

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 11, 1955

FIVE CENTS

PERON AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

... page 4

MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL GOES UNION

... page 8

THE KHRUSHCHEV-TITO PEACE-PIPE

... page 6

BRITAIN HEARS ABOUT AUTOMATION

... page 3

RACISM AND MURDER IN NEW YORK CITY

... page 7

GRIPES BEHIND DETROIT'S WILDCATS

... page 2

THE BLACKBOARD JUNGLE'S CLASSES

... page 5

## Gains by Steel Strike Follow UAW's Blazed Trail

By BEN HALL

After a one-day strike, the United Steel Workers Union won a notable victory in negotiations with the Big Steel corporations. Coming immediately after the UAW's successes against General Motors and Ford, the steel contracts combine to impel the whole union movement forward and set 1955 as a year of labor advances.

Agreements in steel do not expire until next year; but they provided for reopening discussions this year on wages alone. The companies, under strike pressure, granted the union a 15 cent hourly increase after holding stubbornly to a 10 cent offer rejected by the union.

The N. Y. Times, which diffidently welcomed the settlement because the strike was so short, is disturbed at the wage pattern set in auto and steel; it is alarmed to discover that wage increases are being won even though the cost of living has been relatively stable:

"Now we suddenly find that we have been catapulted back (so far as the automobile and steel industries are concerned) into a situation comparable to that prevailing during the years of the first and second post-war rounds of wage rises—and this at a time when the cost of living has been stabilized for the first time since the end of the war. This is a pattern that clearly invites further examination."

The N. Y. Herald Tribune complains that "the settlement was steep" and concludes that "Price and wage rises secured under the pressure of a strike can go too fast and too far." (We doubt that the Tribune is really too annoyed at the rise in steel prices. It is the wage rise which it finds so vexing.)

### NOT MUCH "HARMONY"

What is significant in these press comments is this: When wages rise and prices remain stable, the working class can raise its real standard of living. That is what they find "disturbing." They are eager for a country without class struggle; they yearn for labor-management harmony, for a strikeless economy. Meanwhile, labor must keep its place. But their dreams of peace will always be shattered as organized labor continues its struggle to advance the condition of the working class.

(The Tribune, by the way, also says of the auto agreements: "It had other bad effects, to be sure, in establishing the principle of GAW in industry.")

When Walter Reuther emerged from the final conference sessions with Ford, he was quick to praise the company's

responsible attitude. One can hardly expect less from David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers union.

He told the press: "I hope that the settlement will provide for the ever-greater mutual respect and understanding and continued working together between the company and union which it has always been my purpose to nurture." Clifford F. Hood, president of U. S. Steel, concluded: "I believe the corporation and its employees can continue to make substantial progress working together."

One almost forgets that a nation-wide strike was necessary to force the companies into line! The union had to strike even though—

- The UAW had set a pattern of big increases.
- The steel industry is working at full

(Continued on page 2)

## Go Hire a Hall!

The Court of Appeals may have hit at the government's use of the "subversive list," but try and hire a hall to tell the public about it... Specifically, try and hire the Hotel Diplomat, one of the best known centers for meetings in New York City...

The New York ISL, preparing a meeting at which Max Shachtman was to speak, tried. Thereby hangs a tale of fine irony in these days when so many newspaper editorials have expressed their gratification that the court corrected a deplorable condition.

The ISL was refused use of the hall, to express its gratification that the subversive list has been put in its place, on the ground that—it was on the subversive list!

On Wednesday the ISL contacted the hall-renting manager, a Miss Todman, and practically had it all arranged. The same day, Miss Todman—who assured us that she knew all about the court decision, boasted that the ACLU met frequently in her place, and that she was well acquainted with Norman Thomas—called up to

## U.S., Moscow Look to Horse-trading at Big Four Conference

By GORDON HASKELL

The high hopes which were once widely held for some kind of broad settlement of cold-war issues at the Geneva conference are dribbling away as the date of the meeting draws near. These hopes were raised by the bold Stalinist reversals of policy on the Austrian peace treaty, the visit to Belgrade and the apparent willingness of the Kremlin to recognize the Bonn government. They were fed by the studied "good fellow" behavior of Russian officials all over the world, and by the repeated propaganda hints that the Russian government is willing to apply the principles of the Austrian treaty to a unified Germany.

