

# political affairs

OCTOBER 1955 • 25 CENTS

*Sept.*



- |                              |       |  |
|------------------------------|-------|--|
| AN EDITORIAL                 | [ 1 ] | Put an End to Lynching!                          |
| WILLIAM Z. FOSTER            | [ 3 ] | Post-Geneva: The Fight for Peaceful Co-Existence |
| SIMON W. GERSON              | [15]  | The Battle Against the McCarran Act              |
| LUIGI LONGO                  | [22]  | For a Move to the Left in Italy                  |
| SAUL WELLMAN AND NAT GANLEY  | [31]  | The Auto Workers Advance                         |
| RANK BREWSTER AND MARK LOGAN | [44]  | Automation: Abundance for Whom? I                |
| ALITA LETWIN                 | [54]  | New Stirrings on the Campus                      |
| A. B. MAGIL                  | [64]  | <i>U.S. Over Latin America</i> (Book Review)     |

GREETINGS, COMRADE JEROME, ON YOUR 59th BIRTHDAY  
(October 12, 1955)



**V. J. JEROME**  
*Editor, POLITICAL AFFAIRS*  
*Smith Act Prisoner*

Vol. XXX

A T

An Edi

Em  
5,000, Wh  
to be f  
On  
was sh  
on Au  
Mississ  
child o  
smashe  
body in  
of Dr.  
old bal  
is Pres

In  
to who  
stalwar  
those o  
lynchin  
other  
would  
that m  
come c  
bor, a

The  
in Miss  
class of

It i  
crush t

Re-entered  
under the  
Publishers,  
correspond  
and Canada

IDAY

# political affairs

**A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism**

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## Put an End to Lynching!

### An Editorial

Emmett Louis Till, the 14-year old Negro lad, is lynching victim number 5,000, and number 600 for the State of Mississippi.

What is the number that is to write finis to this barbarism? It is going to be finished, but when—is not 5,000 enough?

On May 7, 1955, in Belzoni, Mississippi, the Reverend George W. Lee was shot dead because he refused to remove his name from the voters' list; on August 13, 1955, Mr. Lamar Smith was shot dead in Lincoln County, Mississippi for the same reason. Three weeks later grown men took the Till child out of his bed in the dead of night and brought him to a barn and smashed in his skull and put a bullet through his temple and then threw his body in a river. And on September 21, a rifle bullet was fired into the home of Dr. A. H. McCoy, in Jackson, Mississippi, narrowly missing his 18-month old baby. No one has any doubts as to why the bullet was fired—Dr. McCoy is President of the N.A.A.C.P. in his State.

In every one of the 5,000 lynchings there has never been any doubt as to who the sadistic brutes were, no more doubt than as to who were the stalwart heroes that beat the Till youngster to a pulp. And in every one of those cases, men of great property, "men of distinction" were behind the lynchings—the bankers and the planters, the real-estate operators and all the other big-time "operators." If they were not behind them, the lynchings would never occur, and if they were not behind them there would be trials that mattered and there would be some legally-executed lynchings—for a welcome change. And let it be remembered that in every lyncher is a hater of labor, a witch-hunter, and a warmonger.

There is a virtual reign of terror now in much of the South and especially in Mississippi. It is condoned by the government and conducted by the same class of "operators" responsible for the lynching system.

It is a campaign of terror waged in desperation by those who seek to crush the Negro liberation movement, to stop labor organization in the South,

*Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.*

to undo, by force and violence, a decision of the United States Supreme Court. If Attorney General Brownell really wants to find advocates and users of force and violence he does not need to concoct cases of "conspiracy" and "membership" against Communists and "prove" they are devotees of violence through the purchased perjuries of degenerate stool-pigeons. There is evidence of the use of violence and it is written in blood all over Mississippi.

The Dixiecrats are desperate because they know that the Negro people are absolutely determined to have their full rights and to have them now. This was yet again typified in the inspiring heroism of the Negro witnesses in the Till lynching trial. They are desperate because the eyes of the world, as never before, are on this country and on the Negro question in this country. Those eyes, belonging to white and yellow and brown and black skinned peoples, numbering hundreds of millions, burn with hatred of racism and of imperialism, and shine with devotion towards liberty and equality. They are desperate because there are more white Americans, North and South, than ever before who are beginning to have some comprehension of the meaning to themselves of the continuance of jim crow and of abominations like lynching that bulwark jim crow—the meaning of this to themselves in terms of bread and butter, of stronger trade-union and political organization, of protecting their own liberties, in terms of their own self-respect. They are desperate because they see the growing unity between Negro and white.

Their desperation is fully warranted; and their complete defeat is possible. There need never be another lynching in our country. And there will not be if each one of us reacts to this latest atrocity as though it were his own son whose battered body had been shipped back to him.

An irresistible demand should arise that denunciations of the lynching of young Till and of the whole damnable jim crow system be forthcoming from the highest levels of the Republican and the Democratic parties. They will be forced to speak out if the people's organizations—and above all the trade-union organizations—demand it, officially, and in thunderous tones.

The honor of our country requires:

Federal intervention now to end the organized defiance of decency and justice in the South;

Immediate implementation of the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in education;

Immediate enforcement of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution, and the unseating of those Congressmen illegally holding office on the basis of the disfranchisement of the Negro people. (For example, in Tallahatchie County, Miss., where the Till youngster was killed, the Negro people make up 65% of the population, but there is no Negro voter!);

Immediate enactment of a federal anti-lynching law;

An end to the poll tax and all other devices to prevent the fullest exercise of all political rights by the Negro people;

The abolition at once of all jim-crow practices by the Federal government and all of its agencies.

By W

THE  
Genev  
feat fo  
the le  
ism, c  
War  
manit  
of nu  
of wh  
was t  
after  
rattler  
China  
occasi  
under  
crate  
atomic  
for th  
co-exis  
less of  
regim  
least,  
war.  
Alo  
milita  
definit  
in all  
broug  
just p  
over t



# Post-Geneva: The Fight for Peaceful Co-Existence

By William Z. Foster

THE BIG FOUR conference, held in Geneva in July, was a major defeat for the warmongers who, under the leadership of American imperialism, ever since the end of World War II, have been threatening humanity with a dreadful holocaust of nuclear world war. The heart of what took place in the conference was that the peoples of the world, after seriously checking the sabre-rattlers during the Korean and Indo-China wars and upon various other occasions, gave the warmakers to understand that they would not tolerate the perspective of any such atomic war. It was a major victory for the principle of the peaceful co-existence of all nations, regardless of the character of their internal regimes. For the time being at least, it lifted the threat of a great war.

Along with this mandate against military warfare, Geneva likewise definitely implied that the cold war, in all its ramifications, should be brought to an end. For in the period just prior to Geneva, the peoples all over the world had made it quite

clear that they were strongly opposed to the insane armaments race and to all the gigantic financial expense and military dangers which this involves. This was the basic mandate of Geneva: to avert the outbreak of a shooting war and to put a stop to the cold war.

But this Geneva mandate does not automatically enforce itself. It has to be fought for by the peace-loving elements, against those reactionary forces who are opposed to most, if not all, of what Geneva stands for. Just what impact Geneva will have upon the history of these years will depend precisely upon the outcome of this struggle between those who are for and those who are against it. Therefore, before discussing Geneva more concretely, let us take a brief look at the major forces upon either side of the struggle around Geneva.

## FOR AND AGAINST GENEVA

The great world forces making for the full realization of the promise of Geneva are the common people—that is, the workers, farmers, intellectuals, small business elements

—of all countries; those of the capitalist, as well as of the Socialist world. They constitute the overwhelming majority of the human race. Their whole impulse is to have international disputes settled peaceably through negotiations. Their basic practical demand is for the peaceful co-existence of all nations. They are opposed to imperialist war and all its works. In this basic respect they are virtually immune to the slick pro-war propaganda of the imperialists. They constitute the immense and immovable rock upon which the world conquest plans of Wall Street imperialism are being shipwrecked.

The second basic peace forces, striving to make real the spirit of Geneva, are the governments of the countries of people's democracy and Socialism—the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the people's democracies in Europe and Asia, who speak directly in the name of over one-third of humanity. In the fight for peace and a sane world, based upon peaceful co-existence, the great advantage of these progressive states is that in this vital matter their interests and those of the world democratic masses dovetail together perfectly. From the ground up, these nations are the enemies of imperialist aggression and war. They are a strong steel rod strengthening the world peace camp, the forces that want to have Geneva mark the beginning of a world in which the dread monster War will no longer plague humanity. Significantly allied with

them in an active desire for peace are India and many of the lesser capitalist states.

One of the very greatest handicaps faced by the countries of Socialism and people's democracy in establishing their new regimes over the years and in bringing their blessings of prosperity and freedom in the maximum to their respective peoples, has been imperialist war. This has hung like a millstone about their necks, hamstringing their general economic and political development. Thus, for example, the Soviet Union, which was a backward country industrially when the Revolution came in October 1917, was devastated by six years of imperialist and civil war. Then came the long and harsh struggle to build up the heavy industries, starting from the ground up, in order to develop a potential defense against the rising Hitler threat. After this severe and protracted effort, the country was devastated again in World War II, with half of its industry wiped out and with its agriculture decimated. Over 12,000,000 Soviet people lost their lives in the war. Hardly had this catastrophe concluded than the country again has had to strain its every resource in order to meet the urgent war threat that came from American imperialism. The ensuing bitter struggle to build up a military force capable of defending the regime and its people against the new aggressors, required a super-human effort and it entailed much underplay of the consumers' goods industries, the assump-

tion  
by th  
of lo  
masse  
essary  
Or  
ple's d  
time  
utilize  
wholl  
living  
masse  
eral v  
a sca  
world  
tries f  
to pas  
worki  
it that  
the gr  
hope  
threat  
ing of  
sions  
develo  
will r  
the la  
more  
talist  
Thi  
ful fo  
monop  
particu  
They  
the pe  
ence, s  
eva co  
cold v  
to rea  
roaring  
need t  
war (e

tion of many strict self-disciplines by the people, and the acceptance of lower living standards by the masses than otherwise would be necessary.

Once the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies get rid of this long-time war waste and are enabled to utilize their soaring production wholly for the improvement of the living and cultural standards of the masses, they will develop their general well-being at a rate and upon a scale hitherto unknown in the world. All this was why these countries fought so hard to bring Geneva to pass, and it is also why they are working so tirelessly now to see to it that the conference shall produce the great peace results that the masses hope for—the liquidation of the threat of atomic war and the ending of the murderous strains and tensions of the cold war. This rapid development of the Socialist lands will raise and inspire the fight of the labor movement to higher and more effective levels in all the capitalist countries.

Third: the chief and most powerful forces opposing Geneva are the monopoly capitalists of the world, particularly those of Wall Street. They have strong interests against the perspective of peaceful co-existence, such as flowed from the Geneva conference. They require the cold war in order to enable them to reap fabulous profits from the roaring armament industries; they need the implied or actual threat of war (even though, in the main, they

now largely realize that the prospects of their carrying through a world war successfully have vanished) so that, with their huge armaments, they can intimidate the peoples of their own and other countries. Especially is all this true of American imperialism, with its objective of world domination. This domination program Washington has by no means abandoned, despite the fact that Geneva gave its war policies and perspectives a rude defeat.

World capitalism, in the post-Geneva period, finds itself in a very precarious position. It is increasingly a prey to its general crisis, which began to develop at the time of World War I and the Russian Revolution. It has lost one-third of the world to Socialism; its colonial system, which was a great bulwark of world capitalism, has been largely shattered as a result of the many colonial liberation revolutions and movements; its economic system is also sick in its most vital fibres, the present hectic capitalist "prosperity" resting primarily upon the unstable basis of repairing the damages and filling the commodity shortages caused by World War II and upon the present huge preparations for another world war. After World War I, during the 1920's, world capitalism managed to stabilize itself partially for a few years, but there is no such stabilization perspective in store for the much sicker capitalist system of today, following World War II. This does

not mean, however, that the graph made by decaying world capitalism is that of a direct and continuous decline. On the contrary, the graph is a zig-zag, with ups and downs, but going in a general downward direction. The capitalist system may experience periods of temporary easing of its elementary decline, as in its present post-war economic spurt; but its basic course carries it into an ever deepening general crisis.

The monopolists of the capitalist world, with Wall Street in the forefront, have many fears regarding the ending of the cold war, as implied by Geneva. They are afraid that inevitably this would entail heavy armaments cuts, with a consequent slash in their unprecedented profits, and they also fear that seriously reduced production in this sphere would have catastrophic effects upon the present war-created "prosperity" in the capitalist countries. They are afraid, too, that if the war hysteria should be fully ended the capitalist nations, in consequence of their multitudinous contradictions in their economic and political interests, would take to colliding heavily with each other instead of with the "Reds"—see Turkey and Greece, Israel and Egypt, etc. They believe also that, once released from the war scare, organized labor, breaking with its present paralyzing class collaborationism, would take up a more active defense of basic working-class interests. Especially American imperialism dreads that ending the arms race and the tensions of the

cold war would be disastrous to its fight for world mastery. Deep in the consciousness of the big monopolists of all capitalist countries also is the fear that if, by the liquidation of the cold war, the Socialist peoples of the world are freed from the crippling burdens and wastes of maintaining a vast military organization in national defense, they will then be able to surge ahead with such a rapid development of mass well-being among their peoples as to have revolutionary consequences upon the workers and other oppressed and exploited elements throughout the capitalist world. They dread the revolutionary example of such a demonstration of the effectiveness of Socialism for the working masses. The above considerations are some of the main reasons why the bulk of big capitalist monopolists, notably those in the United States, look with such a jaundiced eye upon Geneva and also why they must be considered and dealt with as the main obstacles to the realization of the peace hopes generated by that historic gathering.

#### DIFFERENT REACTIONS TO THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

The three broad groups described above have responded in character during the weeks that have elapsed since the holding of the Geneva conference. First, the masses of the people all over the world and not least the American people have given an enthusiastic welcome to the peace

current  
has be  
ments  
the w  
organi  
notabl  
of the  
nated  
ary M  
are di  
One  
ations  
lar ap  
around  
Peace  
eva, in  
this of  
beyond  
operati  
ing sci  
change  
collecte  
rosanct  
whole  
proving  
the m  
was al  
dous re  
of far  
United  
during  
countri  
to the  
temons  
friendly  
nations  
disarma  
with th  
meeting  
nosphe  
erest a  
Second

currents expressed at Geneva. This has been demonstrated by the statements of the leaders and press of the workers' and general peoples' organizations all over the world, a notable exception being in the case of the American trade unions dominated by the clique of ultra-reactionary Meany type of misleaders, who are diehard warmongers.

One of the most striking manifestations of the almost universal popular approval of Geneva developed around the international Atoms-For-Peace conference, also held in Geneva, in August. The attendance at this official UN conference ran far beyond expectations. A strongly cooperative spirit animated the attending scientists, and as they freely exchanged much, if not all, of their collected data upon the hitherto sacrosanct subject of nuclear energy, the whole people's world responded approvingly. Hardly less significant, the mass backing behind Geneva was also expressed by the tremendous reception given to the exchange of farm delegations between the United States and the Soviet Union during July and August. In both countries this important event rose to the height of a broad people's demonstration for peace and for friendly cooperation between the two nations. And at this writing the disarmament conference, freighted with the people's peace hopes, is also meeting in an unprecedented atmosphere of worldwide popular interest and concern.

Second, the government of the

countries of people's democracy and Socialism, fully in harmony with the peace spirit of the world's working masses, are showing their hearty support of Geneva both in words and in concrete actions. Not only has the U.S.S.R. lifted practically all travel restrictions and issued a sweeping amnesty for political prisoners, but it has also announced a cut of 640,000 in its armed forces, to go into effect at the end of this year. And most recently it has returned the Porkalla base to Finland, forty years before its lease ran out. In the same spirit, that the way to disarm is to disarm, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania and Albania have also voluntarily decided to reduce their armies by 47,000, 34,000, 40,000, 18,000, 20,000 and 9,000 men respectively. People's China, repeatedly stating that it is prepared to settle amicably in conference all outstanding questions at issue between the U.S.A. and itself, has voluntarily released the much-mooted eleven American flyers, and has also agreed, in the unofficial U.S.-People's China conference now going on, to allow all other Americans in China, some of whom are guilty of serious counter-revolutionary actions against the people's state, to leave the country.

Thirdly, on the other hand and contravening the people's peace spirit, the Wall Street big monopolists, represented by the Eisenhower government, which had to be pushed into the Geneva conference in the first place, have become distinctly alarmed

at the sweeping popular backing of Geneva among the peoples of the world, including the people of the United States. Through all their gigantic propaganda sources they are warning their allies and followers everywhere not to go overboard on Geneva. This oppositional attitude reached the stage where President Eisenhower, in his speech of August 24th, definitely threw cold water upon the enthusiastic reception given to the Geneva conference by the masses everywhere. Among other negative attitudes, he placed impossible demands as imperative essentials for real peace. These included, in substance, that the people's democracies of Eastern Europe return to capitalism and that the Communist Parties throughout the world be liquidated. This is the old and discredited Dulles "liberation" policy refurbished. It is based on the assumption that only capitalism has a right to exist in the world. Neither of these arrogant demands can or will be realized by Wall Street.

On August 25th, James Reston, star reporter for the *New York Times*, declared that the President's speech indicated: "The Eisenhower Administration has reached a policy decision to put a brake on the optimism created by the Big Four conference last month in Geneva." John Foster Dulles and Vice-President Nixon, a few days later, also spoke in the same derogatory vein, each raising more barriers against world peace and expressing themselves in the tone of world bosses, to which

they are so accustomed. These several speeches, playing down Geneva, were followed up on radio and television and in the daily press by a barrage of anti-Soviet propaganda, reminiscent of the pre-Geneva period.

