necessary as a political demonstration that this country does not intend to use such weapons to impose its policy or its system on Russia or anyone else.

The present round of "disarmament" discussions will not be the last one. The pressure of world public opinion is far too strong for that. And at bottom, the organization and clarification of this public opinion is far more important than the see-saw struggle between the governments which takes place under the guise of disarmament talks. For that organization and clarification will decide, in the long run, not only the outcome of talks on disarmament, but the structure and policy of the governments conducting such talks.

SOUTH AFRICAN DEFENSE FUND

A new organization called South Africa Defense Fund has announced its formation under the co-chairmanship of Reverend James A. Pike and John Gunther. Its sole purpose is to gather money to provide legal defense and support for the families of people arrested for opposing the South African government's racial policy.

South Africa Defense Fund lists a number of prominent people among its sponsors, including James B. Carey, A. Philip Randolph, Charles S. Zimmerman and Victor Reuther from the labor movement. It will be administered by the American Committee on Africa, Inc. Contributions or requests for further information may be sent to 4 West 40th St., New York 18, N. Y.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by
Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.