But as time has passed, there has been a noticeable let-up in the Stalinist campaign with regard to Germany. Instead of a repetition of the proposal for a speedy unification of Germany on the basis of neutrality, instead of a propaganda campaign to build up this proposal in the minds of the peoples of Germany and Europe as the key to the Geneva conference, the Stalinists have tended to play it down to the point of disappearance from their arsenal of political weapons.

This does not mean that the proposal may not be raised at the conference itself. The Stalinist leaders may fear they have overplayed their hand on this issue to the point at which the American bloc at the conference may find some way of calling their bluff. Should they become

convinced at the conference that the leading North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers have no intention of presenting some plan which would call their hand on the democratic unification of Germany, it is entirely possible that the "unity-plus-neutrality" proposal will be revived and pushed to the limit.

But why should this understandable caution of the part of the Stalinists?

(Turn to last page)

### LUPA WINS

John W. Lupa's long fight against his "security risk" labeling has been won. The Detroit mechanic was notified that a special "security" panel had cleared him in Washington.

He had been battling since April 1, 1954 to win reinstatement to a job at the Detroit Tank Arsenal, assisted by the UAW's legal department.

The charge against Lupa was that, during the time he was a member of the UAW, he was associated with the Socialist Workers Party. Lupa denied this. He was finally given a hearing last June and cleared by a hearing board at the Tank Arsenal. But a loyalty-review board in Washington reversed the Detroit decision. Lupa appealed, and a special review board went over the case last month and cleared him.

Lupa will be reinstated to his job at the arsenal along with back pay amounting to some \$6000.

**So We Hired a Hall —  
Come Hear the ISL Chairman Whose  
Fight Made Civil-Liberties History**

**NYC Thursday, July 14 at 8—Central Plaza's AIR-CONDITIONED Gothic Room, 111 2nd Ave. (near 7 St.)  
Max Shachtman on The Passport Victory & Next Steps in the Fight for Civil-Liberties**



## DETROIT

## Discontent in UAW Due to Gripes over Working Conditions

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, July 3—The strangest victory in the history of the United Auto Workers continues to perplex the leadership and ranks of this vast organization; for the aftermath of the Ford and General Motors settlements certainly was not the kind that usually follows success.

Eighteen days after the pact with GM was signed, the last of the wildcat strikes protesting the agreement was broken, but only after three membership meetings had voted to continue the walkout, and only after a court injunction was obtained to break the backbone of resistance to the orders of the international union to call off the strike.

This amazing spectacle took place at the key GM transmission plant at Livonia (Willow Run) plant. Individual strikers were handed the court injunction naming them, and not the union, as responsible for the walkout and ordering its termination. The UAW had repudiated the walkout at the court hearing. Previously its leaders had tried unsuccessfully to get the workers to vote an end to the protest.

Heart of the dispute at Livonia was the failure of the union to get the cutter grinders into the skilled-trades classification, as they are at Ford and Chrysler. This failure not only cost the men the eight cents per hour given the skilled trades in the agreement, but kept their wages down 25 cents an hour below Ford and Chrysler scales on the same job.

Other indications of the unusual impact of the GM and Ford agreement came at unexpected places. The International Executive Board of the UAW approved the package only after vigorous

debate and much questioning of the whole idea.

The routine ratification meeting of the GM national council turned into a turbulent affair lasting all day and night, instead of a perfunctory celebration meeting.

Top officers of the UAW had one of their very special private bull-sessions to iron out misunderstandings and disagreements arising from the unexpected reactions to the settlement in the shops and local unions.

More probably, the disappointment and disillusionment has arisen from something else, and this is the core of the matter: What the UAW ranks want, and what the agreements lack, is guarantees on precisely the one thing bothering the workers more than any other issue—working conditions.

For five years the auto workers have been limited in improving many of the injustices, inequities, work standards, and other shop issues. While it is not arguable that these have not been improved in some respects, nothing decisive enough has been done, to convince the ranks that the victory won't be taken out of their hides in speedup and harder work standards.