In the center of this, to say the least, unenthusiastic response to Geneva on the part of the United States government, is the key determination, expressed again and again by authoritative spokesmen, to the effect that the United States has no foreseeable perspective of disarming substantially. Just at the time when the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries, upon their own initiative, are deeply cutting their armed forces, the Eisenhower Administration is letting it be known that, in any event, it intends to keep up and to increase its military strength. James Reston (the *Times*, Sept. 6th), summarizing the recent speech of D. A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force, says: "The United States was not thinking at all about a disarmament in which everybody would disarm to the point where nobody would have sufficient power to wage a major war" instead, says he, the United States aims for "the retention of overwhelming air-atomic power." Along the same line, Walter Lippmann (*N. Y. Herald-Tribune*, Sept. 1) in dealing with the current meeting of the United Nations disarmament commission, stated: "We are not proposing to disarm. We are proposing to keep our armaments, including atomic bombs, and what we

want  
pre  
publi  
are."  
In  
line,  
the v  
and i  
steps,  
an ar  
to th  
tage  
in M  
confe  
the U  
third;  
tary  
makin  
revolu  
be inc  
of co  
Amer  
nound  
forma  
made  
Czech  
pose  
the l  
racies.  
to pre  
non-ex  
Chine  
tivate  
forces,  
famous  
ican-P  
everyt  
in the  
army  
in fan  
N. Y.  
genera

want of the Soviet Union and are prepared to give them in return, is publicity about where the armaments are."

In the furtherance of this cold war line, the United States government, the voice of Wall Street, has taken and is taking a number of important steps, among them: insistence upon an armed and reactionary Germany, to the point of attempting to sabotage the German-Soviet negotiations in Moscow and the October general conference; preparations to increase the United States Air Force by one-third; an announcement that a military treaty with Japan is in the making; Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary army on Formosa is to be increased by ten divisions, which, of course, are to be equipped at American expense; and an announcement of new American army formations of air-borne commandoes, made up of renegade Russians, Czechs, Rumanians, etc., for the purpose of eventually fighting behind the lines of the people's democracies. At this time also, avowedly to prepare American soldiers against non-existent "brain-washing" by the Chinese "enemy," but actually to cultivate a spirit of sadism in the armed forces, in the tradition of the infamous "water cure" in the American-Philippines war and the "bomb everything that moves" practice in the Korean war, United States army recruits are to be trained in fantastic torture methods (see the *N. Y. Post*, Sept. 7th). In the same general militant spirit, significantly,

the House Un-American Activities Committee, seeking to re-create an atmosphere in the country, has embarked upon a whole series of new thought-control inquisitions.

The above indicated cold war measures, based upon the assumption that in the future the world will have to face up to two world military camps armed to the teeth, is contrary to the spirit of Geneva, as well as to the peace will of the great masses of humanity all over the world. It also conflicts with the disarmament proposals of the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the people's democracies in general, which have repeatedly declared for the abolition of the A- and H-bombs and for a progressive process of world disarmament. Official U.S. policy makes for a continuation of the cold war, with the danger of a shooting war always lingering in the background. It shows definitely just what forces the peace-loving peoples of the world have to combat in order to bring to reality the hopes and perspectives of Geneva.

The United States Government, however, will find itself unable to push through these militant cold war policies. First: it will confront an increasing demand at home from the mass forces making for a program of peaceful coexistence. These forces will embrace not only workers and other democratic elements, but also important sections of the bourgeoisie, and even of monopoly capital itself. This domestic opposition will more and more challenge the aggressive



policies of American imperialism in every field—financial, economic, political and ideological. Second: the Washington proponents of the cold war will also have to face a stiffer resistance from their foreign “allies.” These imperialist powers, whose basic interests conflict with those of United States imperialism at many points, will be less and less inclined to take orders from Wall Street and more inclined to follow active policies of their own making. The whole system of war alliances that the U.S. has so laboriously constructed will be increasingly weakened by internal dissensions and conflicts. In short, the same elementary forces on a domestic and world scale that operated successfully at Geneva to halt Wall Street’s program of world atomic war will continue to operate to block its program of militant cold war.

#### THE FIGHT TO END THE COLD WAR

The Communist Party statement—contained in the September number of *Political Affairs*—gives a clear lead as to the practical tasks confronting the workers and the peace-loving masses generally in this country, in order to carry out the elementary objectives of Geneva. These need not be repeated here. In this article it is timely only to make a few remarks regarding the general conditions under which the continuing peace struggle has to be waged.

During the past eight years, since the United States launched the cold

war with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan in 1947, the task of the Communist Party and the rest of the world peace forces has been clear—to fight against every aspect of the cold war, while at the same time guarding against the overall danger of an atomic world war. Now, following Geneva, the big job is systematically to liquidate the cold war—for one would be foolish to conclude that this has been ended. For the time being, at least, Geneva has abated the threat of a world war; but so long as this country’s government is in the hands of agents of monopoly capital, as it is now, who are controlling a gigantic military machine, with its ramifications all over the world, there will always lurk the danger of war, and this will have to be guarded against.

One thing we must be very conscious of in fighting to end the cold war—this is the fact that, despite the many knotty and difficult diplomatic problems presented internationally, they have all been made easier and more capable of solution by what happened at Geneva. This was made evident by the progress achieved in easing the very difficult German question at the recent Soviet-German conference in Moscow. The heart of the cold war, the factor that tripled the difficulties in the path of all international negotiations, was the threat of world war that Wall Street kept brandishing before humanity. But now that this weapon has at least temporarily been knocked out of the hands of the war-

monger  
their  
Many  
hereto  
activate  
find it  
sible, t  
forces s  
profit f  
not be  
pread  
fore th  
will fir  
the Am  
import  
There  
before  
ral job  
ending  
nificat  
zation  
revitali  
re-estab  
the sea  
United  
cuation  
of the  
bases, a  
All the  
system  
call for  
and fle  
whole  
ems is  
disarm  
nearly  
is the  
inue, t  
form o  
basic o  
arms fr  
notwid



mongers, this softens up materially their whole sabre-rattling set-up. Many and powerful reactionaries, therefore, will try tirelessly to reactivate the war threat, but they will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to do so. That is, if the peace forces remain on the alert, those who profit from war scares and war will not be able to re-create the widespread war fears that prevailed before the Geneva conference. They will find increasing resistance from the American people, including from important business circles.

There are many and urgent tasks before the peace forces in this central job of easing world tensions and ending the cold war—such as the reunification of Germany, the reactivation of NATO and SEATO, the revitalizing of East-West trade, the re-establishment of cultural relations, the seating of People's China in the United Nations, the American evacuation of Germany, the dismantling of the U.S. world network of air-bases, and numerous other problems. All these tasks must be undertaken systematically, and their solution will call for endless patience, resolution, and flexibility. The center of this whole complex of diplomatic problems is the general question of world disarmament. This is the key to nearly all the other issues. So long as the arms race is allowed to continue, the cold war will go on in one form or another. Geneva has created basic opportunities for lessening the arms frenzy, and this can be realized, notwithstanding the loudly-voiced

determination of Wall Street's political spokesmen to maintain and increase the armed forces of the United States and its "allies."

With the whole world crying out that an atomic world war is unthinkable and with even President Eisenhower conceding that the Soviet Government sincerely desires peace, it becomes increasingly difficult for the arms monopolists (save for profit considerations) to find any convincing reasons why armaments should be continuously piled up in this and other capitalist countries. From now on the demand for a progressive reduction and eventual abandonment of the arms race will increase in this country, as elsewhere.

Indeed, already the demand for disarmament is spreading fast. The *New York Post* (September 2) has the following to say about how this movement is developing abroad: "Leading NATO allies are evincing an alarming intent to slash defense plans. The list includes Britain, France, Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands." Turkey is also letting it be known that, unless the United States comes across with bigger subsidies, it is going to cut its military program. Likewise, Japan, swept by peace sentiment, is protesting against the statement made by its Foreign Minister Shigemitsu to the effect that that country, now being re-armed by the United States, is being readied for an active role in Western "defense." In West Germany, too, rising peace sentiment is creat-

ing new obstacles to Wall Street's plans for the re-armament of that country. And in the United States, despite all the clamor of the militarists, the mass demand for a deep slash in the present monstrous arms appropriations and in the over-swollen armed forces will grow rapidly. In all probability, also, the United States, despite the expressed determination of the Government to keep up and even to increase its military forces, and notwithstanding its "heads-I-win, tails-you-lose" conception of negotiations, with the USSR making all the concessions, will, in the face of the world-wide peace demand, be forced to make some steps in the direction of partial disarmament or slowdown of the arms race, at the current United Nations conference on this question and possibly also at the present General Assembly meeting of the U.N.

In the United States the fight to end the cold war will be greatly aided by the pressures of the common people of the world for peace. The time is past when, disregarding world opinion, the moguls of the imperialist countries, the United States included, could, without restraint, carry out their policies of reaction and aggression. This is true not only of foreign, but also of major domestic policy. During the past several years the Wall Street imperialists have been taught this new and vital lesson upon a number of occasions. Thus, it was largely indignation abroad at the American Jim Crow system that compelled the

U.S. Government to at least partially desegregate its armed forces, and the same foreign democratic pressure had very much to do with the Supreme Court's issuing its order to desegregate the schools. It was also largely due to the tremendous opposition abroad against the rising menace of fascism in the United States that McCarthy came a cropper and found himself so discredited. McCarthy fatally compromised Wall Street's pretenses abroad of democracy, so he had to be disciplined. Finally, of course, there was the classic check administered to American imperialism's whole war program by the peoples of the world at the Geneva conference. International democratic pressure has now become a great constructive force in the world, which cannot be ignored by imperialist rulers, and which will play a decisive role in the struggle everywhere to end the cold war in all its manifestations.

In striving to liquidate the cold war, the greatest weakness of the peace forces in the United States is the ultra-reactionary character of the Meany group of mis-leaders now dominating the A. F. of L., and soon to have their influence spread further, through the current merger of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. These people, who have nothing in common with the interests of the working class, are definitely a part of the reactionary forces which are trying to negate Geneva and to continue with the cold war. In this respect, these policies echo those of Wall

Street a  
ideology  
and K.  
years esp  
worked  
with the  
try. Thi  
big bos  
inued  
ing, whi  
ed that  
It also  
want th  
But M  
ense re  
of the g  
sts in  
initely  
to the t  
the who  
with its  
expendi  
This ba  
also bei  
in offic  
number  
do not  
of conti  
such as  
course  
States m  
attack a  
for a m  
workers  
ests. T  
United  
ng cla  
more an  
enge to  
of the  
One  
importa

Street and they reflect the warlike ideology of the McCarthys, Nixons, and Knowlands. For the past 15 years especially these misleaders have worked in the closest collaboration with the big monopolists of the country. This open partnership with the big bosses explains their long-continued warmongering and red-baiting, which in many cases has exceeded that of the capitalists themselves. It also explains why they do not want the cold war liquidated.

But Meany and his cronies in no sense represent the spirit or interest of the great masses of trade unionists in this country. The latter definitely want an end put, not only to the threat of atomic war but to the whole practice of the cold war, with its arms race, huge armaments expenditures, and domestic reaction. This basic spirit of the workers is also being expressed more and more in official ranks, as clearly large numbers of trade union leaders also do not share the Meany conception of continuing the cold war. Whether such as Meany like it or not, the course of events in the United States makes for a sharpening of the attack against the cold war and also for a more intensive defense of the workers' economic and political interests. The coming period in the United States will be one of increasing class struggle. There will be more and more of the workers' challenge to the ultra-reactionary policies of the Meany type of leadership.

One immediate task of no little importance in the struggle to realize

the peace perspectives of Geneva is to send an American labor delegation to the USSR to establish contact with the great trade unions of that country. But Mr. Meany has the arrogance to state that the American trade union movement will send no such delegation. Politicians, newspapermen, actors, businessmen, scientists, farmers, women, clerics, and the youth are sending one delegation after another, to improve cultural and political relationships between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. It is intolerable, therefore, that organized labor should fail to fulfill its progressive peace role in this general respect. Like the workers in other countries are doing, the organized trade unionists in this country should also send their delegations to the U.S.S.R. and invite the Soviet workers to have their union representatives visit this country.

The coming A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merger, which is scheduled to take place at a series of conventions this December, also faces important tasks regarding the easing of the cold war and world tensions. In this respect it will constitute a real challenge to the progressive forces in the American labor movement. It would be a serious setback for the general peace situation if the Meany pro-cold war policies were to prevail at the merger conventions. The new body must speak out clearly for peace. The newly merged organization possesses enormous potential power for the working class. One of the first steps in realizing this potential is to com-

mit the new organization definitely to a policy of peace in the spirit of Geneva. Another needed step, in the same general direction, is to democratize the proposed constitution of the merged labor organization, which has been especially designed to keep the Meany reactionaries in control of the American labor movement. This criticism of the new body's constitution is now being made by numbers of trade union leaders and organizations. The needs of the American labor movement require a program on domestic and international affairs which truly reflects the peace, economic and democratic interests of the American people.

In the 1956 Presidential elections the question of liquidating the cold war, and with it the feverish, over-swollen military build-up of the United States, should also be made a vital issue. Inasmuch as the workers, in the main, function politically through the Democratic Party, this requires that a fight be conducted in the ranks of that party against the Harriman-Meany-Truman-Paul Douglas pro-cold war line. Such attitudes conflict with the strong peace will of the workers and the whole American people, and if the Democrats do not reject them and take a pro-Geneva stand, this could contribute heavily to a Republican victory in the Fall elections. Organized labor will make a fundamental error in the elections if it does not put itself at the head of the mass peace sentiment in this country

and bring forth a program to end the cold war by fighting against all of its many manifestations.

Presidents Meany and Reuther of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. both aver that the current merger of their two organizations will produce increase political activity by the labor movement. This assertion is good, so far as it goes; but it is necessary nevertheless to see to it that this stepped-up political activity is directed toward advancing the true interests of the working class. Among others, this calls for two basic considerations: first, that it be aimed at breaking the grip of the militarists upon this country and to writing "Finis" to their cold war; and second, that it move in the direction of developing independent political action of the working class. The American labor movement has far too long, dragged tamely after the two bourgeois political parties and their reactionary leaders and programs. If the labor movement, during the coming period, lives up to the spirit of the Geneva conference, by fighting against the warmongers and arms profiteers, one of the sure results in the near future will be a substantial increase in independent working class political action; first within the Democratic Party (as outlined in the program of the Communist Party) and ultimately in the direction of creating a great labor-farmer party, worthy of a labor movement with some 16,000,000 members.

By St

READER  
unfol  
tembe  
a two  
360 C  
nal S

It w  
page  
nature  
tion-w  
mere  
spoke  
politic  
For h  
munis  
law o  
Augu  
tution  
Securi  
Act.  
Presid  
which  
bers a  
munis  
and "  
zation  
legal  
suppo  
of var  
treated

It w  
otherw

# The Battle Against the McCarran Act

By Simon W. Gerson

READERS of the *New York Times* unfolded their newspaper on September 16, 1955 to be confronted by a two-column headline on page 1: 360 *Citizens Ask Voiding of Internal Security Act.*

It was, of course, worthy of front-page attention. But the respectful nature of the attention and its nation-wide scope reflected more than mere journalistic acumen. They spoke volumes about the changing political atmosphere in our nation. For here was a case where the Communist Party—itsself declared an outlaw organization by Congress in August 1954—challenged the constitutionality of the so-called Internal Security Act of 1950, the McCarran Act. This is the law, passed over President Truman's veto in 1950, which requires registration of members and officers of so-called "Communist-action," "Communist-front" and "Communist-infiltrated" organizations. Far from being derided, this legal action of the C.P. was being supported by 360 prominent citizens of various political views—and being treated most respectfully by the press.

It was, of course, difficult to do otherwise. For the signers included

80 clergymen—rabbis, ministers, and bishops; 76 teachers, professors and college presidents; 25 authors, editors and publishers; 25 physicians; 13 lawyers, including two judges; more than a score of Negro leaders and trade unionists, and one United States Senator. It was difficult for the press to be anything but respectful of a list of "friends of the court" which included three Nobel Prize winners and one United States Senator, Pat McNamara, Democrat of Michigan and only trade unionist in the upper chamber.

Newspaper efforts to get the Senator from Michigan to repudiate his signature fell flat. The Senator, whose main political base is the powerful Michigan labor movement, especially the CIO United Auto Workers, showed a special sensitivity to the right of association. He said flatly that the McCarran Act

attempts to take away the basic right of free association guaranteed to the American people by the Bill of Rights.

While I abhor the Communist Party I was happy on this occasion to join with a group of public-spirited citizens who, while they made no defense of the Communist Party, are deeply

concerned about the liberties of the American people.

Editorial attack on the Senator by the Detroit *Free Press* has been more than outweighed by the numerous congratulatory messages he received from Michigan and elsewhere. Similar editorial assaults by the Scripps-Howard *World Telegram and Sun* of New York have failed to move the signers. Even the fleabite attack of James T. Farrell on behalf of the so-called American Committee for Cultural Freedom produced no defections (particularly since it was obvious that Mr. Farrell and his publicity man had released the statement without polling his committee). On the contrary, newspapers like the Providence *Journal* editorially praised the signers and their friend-of-the-court brief. Even the conservative Springfield, Mass., *News*, while engaging in some of the usual anti-Communist demonology, felt it necessary to remind its readers editorially that the Constitution protects Communists, too. It said (Sept. 16, 1955):

We do not believe that it is necessary to protect the country by using unconstitutional means even against those who would subvert it. . . . If it trespasses on civil liberties and is therefore not constitutional, then the law will be set aside.

We are a nation of laws, and those laws protect every man, even the Communist.

\* \* \*

The chronology of the battle of

the McCarran Act, soon to come to a legal climax in the United States Supreme Court, provides something of a political weather map of the pressures of our times. By plotting the course of the McCarran Act one can trace the tortuous struggle to maintain democracy in the America of the cold war.

Sponsors of the McCarran Act, coming from the extreme Right in American politics, were casting about for years for a legislative weapon by which to clamp down on the Communist Party, on progressive organizations and, finally, on that great loose coalition of labor, Negro people's, farm and independent groups which made up the New Deal. Reactionary lawyers hit upon the idea of outlawing the Communist Party by compelling it to register as a foreign agent. Sen. Mundt introduced a bill in the 80th Congress (1947) that would have required the Communist Party by name to register as a foreign agent without any judicial or even quasi-judicial hearings. But this was so raw that the then Attorney General (now Supreme Court Justice) Clark advised the Congress that this singling out of the Communist Party was probably unconstitutional. Because of these warnings the House Un-American Activities Committee reported out a somewhat revised measure, the notorious Mundt-Nixon bill in the second session of the 80th Congress (1948), touching off a historic mass fight which defeated the measure.

The weasel reasoning that went into the drafting of the measure is worth recalling. Rep. (now Vice-President) Nixon said bluntly that the bill of which he was co-sponsor was simply seeking "a legislative device for meeting the problem in a constitutional manner."

Their "problem," as Nixon knew, was a difficult one under our Constitution. It was how to order the Communist Party to register as a seditious conspiracy controlled by a foreign power without real proof and without naming it. The McCarran Act is the "legislative device" to solve Nixon's "problem."

The Act adopts the shabbily transparent device of not naming the Communist Party but referring to some mythical apparently anonymous "Communist Action" organization. Then it goes on to make certain "findings" of the usual horrendous sort about an alleged world Communist conspiracy. It then sets up a Subversive Activities Control Board, wholly dependent on Congress for its very existence, to "rule" on its findings. It would be like a master making a finding that his neighbor was a rascal and then having five of his paid servants solemnly sit in judgment on the allegedly rascally neighbor. Under these circumstances, with guilt legislatively pre-determined, the verdict of the S.A.C.B. is, as the late Vito Marcantonio pointed out, "built in" to the Act. As the Communist Party brief to the Supreme Court said: "It would be fatuous to expect the

Board to overrule legislative findings on the identical issues it is supposed to determine."

This confirms again the axiom that an unconstitutional law generally requires by its very nature unconstitutional means of enforcement. The reactionary Congress majority, faced with an insoluble constitutional problem—how to outlaw the Communist Party and many other organizations—simply "found" that the Party was a foreign agency, part of an alleged world conspiracy and set up a five-member board to rubber-stamp its "findings."

The principal test as to whether a group is a foreign agent of a "Communist totalitarian dictatorship" (they mean the Soviet Union), is the alleged identity of views with those of the Soviet Union, the infamous "non-deviation" test. Under this fantastic non-deviation test the stigma of foreign control and sedition can be avoided only by taking a position contrary to that of the Soviet Union. If the U.S.S.R. takes a position that is demonstrably true, the only safe thing under this obscurantist provision is for an American organization to take the opposite one—even if the opposite is a demonstrably false one.

Under this Goebbels-like ideological yardstick any parallelism with Soviet views becomes perilous. How this can work out even to the detriment of a President Eisenhower was indicated recently, tongue-in-cheek fashion, by the gifted Washington journalist, I. F. Stone. Discussing a



recent SACB proceeding against the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, Stone wrote:

In 1945 General Eisenhower cabled a rally of this same Council, 'American Soviet Friendship is one of the cornerstones on which the edifice of peace should be built.' In 1955, at Geneva, this is exactly the premise on which Eisenhower operated. In this the Administration parallels declared Soviet aims for peace and co-existence. Is Eisenhower then a Communist front? (*I. F. Stone's Weekly*, Sept. 19, 1955)

Failure to comply with the law—which requires registration of members, officers, finances, printing presses, mimeograph machines and labeling of all printed and mailed material—brings astronomical penalties. Failure to register is punishable by imprisonment up to five years, fine up to \$10,000, or both. *Each day of failure to register constitutes a separate offense.* A person failing to register for 30 days, for example, would be liable to 150 years in jail and a \$300,000 fine!

Obviously, this is no regulatory act or simple disclosure law. It is rather an outlawry statute. As broadened by the Communist Control Act of 1954 it drags millions more into its net, especially trade unionists. Under the terms of the law the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union is being prosecuted and the Attorney General has announced that this is but the opening gun of his drive against allegedly Communist-infiltrated unions. What constitutes so-called Communist in-

filtration is a matter that the Attorney General decides. Perhaps the powerful CIO United Auto Workers Union, now being prosecuted under the Corrupt Practices Act for daring to use union funds to help elect Sen. McNamara, will in the not-too-distant future be regarded by the Cadillac Cabinet and its Attorney General as "Communist-infiltrated."

\* \* \*

Mundt, McCarran, Nixon & Co. found the going rough in 1948 and 1949, despite the increasingly lowered temperatures of the cold war. The wide opposition made it necessary for them to find new legislative stratagems, but it was not until the Korean war broke out in 1950 that they felt their moment had come. A drive to jam through the McCarran Act got under way promptly, stimulated by the Court of Appeals decision in the Dennis case. On August 8, 1950 President Truman sent the Congress a message in which he warned against "extremists who urge us to adopt police state measures." He went on:

Such persons advocate breaking down the guarantees of the Bill of Rights in order to get at the Communists. They forget that if the Bill of Rights were to be broken down, all groups, even the most conservative, would be in danger from the arbitrary power of the government.

But it was too late. The reactionaries were utilizing to the full Truman's own cold war measures and the intervention in Korea. Sen-

ate lib  
moral;  
hunting  
that n  
worsen  
vetoed  
ment,  
rible m

Unfo  
provisi  
and un  
and p  
tions. .

Obvi  
statute  
would  
might  
leviatin  
Comm  
no one  
views v  
table t  
views o

But  
not ba  
of his  
ship—v  
overroo  
to 10;

Shor  
Activit  
pointed  
er 22  
iled w  
regist  
nunist  
f evid  
Vito M  
nunist  
with Jo  
Vitness  
Gates,



ate liberals became completely demoralized and developed a tactic of hunting with the hounds, a tactic that not only discredited them but worsened the legislation. Truman vetoed the bill in a 5,500-word statement, holding that it was a "terrible mistake" and adding:

Unfortunately, these [registration] provisions are not merely ineffective and unworkable. They represent a clear and present danger to our institutions. . . .

Obviously, if this law were on the statute books, the part of prudence would be to avoid saying anything that might be construed by someone as not deviating sufficiently from the current Communist propaganda line. And since no one could be sure in advance what views were safe to express, the inevitable tendency would be express no views on controversial subjects.

But Truman's words—which were not backed up by the great power of his office and his party leadership—were to no avail. The Senate overrode his veto by a vote of 57 to 10; the House by 286 to 48.

Shortly afterwards a Subversive Activities Control Board was appointed by Truman and on November 22, 1950 the Attorney General filed with the Board a petition for a registration order against the Communist Party. Months of taking of evidence followed, with the late Vito Marcantonio heading the Communist Party's legal defense, along with John J. Abt and Joseph Forer. Witnesses for the Party were John Gates, then serving a five-year term

under the Smith Act in Atlanta penitentiary; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, party leader then on trial herself under the Smith Act, and Herbert Aptheker, the noted Marxist writer and historian. Government witnesses were the usual run of Department of Justice informer, except for Prof. Philip Mosely, the so-called Russian specialist at Columbia. Stool-pigeons included Louis Budenz, John Lautner, Ben Gitlow, Paul Crouch, Manning Johnson, Mary Markward, Harvey Matusow and a few others of the sordid stable. (Matusow has since admitted that he lied in these hearings, as in so many others.) Nevertheless, the built-in verdict came down as expected on April 20, 1953 with its order to the party to register.

This decision was appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals which affirmed the Court's order, 2 to 1, last December. The current appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, scheduled to be heard this Fall, is from the decision of the Appeals Court. It is this appeal, a 270-page brief for which was filed by the Party on Sept. 13, which was supported by the 360 prominent citizens mentioned earlier.

\* \* \*

We are now in the opening phase of a great popular reaction against McCarthyism. Undoubtedly, the stubborn fight of the American people—not the least of which was the valiant battle of the Communists to maintain and extend democracy—helped bring this about. But the decisive element without question was

the registering of the ascendancy of the forces for peace at Geneva. On this score spokesmen as far apart ideologically as Communist leader Claude Lightfoot and Walter Lippmann agree basically. Comrade Lightfoot writes in the September *Political Affairs* that "the basis for these democratic changes" can be found "first and foremost" in "the changes that are taking place in the international situation." And, he goes on:

The easing of war tensions systematically makes more difficult the destruction of constitutional liberties . . . as long as it was widely believed that the nation was in immediate danger of war, many were prepared to accept limitations on the Bill of Rights as a necessity.

Lippmann, in his column of August 25, also credits the change in domestic atmosphere as regards civil liberties to the relaxation of war tensions. He writes:

The ultimate reason for the change is, I believe, the enormous emotional relief which has come since all the great powers have acknowledged publicly that there is no alternative to peace, that they cannot contemplate war.

The pall of a terrifying and obsessive fear has been lifted, and men feel free again to care for those things, like their liberties, which they have always cared for.

From this no one should draw any easy conclusions that the Bill of Rights is back in full operation. Since Geneva, two Communists, John

Noto and Max Weiss, were arrested under the Smith Act membership clause. Smith Act trials are under way or in preparation. Grand Juries are in session. Reactionary Congressmen are preparing new witch hunts. And terror rides high against the Negro people. Attorney General Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover are still actively at work against popular liberties. New assaults under the Smith, McCarran, Taft-Hartley and other laws may be anticipated. The Administration can be expected to launch new attacks on the labor movement in a variety of ways. No, the Geneva spirit has by no means changed the Department of Justice or the judicial bureaucracy, despite its vast impact on the world.

For the basic elements of extreme reaction are still present. The relationship of forces in the country is one in which the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital still hold profoundly important positions of power.

And there are still deep illusions in some sections of labor and among some liberals that it is possible to retain civil liberties—about which they are genuinely concerned—while maintaining the monstrous hoax of a Communist conspiracy. They still cling to the pathetic hope that there can be anti-Communist legislation which somehow will exempt them. That is why it is necessary, most patiently and resolutely, to continue to explain in what ways the defense of the rights of the Communists is essential to the defense

of the  
It is  
360 A  
cus b  
forwar  
sary t  
the co  
the civ  
is an i  
to def  
is still  
joinin  
gle fo  
people  
people  
The  
outstar  
the tre  
effecti  
of Rig  
onstra  
urgent  
Carran  
The  
of our  
possibi  
cities,  
campu  
proach

of the rights of all Americans.

It is the great contribution of the 360 Americans who signed the amicus brief that they have made this forward step. But it is still necessary to instill organized labor with the conviction that the defense of the civil liberties of the Communists is an integral part of their own fight to defend their living standards. It is still necessary to bring about the joining of the great stream of struggle for the civil rights of the Negro people with the struggle of all the people for civil liberties.

The amicus brief, signed by 360 outstanding personalities, indicates the tremendous new potentialities for effective struggle to defend the Bill of Rights and specifically to demonstrate to the Supreme Court the urgent necessity of nullifying the McCarran Act.

The statement shows that support of our Party's battle, on the broadest possible basis, can be obtained in the cities, farming communities and campuses of our land. A fresh approach is possible to all organizations

of the people, and above all to the trade unions, whose members can be shown that the fight against the McCarran Act is a fight in defense of the trade unions, and in defense of the Bill of Rights. Prominent community figures, leaders of organizations, and rank and file people can be gotten to support the battle against the McCarran Act, and many of them will be found quite ready now to join in this historic effort to preserve the liberties of our country.

The rising tide of the popular reaction against repression on all fronts makes all this more possible. It is now possible so to broaden the front against reaction by a correct policy of the united front in defense of the Bill of Rights that we can enter what Comrade Lightfoot called "a new era of struggle—an era in which the fascist menace can be decisively crushed." Then, in Jefferson's words, "We shall see the reign of the witches pass over, their spells dissolved, and the people recovering their true sight."

# For a Move to the Left in Italy\*

By Luigi Longo

*Deputy General Secretary, CP of Italy*

THE PRESENT MEETING of the Central Committee follows close upon two important events: on the internal plane—the fall of the Scelba government, on the international plane—the Geneva Conference.

It should not seem strange for us to be speaking of the fall of the Scelba government instead of the formation of the Segni Government. Scelba's fall put an end not only to a government, but also to a system and a policy, whereas the formation of the Segni Government has not marked the beginning of a new course, even though it does not represent a continuation of the old and opens up some new prospects. One thing is clear—Scelba's fall, as Comrade Togliatti has stated, is the good fortune of Italian democracy. But the new policy is still something we must fight for.

The Geneva Conference is indicative of the intention to place relations between states on a new footing and this alone is a positive factor making for the relaxation of tension, and is a sign of the movement to-

wards the elimination of differences. But the goal—peaceful coexistence and international cooperation—is still remote and it too remains something we must fight for.

Apart from these two important facts, glaring political and social contrasts still remain in the country. Anti-communism and the division of the nation have not yet been done away with even though it is expected that the new Government, according to its promises, will not violate the law so crudely. Nor has the social policy of preserving and defending privileges, upon which the government compromise in favor of the industrialist and big landlord organizations rests, been done away with. Despite growing pressure from the people, embracing the rank and file of the government parties, despite the mass struggle involving not only workers and peasants but new sections and categories of the people, despite the widespread unrest, the employers are not giving up their offensive against the freedoms of the workers and the living conditions of the working people. The more reactionary social and political groups oppose every manifestation of internal and international de-

\* From a report to a meeting of the Central Committee, CP of Italy; Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, August 5, 1955; text slightly condensed.

ente. The fall of Scelba and the Geneva Conference were a blow to these forces, but we are still far from seeing them placed in a position in which they would be powerless to do any more harm.

On the whole, therefore, the present state of affairs is characterized by an intensification of the political and social struggle, by some development, although uncertain, of the internal and international situation and by the possibility of achieving concrete results through political activity. Some of the events of these past months, such as Gronchi's election to the presidency, the fall of Scelba, the new orientation of the political groups, the united struggle and the fact that the move to the Left is becoming a matter of current attention, show the possibility of obtaining concrete results and successes which, naturally, should not be overestimated, but should nevertheless not be underestimated. In the situation which is slowly and painfully developing, every step, however slight, is of great importance. This makes it necessary to be able to perceive the positive elements in any situation, to be able to make use of the opportunities for concrete and direct political action: propaganda and agitation of a general character are no longer sufficient; what is needed is political action closely corrected with each peculiarity of the situation, with each moment of it.

We of the Party, are faced with the task of taking action, of influencing

the unrest and the new elements through our political activity, in order to give them greater strength and stability, in order not to leave the field clear for the government and its friends to do as they like undisturbed, and moreover in order to force them to change their course. And on this plane political activity and the struggle for the demands of the broad masses should supplement and support each other.

Our struggle is based on the demand for a move to the Left. It may appear that this formula is a recent one, but its essence has been the basis of our activity ever since the problem arose of recreating the people's unity destroyed by the Christian Democratic Party. Back in 1948 Comrade Togliatti set the task of "rousing all the forces in Italian society that are capable of uniting," in order to "prevent Italy's conversion into a reactionary police state," in order to form "a government of mutual understanding and common action" capable of developing "energetic activity for introducing the social reforms that no longer brook delay." In January, 1954 Togliatti declared: "We are prepared for meetings, discussions, mutual understandings, for common action. Let people capable of doing the same come forward in other parties as well."

This line of policy has never been changed; on the contrary, it has steadily been enriched and made more definite. In their turn, the Socialists made a substantial contribu-

tion to the development of this line with their slogan of "the socialist alternative."

Now, however, with the fall of the Scelba government, there has arisen the possibility of accomplishing at least a move to the Left if not quite a "socialist alternative." The question we are posing is not one of participating in the government and not even one of certain government formulas, but one of a new policy that would be based upon respect for the Constitution, that would put an end to every form of discrimination on the part of the government and the employers, would contribute to a detente and would be guided by the President's Address and the people's desire for the regeneration of the country, so that such a political change would lead to a corresponding social shift benefiting the people. A government of this kind is both necessary and possible.

But the move to the Left remains a goal to be fought for. Not always has the Party mobilized its forces on the necessary scale and with the required enthusiasm, even though there have been exceptions such as the mobilization of broad sections of working people for struggle (farmhands, sharecroppers, school teachers). The slogan of a move to the Left has not always been taken outside the sterile parliamentary game and made something to fight for. The mass organizations have not always taken account of the fact that the political crisis was developing around the fundamental problems

of the workers' struggle and the structure of the national economy, thus favoring the development of action by the masses for their demands.

To win the fight for a move to the Left, it is necessary to get rid of any vestiges of political uncertainty in regard to it. On this question there definitely cannot be and are no differences between Communists and Socialists. Political agreement between the Communist and Socialist Parties does not and must not arise on the basis of the unity of action pact, understood as something abstract, springing from the "contractual obligations" of the two parties; it arises and is renewed on the basis of and through political action.

The Socialist Party has its characteristics, its specific features in action, its policy; the questions which arise as the situation develops are solved by the two working-class parties by means of political action. Today the Socialist Party is not taking action only for a socialist alternative, nor is the Communist Party working only for the participation of Communists and Socialists in the Government, as two diametrically opposed lines of action. In these past weeks Communists and Socialists have both been working simply for a move to the Left, which is the course of its development comprises both lines of action. For the time being, however, the move to the Left signifies something much less. It merely means creating op-

portun  
cooper  
and P  
does r  
for an  
binati  
agents  
landlo  
clude  
able i  
from  
tion o  
fight  
for th  
and C  
The i  
termin  
the m  
which  
be m  
entire  
possib  
The  
day b  
the S  
or eve  
nists  
the fe  
nist a  
and R  
and C  
work  
them  
tion.  
It is  
the S  
darity  
munis  
not h  
stand  
out a  
the S

opportunities for rapprochement and cooperation between all the social and political forces of the people and does not take the form of a demand for any particular government combination, it merely means that the agents of the industrialist and big landlord organizations should be excluded from the Government, to enable it to follow a policy different from the present one. As the situation develops it will be possible to fight for a socialist alternative and for the participation of Socialists and Communists in the government. The important thing is not to determine abstractly which demand is the most advanced, but to select that which in the given circumstances can be most effective in advancing the entire movement and providing new possibilities for development.

The move to the Left cannot today be the aim of the struggle of the Socialists or Communists alone, or even of the Socialists and Communists together. It is the aim of all the forces of the people: Communist and Socialist, Social Democrat and Republican, Christian Democrat and Catholic, each of which must work in its own sphere and all of them together in the general situation.