It is a fact that every other management is demanding of union officials that they meet GM standards on operations, labor productivity, etc., and this is a sore point in the UAW. It even came up as an issue at the IEB meeting. In fact, the problem was even posed that to meet GM standards on everything meant not only hardship to the locals but wiping out the corporation itself, conversely, if GM costs were imposed on them. In other words, the agreement was attacked from the "left" and from the "right."

# LABOR SCOPE

## NMU Settlement Shows Up Lundeberg Concessions

By BEN HALL

Strikes in maritime and steel came as immediate by-products of the auto settlements. Thus the UAW's agreement with Ford and General Motors, hailed as a harbinger of labor-management harmony, seems destined to open a new round of friction instead.

Shipping on the Atlantic Coast and the Gulf was shut down tight on June 16 by a strike involving four unions: National Maritime Union; Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; American Radio Association; Masters, Mates and Pilots. More than half of the country's merchant marine was idle.

The key union, strongest and largest, was the NMU; its chief demand paralleled that of the United Auto Workers. Its newspaper, the Pilot, reported on June 9: "An employer-financed unemployment-benefits plan similar in principle to the plan sought by the National Maritime Union in current negotiations with the shipowners, was won this week by the CIO United Automobile Workers."

Breaking-point came when the employers who were ready to concede on other grounds insisted that seamen who voluntarily quit their jobs be barred in advance from unemployment payments. But the union refused to make this concession. When contracts expired, the strike was on.

Within 24 hours merchant and cargo shipping companies capitulated to the NMU and granted its demand. The issue of voluntary quits, according to the agreement, would be settled in each case by arbitration. The Oil Tankers refused to settle. But after a one-week strike, during which seamen picketed oil refineries and closed them down with the sup-

port of oil workers, the tankers surrendered.

Ordinarily, this might make a simple routine report of a union strike victory; but certain aspects give it added significance:

(1) Maritime labor has been under almost continuous pressure from employers and government to undermine working conditions.

(2) On the West Coast, the Seafarers International Union (AFL), under the leadership of Lundeberg, has already made important concessions to employers, concessions which might have been expected to serve as a precedent on the East Coast.

An investigation and open hearings are currently being held by the House Merchant Marine Committee. Its sessions are turned into an open forum for attacks on wage standards. Representative George P. Miller, Democrat of California, charged that it was making marine labor a "whipping boy." Testifying at the hearings, Clarence C. Morse, chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, said that shipping management was in a "woefully weak position" while strength was "overwhelmingly on the labor side."

Perhaps to counter labor's "strength," the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, Representative Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat of North Carolina, has introduced a bill in Congress for regulating maritime labor. Of this bill, the CIO Marine Engineers Beneficial Association reports: "Bonner has thrown together virtually every anti-labor proposal of the last ten years into one package. . . . The more dangerous and serious provisions of the proposed bill, such as cooling-off periods, committees of inquiry, anti-strike injunctions, and votes on the employers' last offer are either already incorporated into the Taft-Hartley Law or repudiated after successive attempts to write into law. As an indication of the anti-labor bias of the bill, it may be noted that it is the secretary of Commerce who would make the decision that a particular dispute endangered the health, safety or security of the nation, not the secretary of Labor."

### CHARGE SELLOUT

Early in March, Harry Lundeberg, secretary-treasurer of the Sailors Union of the Pacific (SIU-AFL), worked out an unusual deal with a small West Coast operator, the International Shipping Company. The agreement, which cut deeply into working conditions, was presumably an experiment to test out the possibilities of meeting the competition of low-wage foreign ships by reducing the standards of U. S. seamen.

Lundeberg, at the same time, agreed to supply all categories of seagoing personnel, not only unlicensed seamen but also all licensed personnel. He thus cut into the traditional jurisdiction of other unions, including another AFL union, the Masters, Mates, and Pilots.

Among the chief provisions of the contracts were: (1) The 40-hour week was abandoned. Most of the crew could work a 56-hour week at straight time. (2) The number of men in the crew was cut. (3) In return for these and other concessions by the union, the company agreed to increase straight-time rates. (4) But the over-all result was a decrease in wages.