It is certainly not the intention of the Socialist Party to disrupt its solidarity and unity of action with Communist working people. And this is not because a united action pact stands in the way—that would be but a very frail barrier—but because the Socialist Party is indeed socialist

and is tied up with the broad masses of the working people and therefore cannot renounce its political origins, its very nature and its social bonds; it cannot commit suicide. Failure to see this means understanding nothing of political dialectics.

The formation of the Segni Government did not resolve the political crisis caused by the divorce between the actions of the Government and the desires of the broad working masses. The new Government came into being with the support of the industrialist and big landlord organizations, at the will of Fanfani and Saragat. It would be a mistake to assume, however, that there is nothing new about this. Not only did Scelba fall, but his successor, if he has not rejected the whole of the past, has nevertheless not declared that he means to carry on with the same policy and in the same spirit. It is likewise a fact that the Segni Government cannot do everything it likes or that its friends would like.

The crisis is continuing and makes itself felt. If the Government should want to carry through the compromise it agreed to in the interests of the monopolies, it will not have an easy time of it. If, on the other hand, it should want to satisfy some social demands certain of its representatives talk about, it will definitely have to look for support not to its allies but to its opponents. And in this, too, we shall urge it on, making each elected representative face his conscience and



each Catholic voter weigh the promises and actions of his deputy.

Two major events in Europe—the Austrian State Treaty and the successful outcome of the Soviet-Yugoslav talks—showed that even small states can have an independent and autonomous policy. By lessening military tension on our frontiers they also showed that the time had come for Italy too to rid herself of the bonds and the military burden imposed upon it by foreigners. But our Foreign Minister at first supported the strange thesis that Italy is neither sufficiently small nor sufficiently big to follow a policy independent of the military blocs and then drew from the two events in question a conclusion completely at variance with logic. Our rulers asserted that the detente at our frontiers does not lessen but increases the threat to our security and even went so far as to offer hospitality on Italian territory to the American troops that will be withdrawn from Austria. This is one more proof of extreme subordination. The new Government has changed neither the old Foreign Minister nor the old policy.

At a time when all the leaders of the capitalist countries are re-examining their views, when the heads of the Four Great Powers have been meeting in Geneva and manifesting their good will, when Einstein's message and the appeal of prominent scientists of world repute are focusing the attention of all peo-

ple on the necessity of removing forever the danger of atomic war, when in Italy itself influential people of all trends are giving their support to this idea and Italian peace supporters have added millions of signatures to the hundreds of millions collected throughout the world—at a time when all this is taking place our rulers look on indifferently and go right on as though nothing had happened.

From Helsinki to Geneva there was only one question on the agenda: to establish, at long last, a regime of international coexistence based on atomic and general disarmament and on collective security. From this orientation of the peoples and the statesmen Italy only stands to gain. But our rulers, it seems, are likely to lose all.

If, thanks to the Geneva Conference, there has now emerged in the world a move towards the relaxation of tension and a political course designed to effect this relaxation and achieve coexistence, then nobody can deny that the credit for this belongs to the Soviet Union.

The Geneva Conference therefore signifies a great triumph for the peace policy of the USSR and at the same time for the champions of peace all over the world who since 1951, first in Berlin and then in Helsinki, Vienna and Budapest, have, with the support of hundreds of millions of people, been demanding such a meeting.

As for Italy and her foreign policy,

it is a  
the Ita  
the ap  
to vote  
Italy t  
would  
with th  
relaxat  
and fo  
actiona  
Christi  
yet all  
govern  
ni Gov  
antees  
Henc  
it is n  
this g  
foreign  
Left in  
ternati  
In th  
initiati  
part of  
ing on  
the gov  
toward  
cially r  
and th  
ment  
trends  
be allo  
by cha  
recent  
sinki c  
that "t  
be ach  
which  
jectives  
ments  
tical



it is a fact that on June 7, 1953, the Italian electorate responded to the appeal of Comrade Togliatti to vote "in such a way as to enable Italy to have a government which would actively unite its own efforts with those of all who work for the relaxation of international tension and for peace." But the most reactionary groups which head the Christian Democratic Party do not yet allow the formation of such a government. In this respect the Segni Government offers no better guarantees than did that of Scelba.

Hence, in defense of peace, too, it is necessary to struggle against this government—for a change in foreign policy, for a move to the Left in all matters concerning international relations.

In the new conditions the peace initiative can and must be made part of the national policy, developing on both the parliamentary and the government planes and oriented towards all political sections, especially towards the Catholic masses and their cadres, who are in ferment and among whom various trends are developing that cannot be allowed to peter out. It is not by chance that the Appeal of the recent World Peace Assembly in Helsinki concludes with the statement that "the work of peace can at last be achieved if the forces of peace which set themselves the same objectives—in particular, the movements for peace and the great political organizations whose inspira-

tion is Christian or Socialist—unite their efforts to dissipate distrust and win peace."

But our work must be conducted not only among the forces which already follow us, so that they become better oriented, but also among all political forces, among the rank and file of other parties, especially of the Christian Democratic Party. Is there any possibility of this? The answer can only be positive. There are many facts which prove that and which result, in particular, from an analysis of the significance and variety of the Left trends in the Christian Democratic Party.

The rank and file and also the cadres of Left Catholic trends are leveling well-grounded accusations against the ruling class of industrialists and big monopolies. They are condemning (as was the case at the recent conference in Florence) the fact that "the state and the organs of society are placed at the service of the economic barons." They are demanding nationalization of the Montecatini chemical monopoly and the monopolist electric power groups. They are protesting against the regime of exploitation instituted in the enterprises, which affects Catholic workers too. And because they are weary of useless protests, they are beginning to raise the question of revolutionizing the leadership of the Christian Democratic Party in order to wrest it from the grip of the more reactionary groups. There is also arising the political

problem of seeking and establishing new alliances with the forces which give expression to the demands of the proletarian masses and the people. It is to stop this ferment that the Christian Democratic Party's Secretary Fanfani has taken repressive measures.

If we want our efforts to be fruitful, we must have a deep knowledge of the character and significance of the various forces working within the Christian Democratic Party. The different Christian Democratic and Catholic forces can now be classified as follows: the conservative forces at the head, the popular forces which do not have faith in the leadership and think to alter the party's orientation from within despite the existing division of the national democratic forces; the popular forces which believe that new alliances are needed to change the orientation of the Christian Democratic Party.

We rejoice at all signs of democratic progress within the Christian Democratic ranks. But we must see to it that every contradiction between word and deed, between premise and conclusion, is brought out, for it is not enough to level accusations—it is necessary to act; it is not enough to have a good program—there must be the social forces capable of seeing to it that this program is carried out, and it is not enough to indicate these forces—they must be united, mobilized and set in action.

At present these questions are being energetically discussed in the branch organizations of the Christian Democratic Party, and this is

being done without explicit anti-Communist polemics, without absurd prejudices and sometimes even with sympathy for the decisions which we suggest.

And it is not only among Catholics, but among Social Democrats and Republicans as well, that voices are rising in support of a move to the Left. This confirms the fact that we have a great deal to do in this highly important direction to complete the move to the Left and the struggle for a new policy successfully.

In the enterprises, where the employers have not ceased their offensive, the workers have begun to offer more energetic and militant resistance. Numerous examples bear this out. If it is true that there are many difficulties in the present situation, it is likewise true that these difficulties do not make struggle impossible and do not justify the pessimistic and skeptical moods that are manifest here and there.

These moods are seen to be even less justified when the developments of the past ten years are examined. Much has changed since 1945, but it would be utterly erroneous to maintain that the working-class movement has lost ground. On the whole, the Party and the working-class forces have not grown weaker; in general they have maintained their positions and on some sectors even extended and deepened them, while in other cases they have retreated somewhat. In the main the organized forces of the working-class movement and its influence have not diminished but have grown; the

numb  
ple h  
numb  
cratic  
ness  
thene  
trade  
dealt  
bor n  
split  
If in  
of for  
ment  
it is c  
ening  
ening  
more  
Govern  
just t  
nifican  
for th  
genera  
that v  
respec  
recogn  
recogn  
duty.  
We  
of thi  
of the  
and ot  
more  
cess ha  
sphere  
tories  
ion an  
employ  
affairs  
the w  
privati  
he g  
presen

number of organized working people has increased and so has the number of votes polled by the democratic forces; its militancy and readiness to sacrifice have been strengthened. This is equally true of the trade unions, despite the heavy blow dealt to the effectiveness of the labor movement by the trade union split benefiting the employers.

If in these ten years the correlation of forces between the labor movement and the employers has changed, it is due not so much to the weakening of the former as to the strengthening of the latter, who are being more and more openly backed by the Government authorities. But it is just this that emphasizes the significance that political struggle has for the labor movement, that is, a general struggle for a government that would force the employers to respect the law, that would itself recognize and compel others to recognize national solidarity as a duty.

We are now faced with a situation of this kind: whereas the struggle of the working people in the factories and other places of work has become more difficult, new prospects of success have opened up in the political sphere. The difficulties in the factories arise from increased exploitation and the arbitrary actions of the employers, but it is just this state of affairs that increases the hostility of the working people, brings greater privations to citizens and enhances the general consciousness that the present situation is unjust and in-

tolerable. Consequently, all this broadens and strengthens the basis for political struggle as a whole. Therein lies the significance of the fresh ferment developing in all the political movements. And since it was the political activities of the Government that enabled the employers to bring increased political pressure to bear, the struggle of the people is developing not only against the employers but also against the Government.

Our task is to encourage and guide the development of this popular reaction in both directions, not in one only. Hence the significance of our political struggle for a move to the Left. Hence also the significance of our work in the factories to support the general political actions in the country and in Parliament with actions by the workers.

It is necessary to refute the insinuation—in which our enemies are interested—that we are retreating in the factories. Certainly in a few factories we did retreat, and in some of them even to a serious extent. But those retreats are in no way indicative of the general situation. We retain our positions and in some cases are even improving them. Sometimes the number of votes polled for us increases very markedly—at times reaching 80% or more. This is to be seen even in factories where the employers and the splitting organizations are energetically pushing their combined activities.

In recent times we have seen heroic struggles in Italy. There have been

those of the building and metal workers of Rome, the miners of Valdarno and Monte Amiata; the unquestionably great and incomparable struggle by the dockers of Genoa, struggles by the textile workers of Lombardy and Piedmont, and others. Some of these sections of working people who fought for various particular and general demands, for higher wages, for work or in defence of trade union rights and freedoms, were successful, some of them very much so. In the countryside hundreds of thousands of sharecroppers carried on a big struggle for "the just cause" [the right not to be driven from the land by their landlords without good reason.] Stubborn struggle won the women working in the rice fields a great victory—higher wages and recognition of their moral rights. . . .

Even so, however, certain difficulties were to be observed in developing the work because of unexpected circumstances. During the government crisis the usual subjects and formulations were repeated, and sometimes repeated mechanically, at meetings and conferences and in the course of other activities. Not always were the political questions that had to be emphasized singled out quickly—the questions of putting an end to discrimination, of forming a move-to-the-Left government, of putting an end to the four-party coalition, of excluding the Liberals from the government, inasmuch as

they are agents of the industrialist and big landlord organizations, and of satisfying the social demands which are most popular among the rank and file of the parties that have two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies.

Similarly, united action in relation to other trends of public opinion, to the leaders, groups and sections of other parties was not always conducted on the necessary scale and with the required efficacy by all our organizations.

The political situation at home and on the international plane continues to develop. This is a difficult and serious situation but it offers opportunities for favorable development of every kind. For that reason the actions the Party succeeds in carrying out for achieving unity of the people, effecting a move to the Left and introducing a social policy of regeneration will be decisive. There is no room for pessimism, just as there is no room for light-minded optimism. We must leave room only for political action, for propaganda and agitation work, for the work of explaining, uniting and mobilizing, for the work of organizing the struggle. And into this work we must draw all our Party members, all our forces. In this manner and in this spirit we will be able to give vigor and breadth to the struggle for freedom in the enterprises, to the struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension.

By

PRIOR  
Ford  
try in  
crease  
democ  
6 cen  
For  
work  
tract  
the n  
tions.  
pany  
dens  
strug  
on th  
speed  
shops  
(Mur  
penal  
inhu  
comp  
heavy  
work  
In  
impo  
work  
Willy  
Moto  
worse  
the  
strike  
Amer

# The Auto Workers Advance

By Saul Wellman and Nat Ganley

PRIOR TO THE General Motors and Ford negotiations this year, industry in general was resisting wage increases. Collective bargaining settlements with raises averaged 5 to 6 cents per hour.

For five years, since 1950, the auto workers had suffered under a contract which tied their hands against the most oppressive working conditions. During this period the company strove to place the full burdens of their increased competitive struggle to redivide the car market on the backs of the workers through speed-up, automation, run-away shops, lay-offs, plant shut-down (Murray and Hudson in Detroit), penalizing of workers through an inhuman enforcement of arbitrary company rules and through extra heavy blows against the Negro workers.

In 1954 the auto employers were imposing direct wage cuts on the workers in Studebaker, Kaiser-Willys, Continental Motors, Reo Motors, etc. In an attempt to impose worsened contracts on the workers, the employers launched vicious strike-breaking drives in the North American Aircraft Company in Cali-

fornia, in Parks Drop Forge in Cleveland, in Kohler's in Wisconsin and in the Square D Company in Detroit.

Ford, GM, and finance capital generally, hoped to continue this anti-labor trend in the 1955 negotiations. Ford proposed thirty-four backward steps for its new contract with the U.A.W.-C.I.O. The company's proposals ranged all the way from excluding some categories of Ford workers now covered by the U.A.W. from the ranks of the union, to withdrawing the right to strike against speed-up, to direct wage cuts for the Ford steel workers. But the employers had to change their tune.

## REASONS FOR THE CHANGE

The auto workers fought back during the five-year contract period. In 1953 they won some economic concessions when they forced the reopening of the contracts as "living documents," two years prior to their expiration date. They were determined to win economic gains and contract improvements this year. Their fighting spirit became the de-

cisive factor in the 1955 negotiations of the U.A.W.-C.I.O.

The auto workers' unity and militancy were displayed at the U.A.W.'s fifteenth convention in March. They voted to set up a \$25,000,000 strike fund. When their negotiations were deadlocked, over 70% of the Ford workers cast ballots in a strike vote; 96.3% voted for strike. In Ford Local 600 it was 97.5% for strike. In General Motors it was over 93%. During the negotiations 45,000 Rouge workers, at a plant gate rally, demonstrated for their demands. The widespread strikes following the termination of the contract were the latest proof of the workers' militancy.

This convinced the corporations that the workers were ready to battle. The corporations, which were at peak productions during negotiations, enjoying record-shattering profits, and in the throes of cutthroat competition, feared a strike and were forced to retreat from their previous objectives.

### THE AUTO SETTLEMENTS

In the Ford and GM settlements the workers won an economic package estimated by the U.A.W. as coming to 20 cents an hour. Regardless of the fact that 5 cents of this amount, namely the annual productivity raise, was promised under the previous contract, and that the package primarily represents fringe benefits, it had the effect of raising labor's sights for the 1955 wage round and therefore helped raise the mili-

tancy of the workers. It has already influenced the wage victory in the steel industry, encouraged textile workers' resistance to wage cuts, and has helped the copper miners. It breaks the workers out of the 5 and 6 cents pattern settlements of the last several years.

What did the U.A.W.-C.I.O. specifically get in the pattern-setting Ford settlement?

(1) They won Supplementary Unemployment Benefits. This is a break-through towards the principle of employer responsibility for lay-off pay. It provides for combined State and company benefits equal to 65% of take-home pay for the first four week of a lay-off and 60% of take-home pay for a maximum of 22 additional weeks, to employees with one or more years of seniority. The company benefits are financed solely by the company by setting aside 5 cents per hour per employee into a Supplementary Unemployment Benefits (SUB) Fund. When approved by the States having two-thirds of the company's employees, most payments under this plan, commencing after June 1, 1956, will have maximum durations ranging from four to thirteen weeks. Full 26 weeks of benefits to all having the necessary credits can't be secured until 1958 when the SUB fund may reach 85% of maximum position. Experience, however, already shows that as the SUB plan spreads to other sections of the labor movement (especially in trustified industry); it encourages the workers to

stru-  
"hoc  
in  
Wit  
prin  
figh  
the  
tem  
and  
nent  
SUB  
for  
thre  
the  
sett  
plan  
home  
inste  
Work  
plans  
(2)  
produ  
cents,  
greate  
dition  
of the  
maker  
skilled  
and a  
(3)  
crease  
those  
from  
service  
proven  
vested  
with  
(4)  
were v  
aranc  
back be  
for w

struggle for the elimination of the "hooks" and the "built-in gimmicks" in the plan, and to win better ones. With the break-through towards the principle achieved, the workers now fight for favorable State rulings on the plan. Following the auto settlement, the United Steel Workers and the American Can and Continental Can Companies agreed to SUB at 65% of take-home pay for 52 weeks for employees with three or more years seniority, and the U.A.W. in the Allis-Chalmers settlement adjusted the Ford SUB plan to provide for 65% of take-home pay for the full 26 weeks, instead of only the first four weeks. Workers now covered by these SUB plans are nearing the million mark.

(2) Ford increased the annual productivity raise from 5 cents to 6 cents, or 2½%, whichever is the greater, and granted some additional classification raises. On top of the productivity raises, the pattern-makers got a 10 cent raise, other skilled trades journeymen 8 cents, and apprentices 5 cents.

(3) Retirement pensions were increased for those already retired and those to be retired in the future, from \$1.75 per month, per year of service, to \$2.25. Other pension improvements were also won, including vested pension rights for workers with 10 or more years seniority.

(4) A number of improvements were won in the health and life insurance setup, including increased sick benefits from \$41 to \$48 weekly for workers in the \$1.90 to \$2.10

wage bracket, with the maximum benefits increased from \$43.60 weekly to \$76.80.

(5) The workers got triple time for work on holidays and increased the number of holidays paid at straight-time rates without working, from 6 to 7 holidays.

(6) Vacation pay for the 10 to 15 year seniority workers increased from two weeks to two and a half weeks.