The National Maritime Union was the first to protest, and when it and other CIO unions denounced the agreement Lundeberg and his SIU bolted from the Conference of American Maritime Unions, a federated committee of all AFL and CIO unions. The conference was destroyed. The "CIO News" reported the incident under the headline: "Lundeberg Sellout of Seamen Blasted by CIO Marine Union."

Joseph Curran, president of the NMU, charged that the SUP was "engaged to do some plain and fancy scabbing on those unions which fight to retain the 40-hour week, to scab on those unions even though they know that the 40-hour week is a fundamental part of the whole struggle of the labor movement."

It is on this background that the East Coast settlement must be viewed. The UAW success was undoubtedly a key factor encouraging maritime workers to fight and win.

## Gains by Steel Strike — —

(Continued from page 1)

capacity with a virtually unlimited market for its output.

• As compared with the same period last year, U. S. Steel profits in the first quarter of 1955 rose 62 per cent. It had produced 481,000 more tons of steel—with 26,000 fewer workers—with a wage bill nearly \$3,000,000 lower.

• If U. S. Steel increased wages by 30 cents per hour, it would still enjoy the largest profits of any year except 1916.

• The cost of increases was immediately cancelled out when the companies announced a price rise of \$7.50 a ton. The size of this increase amazed industry experts who anticipated a maximum rise of \$6. Iron Age, an employers' publica-

tion, had predicted a \$4.50 per ton increase.

If under such conditions a strike must take place, we can foresee the fate of labor-management cooperation whenever the economy suffers from a dip. And we can imagine with what enlightened tolerance the big corporations will treat labor demands if the unions, for any reason, are weakened.

The quick victory in steel, and the size of the wage increase, were a direct product of the UAW's victory in auto. The auto package stood as a measuring rod.

McDonald, in rejecting the first company offer, told the 130 steel delegates: "I am almost ashamed to mention the amount the industry is offering. It is an

affrontery in this most profitable year in the industry's history. It is less than half what General Motors gave. What are we anyway—second-class citizens?" Last year, the steel union took about 10½ cents, and the year before 8½ cents.

David McDonald was pushed, prodded and finally forced to lead a strike because of the pressure of the auto settlements. He could not settle for much less than his rival Reuther; especially at a time when he faces opposition from a section of the steel union leadership.

But that doesn't prevent him from throwing darts at Reuther. He is reported to have announced that the steel union will make a "big push" for a Guaranteed Annual Wage next year. And he said contemptuously that it would be "an honest-to-God one," not the sort of plan accepted by the UAW.

Now that the militant UAW has broken the trail, McDonald speaks up bravely. But he had his chance to set the pace in 1954. In February 1954 Steel Labor, published by McDonald's union, wrote:

"Just as the Steelworkers pioneered the pension and social insurance programs that set the pattern for industry throughout the country, so we propose to lead the way in the fight against unemployment and depression with the guaranteed annual wage." And it added, "From the very beginning the union has emphasized that the GAW is a matter for negotiations and cooperative study with industry, a proposal to be hammered into shape at the collective-bargaining table."

The CIO tried to put the flag into his hands but he demurred. Victor Reuther, last year, on the eve of steel negotiations, told a CIO unemployment meeting in Des Moines, Iowa: "The CIO will seek the wage guarantee in negotiations with the steel industry this year and will make the same demands on the auto industry in 1955." McDonald hastened to drop the stance of the brave bull. He indignantly repudiated Vic Reuther for presuming to "dictate" the steel workers' demands. That was the end of GAW in steel that year. The 1954 contracts ignored the question.

Nevertheless the ice is broken. Next year, the steel union will, according to McDonald, insist upon a GAW demand that goes further than the Ford-GM plans. The two largest industrial unions will pave the way for a new advance in the class struggle.

## U.S. Hit on Rule over Okinawa

U. S. violation of trade-union rights in its dependency of Okinawa was before the world congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions at its world congress in May in Vienna.