(7) The five-year contract term was changed to three years. The union had demanded a maximum two-year contract.

(8) Gains won in the past by the Ford workers were not given up, although this had occurred in a number of previous contract settlements. The Ford UAW contract contains about 28 contract changes, two of them solely helpful to the company, and most of them in the nature of secondary improvements for the workers (promotion job openings must be posted, the demerit record of an employee can't be used after five years, etc.).

These were the specific gains in the Ford pattern settlement.

A local union strike movement started spreading nationwide among Ford and GM workers following the Ford settlement. This forced General Motors in the national negotiations to grant the Ford pattern plus the following additional gains: Time and a half for work on Saturday as such, increase in the mid-night shift premium from 7½% to 10% and the first full union shop,



this at a time when the employers are on the offensive against the union shop, when "right-to-work" laws are used against the unions in eighteen states.

The Chrysler Corporation's efforts to avoid the pattern was doomed to failure. When no settlement was reached at deadline time by a subcommittee of the union negotiators and the company, the Chrysler workers went out on strike, and a demonstration was set off in a room adjoining the negotiations by members of the bargaining committee who were not in the final talks. They sang "Solidarity Forever" and chanted "Chrysler was a horse thief." Shortly thereafter Chrysler granted a settlement similar to GM plus the following additional gains: A nation-wide Chrysler uniform wage scale for its plants in the Northern states. This meant 8 to 38 cents per hour wage increases for 12,700 skilled workers and 4 to 9-cent raises for 16,000 production workers in Michigan, Indiana, California, Kansas and Delaware on top of the uniform productivity raise. The right-to-strike against speedup previously won by the Ford and GM workers, was also granted to Chrysler workers. The Chrysler settlement established another first by including the 9,000 salaried Chrysler office and engineering workers organized in the U.A.W. in the SUB plan. Also the Chrysler contract expiration date was set for June 1, 1958, rather than August, making it the same as in GM and Ford. These

are measures that can help the U.A.W.'s longer-range goal for an industry-wide equal pay for equal work wage agreement.

The pattern settlement (including the union-shop and SUB plan) was extended to the farm implement industry when Caterpillar Tractor, John Deere and Allis-Chalmers signed on the dotted line. About 40,000 International Harvester workers in 18 plants and in 6 states, engaged in their first united strike not only for the auto pattern but to win guarantees against rate-cutting, wage and equities, for fair seniority and other conditions. The strike lasted four weeks. They won the bulk of their demands, including an economic package estimated by the U.A.W.-C.I.O. as coming to a 34-cents an hour gain.

Bendix Corporation workers in five states won the pattern after a week-long strike. The Studebaker workers in South Bend cited the lessons of the Bendix strike as their justification in demanding strike authorization from the U.A.W. top officers. Contract guarantees against speed-up and bottle-neck grievance procedures is a key issue of the Studebaker workers.

The first settlement of the auto industry's Little Three—American Motors (Nash, Hudson and Kelvinator) was based on the Big Three pattern, including retirement pensions for the 3,000 workers in the defunct Detroit Hudson plant. However, U.A.W. Vice-President Leonard Woodcock granted the corporation

a de  
un  
mist  
can  
It w  
bake  
to t  
in r  
reap  
short  
tamp  
ing c

THE  
OF

For  
won  
consi  
far sh  
pectat  
facing  
solved

Star  
settle  
agreed  
union  
practic  
tees a  
alty sy  
ance  
hiring

(d) l  
such as  
trades  
captive  
the ou  
Since  
strong  
many  
ould l  
conditio



a deferment on their SUB payments until September 15, 1957 under the mistaken notion of protecting American Motors' "competitive position." It was under this guise that Studebaker workers last year were forced to take a wage cut of over 14% in return for which they merely reaped a harvest of more speed-up, short work weeks, lay-offs and the tampering with their hard-won working conditions.

#### THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

For the auto workers the gains won in the pattern settlement were considered as partial gains and fell far short of their demands and expectations. The most burning issues facing the auto workers were not solved in the national agreement.

Starting with the Ford pattern settlement, the U.A.W. top officers agreed to wash out the following union demands: (a) The model fair practices clause; (b) contract guarantees against speed-up, company penalty systems, and bottle-neck grievance procedures; (c) preferential hiring of laid-off union members; (d) long-standing local demands such as the elimination of the skilled trades wage and equity between the captive and jobbing shops, ending the outside contractors, etc.

Since the U.A.W. was in an extra strong bargaining position this year, many of these additional demands could have been won. Under these conditions it was unnecessary and

impermissible for the U.A.W. top negotiators to trade off these demands for the gains that were won.

The militant stand of the auto workers for these additional demands, and the warning stemming from the Left against settling for one demand at the expense of other demands, led to the promise made by President Reuther and Vice-President Livingston to the March U.A.W. convention that the contract and local demands would have equal importance with the "Guaranteed Annual Wage" (GAW) in the negotiations. However, a discrepancy arose between their words and their deeds.

The April and May issues of the U.A.W. official newspaper, in listing the key 1955 demands prior to the negotiations, had already dropped part 8 of the U.A.W. program. This part contained the demands for the model fair practice clause, the major contract changes, and the local demands.

President Reuther's role in the negotiations was contradictory. His determination to get a foothold on the "GAW" helped at first to increase the economic package, as seen by the first Ford-GM counter-proposals to the union's "GAW" demand. But after the break-through was won on the principle of lay-off pay under his leadership, President Reuther supported the old contract clauses that were aimed at preventing a determined struggle against speed-up, for fair practices in industry, and for more grass-roots shop democ-

racy for the workers. This typifies the practices of Social-Democratic leaders who many times trade off the urgently needed demands of the workers out of fear of the workers' rising militancy and their inability to control it.

### THE LOCAL STRIKES

On June 7 (the day after the Ford settlement) 114,000 out of 140,000 Ford workers were on strike in 89 plants and parts depots. On June 14 (the day after the GM settlement) 122,000 GM workers were on strike in 44 plants, out of 375,000 GM workers in 119 plants.

These were historic strikes for the U.A.W., *led in most cases officially by the local union leaderships* regardless of whether they were Right, Center or Left, and these strikes coincided more or less with the deadline set by the top U.A.W. officers for the nationally authorized strikes. It's the first time that such widespread strikes took place after a unanimous national contract settlement. These strikes could therefore not be considered in the ordinary sense as being "unauthorized" or "wildcat."

The local strikes in general expressed dissatisfaction with the national settlement and in this sense were protest actions. But specifically, the anger of the workers was primarily directed towards winning their unsettled demands before the national contract would be ratified and sewn up for three more years.

These strikes were therefore primarily positive strikes for the demands not won, and not negative strikes against "GAW," the U.A.W. and the union leaders. Despite their anger, the workers were not ready to break with their top union leaders. In fact, they sought their help in winning their local demands. This was seen when the International arranged negotiations in Detroit between the local strikers and the top management of GM's Fisher division that ended piece work in seven GM Fisher plants throughout the country.

By their very nature—an effort to win local demands before the national agreement was ratified—the strikes were short-term actions, lasting from one day to one week. In most cases they were successful actions. It was this factor in many GM plants that convinced the workers they had won a victory in the settlement as a whole.

Skilled workers played a key role in some of these strikes, such as in the Rouge plant and in the Ternstedt plant in Flint, Mich., but in most areas they were strikes led by the production workers.

A round-up of incomplete reports from 21 GM plants across the nation shows the following types of gains won in the local strikes on top of the national settlement: (1) Blanket wage increases to end wage inequities; 11 cents in Trenton GM, Local 731. A blanket 10 cents raise for all women in the A. C. Sparkplug Plant in Michigan with the excep-

tion  
in  
the  
wor  
cen  
wor  
(  
nati  
Fis  
in  
and  
(  
settl  
a n  
Fis  
cal 5  
Loc  
Det  
(4  
were  
plan  
plan  
Moti  
(5  
won  
the  
work  
time  
time  
(6  
the  
dred  
(7  
were  
Chic  
other  
into  
In  
sland  
the v  
in T  
"Con

tion of the Negro women working in sanitation. (While excluded from the extra raise the Negro women won certain upgrading rights; 75 percent of the plant's employees are women.

(2) The already mentioned elimination of piece work in the seven Fisher plants, including the plants in Tarrytown, N. Y., in Cleveland and in Oakland, Calif.

(3) Inroads were made on the settlement of speed-up grievances in a number of plants, such as the Fisher plant in Chicago, U.A.W. Local 558, the Tarrytown plant, U.A.W. Local 664, and the GM Livonia plant, Detroit U.A.W. Local 262.

(4) Women's rights concessions were won in the A. C. Sparkplug plant in Flint, the Station Wagon plant in Cleveland and the Electro Motive plant in Chicago.

(5) Miscellaneous demands were won in many of these plants covering the area of health and safety, free work clothes, seniority rights, overtime rules, relief periods, wash-up time and rest periods.

(6) GM was forced to withdraw the penalties it inflicted on hundreds of these local strikers.

(7) In some cases local agreements were won for the first time, as in the Chicago GM plant, and in many others the local gains were written into improved local agreements.

In view of these facts it was plain slander and arrogant contempt of the workers when the Trotskyites, in *The Militant*, June 20, said that "Conservatism is still dominant in

the auto plants," while the group that split away from *The Militant*, namely *The American Socialist*, in its July issue, ranted that the mass of the auto workers "are eager to avoid a strike at all costs."

The gains in the new auto contracts won through the strength of the U.A.W.-C.I.O. and the local strikes provide the basis for our estimate that the auto settlements mark a significant advance and inevitably raise the wage sights of other unions.

#### THE APPROACH TO THE NEW CONTRACT

The main effort of the Left in the U.A.W. was to develop the progressive coalition for a series of demands arising from the burning issues, such as wages, speed-up, fair practices, grievance procedures, company penalty systems, local demands, and to tie them up with the "GAW" in one program of demands. This movement sparked by Left-Center progressive coalitions in a number of key locals in the plants of the auto Big Three, and involving broad sections of the workers, culminated in the eight-point program of demands adopted by the U.A.W. economic conference held in November, 1954. In this way the Left made a special contribution in preventing those U.A.W. top officers desiring to settle only for the "GAW" demands from carrying through their plan.

In the earlier stages of preparation

for the 1955 contract, the Left correctly fought to make the demand for the 30-hour week with 40 hours pay the major goal of the union. However, at times it was presented in such a way as to pit the 30-hour week versus the "GAW." When the 15th U.A.W. convention in March reaffirmed the mandate to make "GAW" the main demand in 1955, the Left forces correctly supported this union decision. To have done otherwise would have been divisive and served to demobilize the workers from entering the 1955 economic and contract struggle of the U.A.W., that centered around company responsibility for lay-off pay. The Left fought for a coalition policy in support of "GAW" while continuing to educate the workers on the fight for the shorter work week. The success of this practical approach is borne out by the unanimous mandate of the March, 1955 union convention to make the demand for shorter hours without wage reductions the U.A.W.'s next major collective bargaining goal.

The "GAW" is neither guaranteed annual wages nor guaranteed annual employment. The new auto contracts call it by its proper name, Supplementary Unemployment Benefits, SUB. It does represent the demand of the workers for job security. It places responsibility upon the employer as well as the State for paying some of the cost during periods of lay-off. It advances the movement for broad legislative and collective bargaining actions to extend and

improve upon the SUB plans.

While strongly supporting the struggle for SUB, we reject the false ideological claims made around this demand by the U.A.W. top officers. They put forward this demand as the solution to unemployment, when in reality it represents only an increase in unemployment benefits. They put this demand forward as an answer to the anarchy of production under capitalism, when in reality capitalism is incapable of overcoming the inherent contradictions that lead to economic crisis and mass unemployment. This demagoguery was inadequately exposed by the Left. Nor did the Left do an effective enough job in exposing the false arguments of the N.A.M. in their attacks on the SUB demand.

#### DISTORTING THE SETTLEMENT

When the Ford pattern settlement was consummated the Left had the responsibility of objectively evaluating it. This was especially important in view of the widespread local strikes. The Marxists within the Left had a special responsibility to give a correct lead.

However, in a number of areas and particularly in Michigan, a negative estimate of the Ford U.A.W. settlement was made by some leading Marxist forces both inside and outside the auto plants. This wrong estimate was caused by the following factors:

(1) The lack of clarity around the

SUB  
wron  
U.A.  
ther  
cial-  
(2)  
on t  
at se  
the  
cred  
hand  
conce  
acros  
sult  
as th  
dustr  
(3)  
rect  
ment  
tiona  
settle  
sions  
time  
turn  
plan.  
(4)  
U.A.  
tent  
ted t  
of 'h  
The  
suppo  
as the  
to ga  
ers w  
ready  
ind  
ther s  
of the  
tions  
strike  
over-e

SUB demand. Some believed it was wrong in principle to support this U.A.W. demand. They believed that there was something inherently Social-Democratic in the demand itself.

(2) Some had oriented themselves on the perspective of mass lay-offs at settlement time and did not see the upturn in auto production and credit sales. They ruled out beforehand the possibility of important concessions to the workers granted across the bargaining table as a result of the workers' pressure as well as the economic situation in the industry.

(3) There was likewise the incorrect view by some that any settlement of the contract without a national strike could only be a phony settlement that gives up past concessions on wage rate, seniority, overtime and working conditions in return for some type of "GAW" plan.

(4) Past factional attitudes in the U.A.W. cropped up to a certain extent in this situation and contributed to distorting the real meaning of the local strikes.

The task of the Marxists was to support militantly these local strikes as the short term actions they were, to gauge properly what the workers were ready to fight for and not ready to fight for in these struggles, and to strive to use them to further strengthen the principled unity of the Left-Center progressive coalitions in the U.A.W. Viewing these strikes in a one-sided way by either over-estimating them or under-esti-

imating them, led to wrong estimates on the settlement and wrong tactics in the struggle.

The lessons previously learned in the struggles of the Ford Rouge workers as developed by John Swift in *Political Affairs*, November, 1952, were forgotten in this specific situation. Referring to the need of placing confidence in the workers, Swift said:

But this confidence in the workers can only grow out of understanding them, their conditions of life and struggle, what they are ready to fight for and what they are not and why. Any confidence, if not so grounded, is only a petty bourgeois romantic idealization of the workers. It arises from an idealistic and not materialist point of view. Because it is based on wishful thinking and not fact, it soon turns into its opposite, into a complete loss of confidence in the working class and even a contempt for it. In our own ranks there are examples of both this abstract confidence and this arrogant contempt.

Flowing from this wrong estimate, a number of Left-sectarian and tactical errors seriously strained the united administration coalition in Ford Local 600. President Carl Stelato and the other Local 600 representatives on the national bargaining committee, consisting of Right, Left and Center forces, made a good fight for better terms in the negotiations. However, the Left and progressive forces in Local 600 did not function as a collective team during the negotiations. They failed to render constructive help and criticism

at each stage of the bargaining to the Local 600 negotiators. This led the negotiators to prematurely end the fight for the additional major contract and local demands. Following the settlement, President Stellato unnecessarily undertook to "sell" the contract in such a manner that he sharply clashed with large numbers of workers in the union who were fighting for a better settlement and for their local demands. But this made it all the more urgent that the Left fight for a principled unification of the coalition.

Some Left forces momentarily forgot that the Left-Center coalition in Local 600 has played and continues to play an important role in the further advance of the entire U.A.W.-C.I.O. in a progressive direction. They developed a tactical line that led to unnecessary strains within the coalition and to a near-break of the coalition. They forgot that these progressive coalitions can move the entire U.A.W.-C.I.O., in a team-work of union leaders and members, to play a progressive role in the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. merged labor movement.

The Left through an isolated leaflet and other means called for a plant-wide "no vote" on the settlement. The Stellato forces were trying to get out a large "yes" vote on the settlement. This clash made it more difficult on the one hand to have the Ford workers convince President Stellato that after making a good fight in the national negotiations, he prematurely gave up the

fight for the additional demands. On the other hand it made it more difficult to convince the workers to direct their fire against the company and not against the union leadership at a time when they were striking for the additional demands.

Correct policy in this situation would have required of the Left forces to fight for a principled agreement in the top coalition of the Local that regardless of the outcome of the ratification vote, all Local 600 forces would continue to fight for the additional contract and local demands. These demands have been incorporated in the coalition program over a long period. The Left correctly associated themselves with the workers in a number of the Rouge buildings who spearheaded the local strikes and desired to protest the washing out of their local demands. During the struggle they also should have found the ways and means of avoiding any head-on clash and deep split between the Left and Center forces in the coalition, just as they succeeded in doing after the issue was settled, when the U.A.W. Ford contract was ratified by the vote of the union membership.

Some Marxist Left forces incorrectly viewed coalition policies at the top as conflicting with work among the rank and file, that is, with building the united front of the workers from below. The question was falsely put that the choice of the Left was: Either to exercise its own independent criticism and break up the

coalition or fall into a Right-opportunist swamp of tailing behind reformist leaders.

In trying to overcome the long-continued Rightist error of failing to maintain the independent position of the Left within the coalition, they slipped into the Left-sectarian error of exercising criticism in such a manner as to unnecessarily strain the coalition to the breaking point. But a correct tactical line does not pose the movement of the rank and file versus the local union leadership, and a rupture of the Left with the Center. Independent positions and constructive criticism by workers or leaders in the union have as their object strengthening the principled unity of the workers in their struggle against the employers. This can therefore have only one effect, namely, to strengthen the coalition and the union's fighting capacity.

The coalition policy is not new for the Marxist leadership in Michigan and the Left forces in Ford Local 600. The Left forces were not only the pioneer builders of the union during the tough Harry Bennett days in the 1920's and the 1930's, that also required the most careful building of the worker's united front, but since the first union contract was won in the 1941 Ford strike, the Left in Ford's pursued a Left-Center coalition policy. This policy netted many achievements that served as a progressive model for the entire U.A.W. The progressive coalition in Ford's has mastered many a crisis from company

and McCarthyite attacks to an administratorship imposed over their local by their own international officers. The present constructive criticism must be seen within this overall positive context. It shows that even experienced forces find it difficult in theory and in practice to always see that the independent role of the Left in the union is used to achieve the principled united front of the workers in their struggle against the attacks of the company and against Big Business and McCarthyite reaction in our land.

Marxist forces at national and local levels have also self-critically evaluated other types of errors and shortcomings that arose in this situation. The following examples illustrate them:

There was the failure to be alert to the dropping of part 8 in the union's program of demands; to seize hold of this issue and especially to fight for the inclusion of the fair practices clause unanimously mandated by the union's convention.

In view of the spotlight being focused on the question of Negro leadership in the labor movement and the sharp criticism of the inadequacies of the anti-discrimination clause in the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. proposed constitution, the abandonment of the model fair practice clause was a most serious set-back for the auto workers. It is particularly on this score that the Left's responsibility for neglect of this issue is subject to sharp criticism.

Some forces who made a generally



correct and positive estimate of the auto settlement erred in treating the national Ford settlement as an issue that was already resolved, when in life the strike wave in Ford and GM plants was determining the further outcome of the contract settlements. This did not adequately prepare the Left for the local strike movements that took place.

### LOOKING AHEAD

The perspective ahead is for increased struggles of the auto workers as the corporations in their drive for maximum profits strive to wield the old company-loaded contract clauses against the workers during the next three years. The employers will not succeed. The historic local strikes have had a profound national impact on the union as a whole as well as upon the company. They have laid a solid basis for continued struggles for improvements.

Besides this, the new stage in the fight for peace ushered in by the Geneva Big Four conference, the increased opportunities for ending the cold war and its accompaniment, the internal McCarthyite witchhunt, will have a profound effect on the further progressive advance of the entire U.A.W.-C.I.O. from top to bottom.

The history of the union shows that in the days when it supported a firm peace policy in world affairs it also made its greatest economic gains. In 1946 when GM was forced to grant an 18½ cents an hour across-the-board wage increase, after a

tough strike struggle lasting beyond 100 days, the then newly-elected president of the U.A.W., Walter P. Reuther, felt called upon to express his support of the C.I.O. policy of this period. Said Reuther:

The war-born unity of Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States was the key to our victory over the enemy. Their unity is no less essential if the United Nations is to be the sure guardian of the peace.

We repudiate all efforts calculated to weaken or destroy friendship and close collaboration among the Big Three. We reject proposals for American participation in any bloc or alliance which is inimical to their unity. (Quoted from "A Program and Statement of Policy for the UAW-CIO Membership," Walter P. Reuther, President, April 25, 1946).

The Left forces in the U.A.W. state that history has now placed on the union's agenda the restoration of this sound foreign policy. Trailing behind Dulles on negotiations through positions of strength, through "adequate military power" doesn't make sense when President Reuther himself told the U.A.W. convention in March: "Nobody can win a war fought with atomic bombs."

The Left forces recognize their special responsibility in urging the coalition to help take the good resolutions of the U.A.W. off paper and into the sphere of actions in the field of legislation, political action, civil liberties and civil rights.

In the economic sphere the tendency to win improvements on the

Ford  
the  
wait  
contr  
have  
ward  
issues  
event  
dent  
contr  
ject  
to  
date.  
again  
will  
tive.  
portu  
ween  
ilreac  
hose  
the fi  
are n  
Kohl  
still  
The  
effect  
won  
In  
U.A.W.  
to der  
minis  
trol p  
U.A.W.  
Court  
McCa  
and P  
sand  
shorte  
mactr

Ford pattern settlements shows that the U.A.W. membership will not wait three more years for the key contract and local demands they have not yet won. With a view towards an early adjustment on these issues, the U.A.W. membership will eventually make a reality of President Reuther's slogan that "a union contract is a living document" subject to change prior to its expiration date. The workers' daily struggle against speedup and other grievances will be intertwined with this objective. This will create increased opportunities for solidarity actions between the U.A.W. members that have already won contract settlements and those who still have to win them. In the first place such solidarity actions are needed behind the hard-pressed Kohler strike and the other struggles still on.

The U.A.W.'s legislative fight to effectuate the SUB plans must be won in the various states.

In the best interest of the entire U.A.W., the Left urges the union to demand that the Eisenhower Administration quash the thought-control political action indictment of the U.A.W. and urges the Supreme Court to restore civil liberties in the McCarran, Smith Act membership and Pennsylvania sedition cases. They stand for a stepped-up struggle for shorter hours by fighting for the enactment of shorter-hour laws and

continued education for the thirty-hour week and 40 hours pay as the union's next major bargaining demand.

They further call for: Full implementation of the UAW political action program, calling for a farm-labor-liberal conference next spring and labor's independent political action machinery in the communities. Full support by the entire UAW to the demands of the Negro unionist for representation in the top board of the A. F. of L.-C.I.O.; the election of Negro leaders to top U.A.W. office; to change the merger constitution by providing for unequivocal equal union membership and leadership rights besides "benefit rights" in the united labor organization; and for a clear mandate to launch a major drive to organize the unorganized in the South, based on Negro-white unity.

These measures, if undertaken by a united U.A.W.-C.I.O., will have a tremendous progressive impact on the nation as a whole in all spheres of its economic, political and social life.

For the remainder of 1955 and in the presidential election campaign of 1956 the U.A.W.-C.I.O. can make great contributions towards a further militant and democratic advance of labor and the people.

# Automation: Abundance For Whom?\*

Frank Brewster and Mark Logan

THE FIRST FLUSH of enthusiasm over the new economic "boomlet" is beginning to ebb. A nagging note of concern has crept back into the financial pages of the press.

At the center of the concern and figuring prominently in all the discussions is the pregnant phrase—"greater productivity." Tricky government figures that admit to 2½ million unemployed and 31 major areas with surpluses of workers (August) reveal that output of industry is higher now than during the peak of the 1953 boom though American factories employ 500,000 fewer workers. The new swollen inventories piling sky high in the warehouses and the towering proportions of the unprecedented consumers debt indicate the approaching saturation point of the effective market as well as the precarious nature of the "prosperity" of the average worker's family.

It is in this setting that the country is engaged in debate over the challenge of automation. The subject is hardly a new one. The American public and particularly the work-

ing class has long been acquainted with the terms "mechanization" "assembly line production," and "rationalization." It is not too difficult to recall that these new developments were often accompanied by sharp clashes of class ideologies and bitter class battles.

Even if for the moment we remain content with characterizing automation as simply a further development of the growth of technology, it is clear that any sharp change in the character of the instruments of production is also bound to affect the living standards of the workers and their conditions of work and the very relationship of class forces. These developments must also inevitably generate major ideological and economic struggles.

Unfortunately, the ideological debate is still pretty much one-sided. The reading public is being inundated with a flood of material discussing the trend in modern plants and improved machinery and their impact on productivity and jobs, but it represents mostly the line of Big Business.

The labor movement only now is beginning to come to grips with the

\* This is the first section of a two-part article; the concluding section will appear in our next issue.—Ed.

new challenge it faces in automation, and only in rare instances is developing a class outlook and policy towards it. The C.I.O. Auto Workers Union has probably devoted the most serious attention to the problem, mainly because the problems of automation are rapidly becoming acute all through its industry.

The propaganda approach of Big Business towards automation has been a rather varied one, running the gamut from sly understatement to the coming-of-the-millennium school of purple prose.

In an Employee Relations News Letter titled: "Automation—Friend or Foe?" the General Electric Company writes: "Automation is just more technological progress. It is just more of the kind of stuff which has been taking work out of work."

Not all of Big Business is quite so reserved, however. The McGraw-Hill publications prefer the superlatives of Hollywood promotion. Automation is "the Western Miracle," that "of providing an ever higher standard of living for more and more Americans," As a matter of fact ". . . the correct name is neither 'automation' nor 'fleximation, but 'emancipation' . . . the indications are that 'labor' may soon be an obsolete term for the working man. Physical labor is practically gone in production. . . ."

The bards of Madison Avenue, charged with selling both the products as well as the ideology of Big Business, are hard at work pushing this line through the mass media of

communications. The self-conscious concern of the monopolies over their profit system shows through in all the propaganda. Editorial and ghost writers are lyrically depicting an idyllic future of class harmony based on abundance. Just leave it to the Cadillac Cabinet and to the "social planners" of the monopolies!

We also have the school of those who tend to view automation from the angle of science-fiction. Here we find a few employers who dream of achieving class harmony by simply abolishing the working class.

This outpouring of ideological eyewash, however, can scarcely conceal the fact that automation is a hard reality pregnant with tremendous potentialities for either improving or reducing to dire poverty the material conditions of the masses of the people.

#### IS AUTOMATION "THE SECOND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION"?

Automation has been characterized variously, by both bourgeois spokesmen and labor leaders alike, as the advent of the "Second Industrial Revolution," also as the "Second Phase of the Industrial Revolution."

The intention, no doubt, is to impart a sense of something totally new to the term automation. Some have used this phrase simply to denote a leap in technological growth. Certain labor leaders appear to use the phrase in order to suggest certain analogies with the challenge and the

\* "The American Machinist"—McGraw-Hill Publication.

intensified, brutal forms of exploitation ushered in by the Industrial Revolution. But where the phrase is used to express the concept imparted to it by Big Business, namely, that automation is the threshold of a new capitalist epoch of growth and endless prosperity, it can only confuse and do considerable harm. The concept that automation is a "Second Industrial Revolution" is wrong and can only lead to totally unrealistic conclusions.

The Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th Century ushered in an era of historically progressive capitalism, despite the accompaniment of brutal exploitation. The transition from manufacture to large-scale machine industry worked, as Lenin wrote, "a complete technical revolution" and constituted a "higher stage of capitalism."

But today, one can no longer speak of evolving into either a higher or progressive stage of capitalism. We are living in the epoch of imperialism, the highest and final stage of capitalism, the epoch, said Lenin, of "parasitic or decaying capitalism. . . ."

Thus automation, arising in the epoch of imperialism, can neither provide for a higher stage of capitalism nor can it provide for a new era of "progressive capitalism" as variously envisaged by Social-Democracy, by some New Dealers, by Henry Wallace and by Keynes.

The epoch of Monopoly Capital, though still capable of giving rise to a higher level of technique, is the antithesis of the era ushered in by

the Industrial Revolution. Thus, any analogy of automation to the Industrial Revolution serves only to distort and conceal the difference between the historically progressive and historically reactionary stages of capitalism, serves to conceal the nature of capitalism today, and thus serves to blunt the ideological weapons of the working class in the struggle against Monopoly Capital.

#### IS AUTOMATION SOMETHING NEW?

The productive forces of society which comprise the instruments of production, the people who operate them and their productive skill, are constantly undergoing change and development. Historically, technological growth is a law of social development. But such a definition could, without distinction, be just as well applied to the period of "mechanization without automation" as to the period of "mechanization with automation."

Automation is not just an extension of mechanization. It is definitely something new. *Automation constitutes a new stage in technological growth, a new stage in the substitution of machines for the workers, a new stage in the increase of labor productivity.* John Diebold (*The Advent of the Automatic Factory*) is quite correct when he states that "Automation must be viewed in proper historical perspective as a new chapter in the continuing story of man's organization and mechanization of the forces of nature

... automation does have special characteristics that will uniquely affect the nature of the social and economic changes, but it is not a departure from all that has gone before."

There have been three stages of development in the utilization of large-scale machinery in American industry. In the first stage, in the pre-assembly line stage, a worker was generally called on to complete an entire product or unit, through all its specific operations, while shifting from machine to machine, manually controlled.

In the second stage, in the traditional assembly-line stage, a worker, instead of completing the whole product or unit, did one specific operation, with a machine, also manually controlled.

In both these stages, the machines functioned as independent units in processing the raw materials into its finished product.

The automation stage eliminates—to a greater or lesser degree depending upon its application—the mass of production workers. It permits the production of a commodity through all its steps by a line of connected, automatic, electronically operated machines which are virtually continuous and self-regulating in their operation.

A recent article in the official *Monthly Labor Review* (June, 1955) summarized automation as follows:

With the large-scale use of automatic control devices in industry, a new phase

of the long process of substituting mechanical for human energy begins. Hitherto, technological progress has been concerned primarily with the transfer of manual skills from man to machines, the worker remaining a controller and director. New developments involve the use of improved devices for such operations as sensing, measuring, comparing, and remembering, as well as operating in a predetermined manner. Control of machines by other machines or completely self-regulated production now becomes possible.

#### AUTOMATION'S TEMPO OF DEVELOPMENT

Automation has had a gradual, evolutionary development since about 1929, though the term originated sometime around 1946.

It is safe to say that most of the American economy will be affected by automation, in one way or another. And while it is true that industries that have been completely automatized are still comparatively rare, one can hardly find a production industry that has not *already* seen both its manufacturing and accounting processes transformed to some degree by automation.

Probably, in certain service industries, small business, certain trade industries and the professional fields, automation technique, while enhancing the speed of the process, will not lead to much displacement of manpower. But in the decisive segment of the economy, the manufacturing industries (17,259,000 workers in 1953), and especially the produc-

tion workers (13,850,000) and basic industrial workers employed in durable goods industries (8,167,000) as well as agriculture, mining and construction are bound to feel substantial effects of automation.

Though automation is being introduced piece-meal, it has been estimated that in comparison with the period prior to the Second World War, when about 2 percent of all plant expenditures went for instruments and control, some \$2½ billions or 10 percent were spent on instruments and controls in 1954, and estimates for the current year range from 5 to 6 billion dollars.

In the meantime a new branch of industry has already been introduced into the American economy engaged solely in perfecting automation technique, in addition to the experimentation being conducted by the individual monopolies.

Thus, to underrate the present as well as the future tempo of automation development is to underrate some very severe problems posed to the labor movement by the new technique.

There is no dearth of evidence to prove that automation, where already introduced, has had a marked effect on labor productivity. Literally hundreds of examples have been cited in business and technical journals, extending to such industries as automobiles, electrical, machine tools, oil refining, coal digging, packing, baking, etc., showing the growing displacement of workers by automation.

To get the full sense of the effect of automation, just visualize the fact that in machine-tool building, in Detroit, a corporation is now putting together a two million dollar machine tool "as long as a football field. . . . This mechanical giant performs 540 machine operations. It is run by one man; present methods require from 35 to 75 workers for a similar production pace."\* Or similarly, note the fact that 78 people in Ford's Cleveland plant are doing the work of 770 people and are out-producing them.

These two examples are paralleled, in greater or lesser degree, in all the huge plants of such monopoly corporations as General Electric, Westinghouse and General Motors.

One does not have to subscribe to the theory of a "robot" economy to recognize the danger of large scale chronic unemployment and the consequences of a standing reserve army of unemployed as the result of automation.

Similarly, it is necessary to take into account that new problems are arising with certain changes in the composition of the working class, including an increasingly widening gap between skilled and unskilled workers, a relative increase of unskilled over skilled workers (maintenance, control, etc.) and the undermining and breakdown of specific journeyman categories of skill.

All these changes mean that the wage structure is bound to be affected, that the problem of runaway

\* *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 1, 1954.



shops, already severe, will become intensified, that intensity of labor takes on a new dimension, that the status and working conditions for Negro workers, women and youth are further endangered, and finally that the forms and methods of organizing the unorganized need an overhauling and new impetus.

Underlying all of these problems is the fact that American capitalism is heading inexorably towards an economic crisis, its pace now being accelerated by the growing development of automation. Whether this crisis can be delayed temporarily or whether its full impact, when it does come, can be prevented from falling on the shoulders of the masses, depends largely on the independent role that labor adopts in connection with rising productivity.

Automation, though it contributes greatly to the technological growth of the American economy, is simultaneously intensifying all the contradictions of capitalism.

Automation requires a fully-matured program of struggle to meet the needs of the labor movement today and tomorrow. The penalty for delay and lack of struggle can be disastrous.

#### PRODUCTIVITY AND MAXIMUM PROFITS

The objective of automation under capitalism is, of course, to secure a higher rate of profit as well as a greater volume of profit. This is characteristic of the whole history of mechanization from its very in-

ception, and is especially true today in the era of monopoly capitalism.

Nor is this an obscure and little understood fact of life to the capitalists. In their franker moments, particularly when speaking among themselves, they dispense with the moonshine of "noble" objectives. *Business Week* (Aug. 1953) put it bluntly:

It is safe to assume that the aim of management of the biggest companies, and of those that run close behind, is still what it was 50 years ago: to make more money by making more products. . . .

And in industry today the trend is definitely towards more products per man—a trend that has been stepping up, not slowing down. Take General Electric Company. Despite an increase in wages, total pay roll as percent of sales dropped significantly in the past five years. In 1947, it was 47%; in 1952, 36%. In 1947, one worker accounted for \$7,000 in sales. In 1952, his share was \$12,000.

Productivity—more and more products per man hour, this is what sets their profit-hungry hearts aflutter.

It is a fundamental law of capitalist production, as Marx showed, that in the course of time wages tend to form an ever smaller part of the total capital expended. The outlay for wages (variable capital) tends to decrease in proportion to the expenditures for machinery, plant, raw materials and fuels employed in production (constant capital).

No capitalist country in the world

illustrates this better than the U.S.A. And it is hardly necessary to prove that the tendency for the organic composition of capital to rise is accelerated with the development of automation techniques. Just two facts will suggest the tempo at which this is taking place:

1. Chrysler Corporation reported that in 1951, \$6,600 of manufacturing equipment was employed per employee; in 1952 \$8,719 of equipment was employed per employee, or a third more.

2. Gabriel Kolko in his excellent article in the *New Republic* (July 11, 1955) points out that in the new giant magnesium mill opened by the Dow Chemical Company at Madison, Illinois, "the average machinery investment for a production worker . . . organized around automatic control devices, is \$100,000."

The very process of attempting to increase the rate of profit by raising the ratio of machinery and plant over wages brings into play the unintended and inherent tendency of a falling rate of profit. While it is not too difficult to institute more advanced techniques of mechanization, it is difficult if not impossible to maintain the advantage. Other capitalists in strong competitive positions are quick to match and outdo the new techniques.

The question naturally arises: Why should be capitalists introduce mechanization at all if in the long run it only succeeds in tending to reduce the rate of profit? Mainly because one way to extract the greatest profit

is to be the first to lower the cost of production, to cheapen the commodities produced, while selling at the old price.

Here is how Marx describes the vicious circle, or what he called "this two-faced law":

No capitalist voluntarily introduces a new method of production, no matter how much more productive it may be . . . so long as it reduces the rate of profit. But every new method of production of this sort cheapens the commodities. Hence the capitalist sells them originally above their prices of production, or perhaps above their value. He pockets the difference, which exists between these prices of production and the market prices of the other commodities produced at higher prices of production. He can do this, because the average labor time required socially for the production of these other commodities is higher than the labor time required under the new methods of production. His method is above the social average. *But* competition generalizes it and subjects it to the general law. Then follows a fall in the rate of profit . . .\*

Thus there rages the ceaseless battle for a higher rate of profit and a greater total volume of profit. It must be admitted that in both respects—in rate and volume of profits—American monopoly capitalism has had considerable success, though always of course, at the expense of the workers and the middle classes. There have been brief periods of exception when labor has been able through militant struggles to wrest a greater measure of the value it

\* *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 248 (Kerr edition).

produces, nevertheless this has not been true in recent years. Profits have never been higher. Neither have investments in new equipment and plants.

The *American Machinist* reports the fact that Detroit is currently spending a billion dollars for new production equipment, mainly of the automation type. In advancing six reasons for this huge capital outlay, it gives first: "Competition is back with a vengeance." In what is almost a paraphrase of Marx, this employers' magazine writes:

If a company's share of the market decreases so that it must rely on a wider margin of profits per unit, then automation is one way to reach that end. And if industry leaders are to stay competitive, they too must keep costs as low as rival firms . . . (Special Report No. 378.)

#### AUTOMATION AND EXPLOITATION

One of the greatest myths of all is that automation eases the intensity of labor and the rate of exploitation. This isn't true anywhere in American industry today. But nowhere is this more patently false than in the so-called "sick" industries (those in chronic difficulties but which somehow succeed in making tidy profits) as in textile. Here, the combination of more and more labor-saving machinery with an ever greater intensity of labor, *plus* wage cuts, is a notorious fact.

However, even in industries which are supposedly healthy, and now in

"boom," the pattern of automation is accompanied by greater workloads, more intensive speedup, and greater strain on the job. In other words, the far greater productivity is based not only on fewer hands and more machines, but the fewer hands often work harder, are under greater pressures, and have an ever greater sense of insecurity.

Broadly speaking, there are two main methods whereby capital seeks to maintain and get an ever higher rate of profit. First, through wage cuts—where they can get away with it—and more often by increasing the intensity of labor through speedup, stretch-out and plain slave-driving. Secondly, and not divorced from the first, the introduction of labor-saving machinery to further increase the productivity of the workers.

That these two methods are found side by side has been dramatically illustrated again and again in recent years. As this article is being written the workers in the Studebaker-Packard plants were forced to take a strike vote against the action of the corporation in laying off 1,811 men.

This takes place a year after having talked the workers (with the help of union officials) into taking a wage cut and accepting greater speed-up. Today the official organ of the United Automobile Workers reports that workers in the plant are angry because the union in offering an inch inspired the company to take a mile. It writes that Studebaker-Packard bosses seek "to run

the (assembly) line at the same speed and to sweat the same production out of the fewer than 9,000 remaining workers." The explanation given by the union fills in the picture:

Much of the equipment at Studebaker is old. Much of it is costly to run. The new management apparently is determined to impose a speed-up to make up the difference between its production costs and those of competitors.\*

Obviously, the picture in the Studebaker plant is a by-product of the automation activities of the giant monopolies in auto, and an effort by the "little" monopolies to match the lower cost of production by every means at hand. This is part of the fruits of automation.

The conclusion could be drawn from this that where automation techniques are being instituted and where sales are relatively high, at least here the intensity of labor is eased. But that is not what is actually involved.

What is involved is not simply greater productivity as a result of installation of labor-saving devices, but at the same time a greater intensity of labor on the part not only of the production workers, but also of all the contributing workers. Thus the rate of exploitation is continually increasing. Automation, instead of making life easier for the worker, makes it more burdensome, and more insecure.\*\*

The United Auto Workers has been calling attention to some of the

actual facts. Its studies reveal how foolhardy it is to expect that automation will itself make working conditions better and compensation in terms of real wages greater.

The UAW Economic and Collective Bargaining Conference held in Detroit last November brought the true picture into sharper focus. Drastic changes in factory methods caused by automation are making existing classifications and wage structures obsolete. While productivity is leaping forward, management is adhering to rates and job classifications that have been long outlived. This is particularly true where automation is introduced into old plants on a piece-meal basis.

Effects on older workers are particularly rough. Retraining is often needed and rarely provided, nor are new jobs at old skills always available. The seniority system generally is taking a beating. According to the union: "Narrow seniority groupings are becoming increasingly obsolete and harmful to our membership." Here, in particular, the Negro workers who, as is often true, were the last to be hired, find their jobs in real danger. This is particu-

\* *United Auto Worker*, July, 1955.

\*\* A *New York Times* (May 31, 1955) story reporting the National Conference of Social Work, quotes Dr. Nathan E. Cohen, Associate Dean of the N. Y. School of Social Work:

"He warned that technological changes were adding to the country's mental health problems. . . . Man is more and more able to produce more in a shorter period of time but as yet does not have a greater guarantee of his share of the increased productivity. If anything the increased productivity without a planning concept for its consumption makes his economic position more hazardous, his insecurities greater and his increased leisure time a threat rather than a blessing."

larly true when the plants move South.

Automation, especially in the form of new plants, also means greater hardships for workers and their families. Even where employees are not thrown out and are permitted to move with the plant, the costs of moving, the problems of dislocation all become part of the patterns of exploitation.

Nor is the skilled worker exempt. Automation is being seized upon by employers to reduce the number of journeymen employed, while at the same time making the labor more intense mainly by breaking down lines of demarcation between the skilled trades.

We find this plainly stated in the magazine *Factory Management and Maintenance* (which sells for a dollar and is edited for management):

The jobs that are "duck soup" for elimination by automatic production are mainly the semi-skilled ones, such as machine operating and materials handling. Some observers believe the factory of the future will go so far as to wipe out this great "middle class" of industry. (April, 1952)

But apparently this doesn't go far enough. There is still the "problem" of the highly skilled workers used for maintenance. So, says the same magazine:

You haven't yet hit the big problem of the plant of the future—the problem of preserving basic maintenance craft skills while at the same time having flexibility to cross over craft lines in plant work. . . . [Quoting a plant engineer it continues] "The ideal for us would be to have *combined* maintenance skills—electricians for example who can do hydraulic repairs, too. But the union won't let us. . . . The basic background required is electrical. But our men should be able to do millwright work and pipe fitting, too. As it is, the three crafts hang around and get in one another's way on many jobs. We have one new plant that's not unionized yet. We have just the "general maintenance man" job we need there. . . . But we're going to have a rough time when the union finally gets in and sees what we've done."

As for wages, the employers haven't changed one whit with the "new philosophy of automation." Even where Annual Improvement Factor provisions are included in contracts, they provide no additional compensation for shifts to new modes of production. Particularly with regard to changes in individual jobs, in which as a result of automation the worker's productivity can be doubled, his job classification and wage often remain static.

(To be concluded in our November issue.)

# New Stirrings on the Campus

By Alita Letwin\*

THE CAMPUSES of our nation were among the first to be hard hit by the pro-fascist offensive generated by the cold-war policy. Through every means, the bourgeoisie attempted to cut off the free inquiry and action which constitute the lifeblood of learning. In the light of this attempt, the recent upsurge in student activity and militancy takes on special significance. There are new winds beginning to blow over our nation's campuses which pose some vital lessons and challenges to all who are fighting for peace and democracy.

As a numerical force alone, students constitute an important and powerful group. There are over two and a half million students in the United States. Thirty percent of all 18 year olds are students! As early as 1940, over 40 percent of all college students came from working-class and small-farming families. Not only do they absorb the rich traditions of their parents; they in turn have a strong influence on the entire youth movement, for the leadership of the major national youth

organizations includes large numbers of students or former students.

But the importance of the campus ranges far beyond this. It is to the universities that the ruling class looks for the ideological justifications for its existence and policies. It is here that the textbooks are written and the teachers trained for *all* the nation's children. Young scientists, historians, philosophers and lawyers gain not merely technical skills here, but their outlook as well. By stifling the battle of ideas and imposing their own philosophy in its place, the bourgeoisie seeks to make these young people their future ideologists.

## THE EFFECTS OF THE COLD WAR

With the cold war, the drive to make the campuses the ideological bulwark of imperialism intensified. Big business gained a greater stranglehold on the colleges with over 50 percent of all donations coming from corporations. Militarization of the campuses was stepped up. A host of top brass became college presidents, R.O.T.C. was expanded, and two-thirds of all scien-

\* The author is National Student Secretary of the Labor Youth League. This article is based on a report presented in the summer of 1955 to the National Board of the LYL.—Ed.

tific  
rec  
W  
again  
tion  
the  
amor  
throu  
rulin  
tion  
an a  
which  
picke  
chill  
Univ  
Fulto  
Bey  
of the  
acade  
order  
ment  
the c  
more  
were  
try a  
Amer  
whole  
A.Y.I  
zation  
teache  
Party  
this c  
direct  
amon  
lberg  
loyal  
the M  
ee g  
lunts  
Und  
\* See  
loom (

tific research was brought under direct military control.\*

Wall Street's systematic offensive against democracy in higher education included a drive to choke off the democratic trends so evident among students from the 1930's through the post-war period. To a ruling class bent on world domination it was impermissible to allow an atmosphere to continue under which, for example, 2,000 student pickets could greet Winston Churchill when he appeared at Columbia University shortly after his infamous Fulton, Missouri speech.

Beginning with the earliest days of the cold war a ferocious attack on academic freedom was unleashed in order to crush militant student movements and create a pall of fear over the classroom. In 1946 and 1947 more than a dozen campus groups were banned throughout the country as a result of the House Un-American Activities Committee's wholesale onslaught against the A.Y.D. and other progressive organizations. In 1948 there was a wave of teacher firings because of Progressive Party affiliations. On the heels of this came a host of repressive acts directed against the universities, among them the New York Feinberg Law and the California Tenney "loyalty" oath. And in New York, the McCarran investigating committee gave a preview of the witch-hunts to come.

Under the cover of the Korean

war hysteria, all opposition to the militarization of education was declared unpatriotic.

Following the G.O.P. victory in 1952, the severest attacks on democracy in the schools were launched. In December, 1952, Senator McCarthy, together with his political side-kicks, Velde and Jenner, began an all-out offensive through a series of congressional inquisitions. The hearings lasted for over a year and involved over thirty universities in every part of the country. Openly singling out "communist thinkers" as well as "communists," it became clear, as Dr. Benjamin, of George Peabody College, said, that their objective was nothing less than reducing "education in this country to a dissentionless training of their own choice. . . ."

The assault of these years had its impact on the student body. Surveying 72 colleges, Benjamin Fine, education editor of the *New York Times*, noted the tragic and dangerous fact that students' traditional right to learn and think creatively was being strangled:

A subtle creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech is attacking the college campuses in many parts of the country, limiting both students and faculty in the area traditionally reserved for the free exploration of knowledge and truth. (May 10, 1951).

Through intimidation and red-baiting, the national unity movements that were coming into being immediately after the war were also

\* See: Samuel Sillen, *Cold War in the Classroom* (M&M, N. Y., 1950).



destroyed. There resulted a sharp decline in activity and in the number of students willing to join *any* organization. Objective presentation and discussion of Marxism and the Soviet Union, while always rare, became non-existent, contributing to the general acceptance of the Big Lie. Among certain sections of the student population, fear gave rise to defeatism and compromise. Thus the *Harvard Crimson*, which had spoken out against witch-hunts, in the face of a Jenner committee visit in 1953 editorially advised: "We believe, since there is no way to stop investigators, the soundest course is to speak frankly and answer each question honestly. . . ."

#### STUDENT RESISTANCE

Yet, in spite of their vicious and many-pronged attacks on the campuses, the ruling class was never able to completely obliterate democratic student sentiment and action. At all times there were examples of local student resistance. For example, in the spring of 1951, 2,000 University of Wisconsin students signed a petition urging a Big 5 "summit meeting"; and California students took part in the victorious movement to defeat a state loyalty oath for teachers during the same year.

Student reaction to the rampages of congressional committees in the Spring of 1953 indicated a growing awareness that it was not only the Left which was under attack. During that period, the University of Wisconsin student paper sparked the

formation of a committee of student leaders to fight impending state and congressional inquisitions. The University of Chicago student council sponsored a conference of 85 organizations which formed the All Campus Civil Liberties Committee. Regional student conferences were convened, one in the East and one in the Midwest, to discuss student action to thwart the McCarthys.

The past year and half, however, marked the beginnings of a new mood among students. It has been characterized by a sharp upsurge in student concern and activity over the major problems affecting students: McCarthyism, peace and civil rights. Dramatic movements on these issues encompassing students of the most varied opinions have rocked campuses throughout the country. These developments point to the growing possibility for national student unity movements.

This does not mean that McCarthyism has been routed on the campuses. Not all sections are involved in this fight-back. Ideological confusion has by no means been dissipated. Teachers are still fired, Feinberg laws still exist, classrooms are still largely devoid of controversy, student associations are still proscribed.

But the tide is beginning to turn. The events of the academic year 1954-55 dramatically bear this out.

The spring of 1954 witnessed tens of thousands of students all over the country wearing small green feathers as a symbol of their anti-

McC  
Feat  
expr  
Cens  
fact  
the  
natio  
tache  
ing  
Whi  
sent  
camp  
cessf  
puse  
and  
of C  
plan  
rang  
to t  
Acti  
On  
McC  
ic Fr  
in A  
natio  
natio  
coun  
gaged  
uniti  
organ  
and p  
As  
anti-M  
the fe  
dom  
of M  
dresse  
tor, L  
sorshi  
show  
North  
At Q

McCarthy sentiments. This "Green Feather spirit" found direct political expression in the autumn drive to Censure McCarthy. It can be said in fact that the campus activities were the most dramatic expression of the nation-wide movement. Tags attached to small bars of soap bearing the message: DWJVC—Don't Whitewash Joe, Vote Censure, were sent to senators from a number of campuses. Mass petitions were successfully circulated at many campuses such as Columbia, Harvard and Swarthmore. At the University of Chicago a Censure Rally was planned with sponsorship by groups ranging from the Young Republicans to the Students for Democratic Action.

One of the highpoints of anti-McCarthy activity was the Academic Freedom Week celebrations held in April, 1955. Sponsored by the National Student Association, a national student center of 300 student council affiliates, activities were engaged in throughout the country uniting a wide variety of campus organizations, community figures and professors.

As compared to the prior year, anti-McCarthyism was much more to the forefront in the Academic Freedom celebration. At the University of Michigan the main rally was addressed by the Joe-Must-Go originator, Leroy Gore. Under broad sponsorship "Salt of the Earth" was shown to a packed audience at Northwestern University in Illinois. At Queens College and City College

in New York, Doxey A. Wilkerson and Joseph Starobin were invited to present Marxist viewpoints during panel discussions. In the same spirit, the question "Do Communists Have the Right to Teach?" was reopened for debate at numerous schools such as the Universities of Wisconsin and Michigan after long having been viewed as a "settled question."

Students' interest in Marxism had never really been squelched. Therefore, with the reverses suffered by McCarthyism there has been a marked increase in the willingness of students to listen to, discuss and debate with Marxists. Thus, a political science instructor at the University of Pennsylvania invited a Philadelphia Communist Party leader to address his class on the Communist Party. Simon Gerson and Herbert Aptheker participated in campus discussions under broad sponsorship. Howard Selsam, A.B. Magil and Doxey A. Wilkerson all appeared at well attended meetings sponsored by the Labor Youth League. An additional reflection of this trend is the fact that the L.Y.L. is viewed as a center for Marxist discussion on many campuses. National and local leaders of the organization have participated in campus debates, newspaper interviews and in meetings reaching large numbers of students.

#### ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND PEACE

A very significant link-up began to develop during this period be-

tween the issues of academic freedom and peace, in at least two struggles. First, at the beginning of the Fall semester, a loyalty oath was instituted for all Reserve Officers Training Corps participants. Anger—and a wave of activity—swept the campuses at this infringement. This resulted in the N.S.A. promise to work for the removal of the loyalty oath. But the turning point was the fact that student resistance to the loyalty oath developed into an attack on the very concept of compulsory R.O.T.C.! At Cornell a student referendum indicated that students in a ratio of 2-1 were in favor of abolishing compulsory R.O.T.C. At the University of Wisconsin almost every candidate for student senate opposed the compulsory feature of R.O.T.C. In the Spring, the oath was modified to a simple pledge of allegiance.

Second, the Pentagon created a national furor when it refused to allow the military academies to debate the question: "Should the United States Recognize Red China?" The Temple University debating team expressed the general campus sentiment when it announced that it would return its championship cup and organize its own debating match if it were not allowed to discuss this topic. Finally, even President Eisenhower "saw no reason" to limit such debate.

But by far the most exciting peace movement was around student exchange.

In the summer of 1954, the State Department refused visas to a group

of Soviet student editors on the ground that no school was then in session, and indicated they might apply again later. Desiring to convert the possibility of such a visit into a reality, the student councils at Oberlin College in Ohio and Swarthmore in Pennsylvania undertook a nationwide campaign to have schools invite the editors to visit their campus.

These two student councils wrote to about a hundred schools. Within several months twenty student councils and editorial boards extended invitations to the Soviet editors. The Wisconsin and Illinois Region of the N.S.A. broke with their national policy by approving the program. The Youth Legislative Conference of the N.A.A.C.P. and the student religious groups at Yale supported the project. Everywhere, from the Catholic Fordham University to the University of Colorado, from Wayne College in Detroit to Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, student papers gave their editorial acclaim. However, these invitations were not won without struggle. At U.C.L.A. for example, a poll of student opinion showed that of 3,500 students, four to one wanted the editors to visit their school. When the student council refused to issue an invitation, 1,500 signed a petition calling for a special referendum on the matter.

Visas were granted in March 1955. The enthusiastic response that developed then previewed the reaction of Americans to the visit of Soviet farmers months later. Over a hun-

dred  
At  
sand  
scrol  
W  
the  
were  
for  
Ober  
the  
leges  
State  
appe  
sprea  
tion  
ity.  
Ex  
ing b  
ails d  
he S  
the M  
every  
ply f  
Unio  
NEG  
In  
the c  
he s  
has t  
porta  
his  
welco  
egre  
North  
of the  
ity  
greete  
right.  
a ret  
pressu  
for h

dred colleges extended invitations! At the University of Chicago a thousand signatures were gathered on a scroll welcoming the visitors.

When the conditions imposed upon the visit—including fingerprinting—were such as to make it impossible for the Soviet editors to come, the Oberlin student council again took the lead by asking hundreds of colleges to join them in protesting the State Department's restrictions. This appeal was beginning to elicit widespread support when summer vacation disbanded most student activity.

Exchange of course, means going both ways. Several student councils delegated representatives to visit the Soviet Union this summer, and the *New York Times* reports that every day four to five students apply for permission to visit the Soviet Union.

### NEGRO RIGHTS

In discussing democratic trends on the campuses, it is noteworthy that the struggle against discrimination has traditionally occupied a very important position. An indication of this was the widespread reaction welcoming the Supreme Court's desegregation decision in both the North and South. Thus, the editor of the student paper at the University of Georgia had originally greeted desegregation as morally right. He was then forced to print a retraction under administration pressure. Feeling student support for his position, however, the editor

apologized for his retreat and reiterated in even stronger terms his anti-segregation position! Student struggles for the admittance of Negroes to their schools occurred throughout the South: the Universities of Georgia and North Carolina are examples.

In 1954, the N.A.A.C.P. and its Youth Legislative Conference had adopted a Fair Education Practices Code which provides for barring discrimination in every aspect of university life. The N.S.A. has in principle accepted such a code, as have several campuses. At the University of Chicago, the student government adopted a "model code" and induced a state senator to submit this code to the state legislature for adoption.

Morgan State College is a Negro institution in Baltimore. When the students became fed up with the jim-crow barriers at a local drug store counter, they staged a "sit in" until they broke the discriminatory policies in the entire chain. The Morgan students then tackled a local movie theater that practiced segregation. And this time the three hundred Negro students were joined by fifty white students from nearby Johns Hopkins, all of whom lined up in front of the ticket office in an effective demonstration. Highly significant from the point of view of labor concern and support for democratic student struggles, is the vote of support to this student action by the Baltimore C.I.O. Council. The Council issued a public statement and helped to make signs, and indi-

cated that it would urge their members to join in the line.

### MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF THESE STRUGGLES

Two striking characteristics ran through the student movements of the past year and a half.

a) Above all they were mass movements. It is estimated, for example, that the Green Feather activities involved over 150,000 students. Probably fifty to sixty campuses held Academic Freedom Weeks. The 100 invitations extended to the Soviet editors were the expression of strong student sentiment, as polls at U.C.L.A., Oberlin and Hunter reveal.

b) The beginning of a new mood of boldness and militancy is evident in many of the activities indicated above.

These movements developed because of several factors. In the first place they were an aspect of a nationwide resistance to McCarthyism, and they reflect the first elements of a thawing in the cold war. Secondly, the fact remains that in spite of the frantic efforts of the bourgeoisie, they have not succeeded in quashing the deep-rooted democratic spirit of American students.

One reason for this is the fact that the imperialist aims of the ruling class in our country have had to be couched in the language of traditional bourgeois-democratic concepts. And students have continued to take these concepts seriously. At all times, for example, those who

accepted McCarthy were in the minority even in his home-state university.

Another reason is in the very makeup of the student body. The large number of students from the lower income brackets was undoubtedly increased by the G.I. Bill and the return of veterans to the campus. Large sections of American students have parents who took part in the struggles of the 1930's and the anti-fascist war. Their democratic traditions have been passed on to their children.

### LESSONS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC FORCES

The lessons to learn from these student movements are many and important. They have demonstrated that the American students in their vast majority, can be won to the struggle for peace and democracy.

They have proved that it is possible to develop broad united movements even without the initial approval or aid of the national leadership of the major established organizations. This was characteristic of the Green Feather movement which in the course of a few weeks blossomed into a major national independent mass movement. Likewise, Academic Freedom Week began on a grass roots level. Of great significance is the fact that in both cases local and regional movements rapidly embraced a wide gamut of student leaders and councils, as well as local affiliates of national student organizations. For example, on a num-

ber of  
academ  
inclu  
group  
even,  
publi  
broad  
consi  
the M  
lish  
major  
In  
strug  
in ro  
was  
level  
the L  
role.  
grass  
tuall  
nation  
sored  
nation  
The  
mann  
relate  
inter  
portan  
nation  
chang  
form  
ouses,  
of Ar  
is be  
them.  
The  
learn  
pher  
edy  
comes  
of all

ber of campuses, sponsorship of local academic freedom demonstrations included conservative religious groups, fraternities and sororities and even, in some instances, Young Republican groups. The result of these broad local struggles was that after considerable wavering and reluctance, the N.S.A. felt compelled to establish Academic Freedom Week as a major national event.

In general the national student struggles discussed above developed in roughly the same manner: each was initially generated on a local level by extremely broad forces, with the Left playing an active stimulating role. As a consequence of these grass roots developments, each eventually matured into a movement of national scope, some even sponsored and coordinated by the major national student organizations.

These movements illustrate that the manner in which these issues were related to the traditions and self-interest of students played an important role in capturing the imagination of the students. Student exchange, for example, which was the form of the peace issue on the campuses, corresponded to the traditions of American students and was seen as being of immediate benefit to them.

The inability of young people to learn freely in the poisoned atmosphere of today's colleges is a tragedy for the entire nation. It becomes the responsibility, therefore, of all the democratic forces who are

devoted to learning and reason, who are concerned about the future of our nation's culture and intellectual traditions to radically change this situation. It becomes the responsibility and challenge of labor, and its allies, of Communists and progressives, to fight to end the cold war on the campus.

This involves the fight to eradicate every aspect of the anti-intellectualism that the McCarthyites have fostered. It means fighting for the repeal of Feinberg-type legislation and the ending of the military stranglehold on education. It means defending the right of students to have exchange programs with other students of all countries. It means working for the end of all forms of racism on the campuses and for greater federal and local appropriations for the schools. The accomplishment of these aims depends in large part upon the extent to which the democratic forces view student struggles as their struggles.

There is a responsibility to utilize the opportunities that present themselves as a result of student movements. The trade unions have struck an important blow against jimcrow in Baltimore by joining the fight of Morgan students. Organizations could have utilized the proposed visit of Soviet student editors by inviting them to attend their functions. The Fair Education Practices Code can become a civil rights issue in every legislature in the country, not only in Illinois.



Moreover, there is an important challenge to the Left to bring their ideas and the struggle against repressive legislation to the campuses in a much bolder manner. This means that Communist Party leaders, Labor Youth League spokesmen and progressive forces must take advantage of every invitation, and work to create new opportunities to utilize the growing willingness to listen to the Left, and take action in defense of its rights.

The possibility of creating such opportunities has been proven in several instances. When the University of Washington History Department was told that Herbert Aptheker would be in town for a few days, he received an invitation to lecture to a history class. It was this university that had originally taken the lead in firing Marxist teachers and that had recently barred Robert Oppenheimer on the grounds that he was "too controversial!"

A further indication of this is to be found in the responses of students to the Labor Youth League's appeal for support in its fight against the McCarran Act and the S.A.C.B. ruling that it is a "Communist-front" organization. While no major youth organization has yet officially acted on the League's case, still through L.Y.L.'s appearances before a number of groups it has been able to sharpen the understanding of the McCarran Act itself. At the 1954 N.S.A. Congress, for example, the two L.Y.L. spokesmen met with little hostility and a great amount of hon-

est curiosity—three days after the passage of the Communist Control Act. They were constantly being engaged in discussions ranging from McCarthyism to Marxism. By virtue of their appearance before most of the delegates with the true facts of the McCarran Act, a resolution dealing with this Act was raised on the plenary floor by forty representative sponsors.

The reactionary forces have not relaxed their efforts nor in any way modified their aim of complete domination over the minds and actions of the student body. But the new winds over the campus are refreshing and invigorating. They bring with them the promise of new successes in the fight for democratic rights. They open the way toward growing struggle for democratic resolutions to the deep crisis that engulfs American education. From all those who honor true learning, who work for peace and democracy, the campus struggles merit close attention and support.

\* \* \*

Since the above was written, the Eighth Annual Congress of the National Student Association was held, August 21-31. The trends toward greater liberalism and militancy among students discussed above were dramatically evident there. This takes on added significance because the N.S.A. is everywhere viewed as the leading spokesman for American students. Moreover, its past leadership has been tightly controlled at times by the State Department and other very conservative elements.

It  
ate th  
cath  
which  
that  
"D  
were,  
At o  
marc  
derat  
ing F  
tire  
by th  
a ba  
canno  
—sto  
"John  
onstr  
Carth  
chair  
"C  
Th  
dom  
fensiv  
Cong  
like  
after  
Acad  
firmed  
be ju  
tiona  
were  
ive l  
Act,  
Furth  
dated  
Comm  
findi  
dom.  
facts



It is not intended here to fully evaluate the Congress. However, some indication may be offered of the impact which mass student sentiments had on that gathering.

"Demonstrations," or skits, as it were, are customary at the Congresses. At one point some Southern students marched about holding aloft Confederate flags and singing a song eulogizing Robert E. Lee. In response, the entire remaining plenary body—sparked by the Wisconsin students' display of a banner proclaiming that a nation cannot survive half free and half slave—stood as if one person and all sang "John Brown's Body." A second "demonstration" was a satire in which "McCarthy" and "Cohn" usurped the chair and accused the N.S.A. of being a "Communist-front" organization.

The resolutions on academic freedom showed a desire to take the offensive against McCarthyism. The Congress consented unanimously—unlike last year, when this passed only after hard struggle—to sponsor an Academic Freedom Week and reaffirmed its position that a teacher should be judged only on the basis of professional competency. In addition, there were several resolutions condemning the Attorney General's list, all repressive loyalty oaths, the McCarran-Walter Act, and other reactionary measures. Furthermore, the leadership was mandated to appear before the Hennings Committee to present proposals for defending and extending academic freedom. Widespread concern with the effects of the McCarran Act upon aca-

ademic freedom was displayed. A resolution was passed calling for the circulation of a Fund of the Republic study of this question.

The spirit of Geneva was evident in the *unanimous* reversal of the N.S.A.'s previously hostile position on student exchange with the socialist countries. The new resolution calls for such exchange. However, while the Congress reaffirmed its anti-U.M.T. position, it defeated a resolution condemning the new military reserve act because, it held, "we cannot let our defense guard down."

On the issue of discrimination, the Negro-white unity that was evident in the demonstrations, the militant role of the Negro students themselves, and the generally positive position of the majority of Southern white students resulted in two fine resolutions. The Congress called for the immediate desegregation of all colleges, and immediate compliance with the Supreme Court ruling on desegregating schools. Dropping the gradualist program outlined at the last Congress, the officers were mandated to set up an interracial conference of Southern schools to facilitate united action. The Congress also adopted a Model Educational Practices Standard—a code aimed at eliminating discrimination from every aspect of college life.

The attitude towards the two L.Y.L. representatives—unofficial observers at the Congress—was marked by cordiality and general goodwill and is further proof of the changed atmosphere.

## BOOK REVIEW

### LATIN AMERICA AND THE U.S.A.

By A. B. Magil

*U.S. over Latin America*, by Herman Olden in collaboration with Labor Research Association. International Publishers, N. Y. \$.50.

On January 15, 1955, John Foster Dulles, then newly nominated as Secretary of State, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

*"I have a feeling that the conditions in South America, Latin America, are somewhat comparable to the conditions as they were in China in the middle '30s, when the Communist movement was getting started . . . but we didn't do anything about it. . . . Well, if we don't look out, we will wake up some morning and read in the newspapers that there happened in South America the same kind of thing that happened in China in '49, and the time to meet it is before it reaches the strength that the Communist movement did in China in '49."*

The fact is that the government of the United States has been "meeting it"—"it," being the aspirations and struggles of the Latin American peoples for national freedom—for more than half a century. That is, the "meeting it" began long before there were Communists in China, the United States, Latin America or, for that matter, Russia. And Washington has "met" these struggles at times with marines, bullets and warships; at other times with threats, intrigue and politi-

cal manipulation; at all times with the dollar juggernaut of American monopoly capitalism. Thus, talk about "Communist subversion" and "intervention" is simply a new fraud to justify an old tyranny—in Latin America as elsewhere.

Unfortunately, for most North Americans—including most Communists and other progressives—Latin America is *terra incognita*. It doesn't make the headlines very often except when a revolt or coup explodes somewhere below the Rio Grande. The problems and struggles of Latin America are skimpily treated and prodigally distorted in the standard American histories. And the fact that at the moment Latin America does not shape world events as decisively and dramatically as does Europe or Asia obscures the central role it plays in the U.S. imperialist power structure, as well as its vast democratic potentialities.

All this lends added significance to the 64-page booklet, *U.S. Over Latin America*. Rest assured, there's nothing like it in English. There is no other work which tells so much about Latin America in so little space, which sheds so much light on the meaning of that "other America" for the workers and people of the United States, and points the way toward solving the problems that the Wall Street masters of Latin America have created for all the peoples of our continent.

"U.S. policy toward Latin America has undergone many tactical changes since World War I," Herman Olden writes in his introduction. "But the chief aim of U.S. monopolies—to weld the Western Hemisphere into a strategic and economic bloc in the interests of U.S. finance capital and to maintain that bloc—has not changed. To carry out this policy, U.S. monopolists have penetrated into every aspect of Latin American life—economic, governmental and cultural."

Olden documents this thesis in persuasive fashion. He also traces the tactical changes in U.S. policy, from the "Big Stick" practices of the first third of the century, through the Good Neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt (whose positive features as well as basic limitations he discusses), to the more reactionary and aggressive methods of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations.

In an introduction and eleven brief chapters the author succeeds in condensing a vast amount of knowledge of the Latin American countries and their problems. Here you will find the essential data about that area's economic resources, social and economic conditions, the system of land ownership and its historic background, industrial development, United States investments and other forms of economic control, the Latin American trade-union movement and its relation to U.S. labor (including information on how Wall-Street oppression of Latin America adversely affects wages and conditions of U.S. workers), and the liberation struggle of the Latin American peoples.

Enhancing the booklet's usefulness are five excellent charts, a map of North and South America identifying the various countries, statistical data

on population and area, and reference notes.

Inevitably there are a few weaknesses. In relation to the size of the booklet, it seems to this reviewer too heavily weighted on the economic aspect, fundamental though that is. One could have wished for more discussion of political and social developments and a bit of space devoted to the cultural invasion of Latin America by U.S. imperialism—from the dregs of Hollywood to the corruption of the Spanish language.

Since, as Olden writes, "the issues of national liberation and peace tend to merge" because of Latin America's strategic importance and the part its raw materials play in powering the U.S. war machine, one could also have wished for more on the peace movement, which in a number of countries has attained great scope and influence.

Another shortcoming is the failure to include Puerto Rico as an integral part of the discussion of Latin America; instead, it is given a few paragraphs near the end. Though a separate booklet is planned on Puerto Rico, it is important, in view of Washington's efforts to make it appear that Puerto Rico is somehow an extension of the United States, to emphasize that this U.S. colony is ethnically, historically and culturally an inseparable part of Spanish America.

However, these are minor blemishes on what is a most important achievement, an invaluable complement to William Z. Foster's pioneer Marxist work, *Outline Political History of the Americas*. And it is very good news that *U.S. Over Latin America* is the first in a series on Latin American countries and problems to be issued by Internatioaal Publishers.

***A Happy Publishing Event!***

**ANNOUNCING FOR OCTOBER PUBLICATION:**

# **I SPEAK MY OWN PIECE!**

**AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF "THE REBEL GIRL"**

**By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn**

Here at last is the long-awaited autobiography of America's greatest living woman who, to the undying shame of our nation, will reach her 65th birthday on August 7 behind the iron bars of a prison cell. Compressed into the record of this one lifetime—very far from ended—is a history of the labor and socialist movements of the past fifty years, told with all the drama, warmth, intimacy and authority of a first-hand participant and central character.

Just scanning through the more than ninety chapters is an exciting experience: "First Speech—1906"; "I Mount the Soap Box and Get Arrested"; "James Connolly—Irish Socialist"; "The I.W.W. 'Stirreth Up the People'"; "I Met Tom L. Johnson"; "Mother Jones—Labor Agitator"; "My First Conspiracy Trial—1910"; "Giants of Labor—Haywood and Debs"; "The Lawrence Strike of 1912"; "The Ettor-Giovanitti Trial"; "The Paterson Silk Strike—1913"; "William Z. Foster and Tom Mann—Syndicalists"; "Labor Defense in 1913-1914"; "Joe Hill—Martyred Troubadour of Labor"; "The Mooney Frame-Up"; "The Everett Massacre"; "Frank Little Lynched"; "The Palmer Raids"; "Charles E. Ruthenberg—'Most Arrested Man in America'"; "The Legion Attacks—Centralia, 1919"; "The Irish and Soviet Republics"; "When Americans First Heard of Lenin"; "1919 and the Great Steel Strike"; "Sacco and Vanzetti."

Thousands of individuals, groups and organizations, who love and revere this noble daughter of the American working class, by helping to spread her book far and wide, can make it a powerful weapon for the freedom of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and all others imprisoned for their political views and activities.

*An M & M Book • Popular \$1.75; Cloth \$2.75*

**PLACE YOUR ADVANCE ORDER TODAY**

*at your local bookshop or*

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.**

!

est  
er  
ed  
of  
he  
nd

ng  
ar-  
he  
";  
nd  
";  
—  
oa-  
nk  
ost  
";  
";

nd  
to  
he  
eir

Y.