The ICFTU, to which the AFL and CIO are affiliated, adopted a resolution which presented the charge and decided on an investigation:

"WHEREAS reports have been received that basic human rights, and in particular workers' rights, have been violated in the islands of Okinawa, which are at present under the control of the U. S. A.;

"WHEREAS some Japanese trade unions have, in response to an appeal from workers in Okinawa, endeavored to send a delegation to the islands to investigate the situation but have been unable to obtain a permit from the U. S. military authorities; . . .

"[The congress] instructs the Executive Board to investigate the situation and to adopt a policy in accordance with the results of the investigation."

Needless to say, this didn't make the headlines in this country.

The same ICFTU congress took slaps at some other of the U. S.'s colonialist allies.

One resolution demanded that Britain

grant full civil rights to the people of Malta and "include Malta in all economic programs and social welfare schemes applicable in the metropolitan country." This demand was adopted, even though "full self-government or dominion status for Malta is not considered practicable by organized labor on the island."

Another resolution hit at Britain again by calling for "prompt action" to gain self-determination for Cyprus which is "under foreign occupation, contrary to the will of its people."

Another ally was denounced when the ICFTU Executive Board, meeting just before the congress, took up the expulsion from South Korea, by the Rhee dictatorship, of ICFTU Representative Sigurd Kvilekval on May 12. The board demanded that the Rhee government reverse its decision and permit Kvilekval to re-enter.

The same resolution "notes with great regret that the Korean trade-union movement will be unable to be represented at the Fourth World Congress" of the ICFTU because the government refused to grant exit permits to trade-unionists; and it winds up by urging the government "to place no further obstacles in the way of full participation of Korean workers in the life and activities of the international free trade union movement."



## LONDON LETTER

# Britain Hears About Automation

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, June 18—The language spoken by the inhabitants of this island is the illegitimate end-product of many centuries of interracial relations. The conquered and the conquerors have all left their impression upon what is now known as the Queen's English and which, theoretically at least, is the standard method of human communication in this country.

It is some time since the English did any conquering and even longer since they were conquered, so one might reasonably expect that their language had reached the end of its development. Such an assumption fails to allow for the ingenuity displayed in purloining words from other languages which seem to hold promise for suitable use in the future.

The source of most of the latest acquisitions has been American—and I use this term in a loose fashion to distinguish between the method of speech of the inhabitants of the United States on one hand and the inhabitants of Britain on the other. American films, plays, literature and service personnel have all introduced new words to the vocabulary of the British, words which gradually are accepted into common usage until they become widely used in every day speech.

Recently the British Broadcasting Corporation featured a radio discussion between two British trade-unionists and two of their American counterparts—one of whom was Don Slaiman of the UAW—and the subject was "The Automatic Factory." The radio critic of the New Statesman and Nation, when reviewing this broadcast, was moved to comment: "I imagine the word that ran through the discussion, 'automation,' was as new to most listeners as it was to me."

In making this statement the critic was displaying a considerable lack of knowledge of a topic which of late has been the subject of much discussion in the British trade-union movement. But, at the same time, there is little doubt that the two American trade-unionists on that program did much to speed the common acceptance of a new addition to the British vocabulary—one which will soon be very much in use.

Until fairly recently it seemed that automation was something which was very much bothering labor in the United States but had no immediate concern for labor in Britain. Now, quite suddenly, it has loomed large as a problem which needs prompt attention. Workers, management, technicians and scientists are now all busy discussing this "thing called automation."

## SOCIALIST LINE

Because of the character of the industry it is the automobile factories which have most advanced the techniques of automatic production and control of their manufacturing process. Hence it is only natural that the first real attempt to come to grips with the problem, at a rank-and-file level, should spring from the workers in this industry.

A fortnight ago nearly two hundred shop stewards from the mass-production automobile plants met at Birmingham, the center of Britain's automobile industry, to try and thrash out a policy to meet the growth of automation. The line adopted was to welcome automation as a means of increasing the freedom of the worker from drudgery and making possible a higher standard of living. In order to realize this the stewards called for higher basic wage rates, shorter working week, longer holidays, payment for sickness and a retirement pension scheme.

The Bevanite weekly *Tribune* made a four-column feature of automation on the week following the Birmingham conference. It was written by John Lawrence, who was editor of the *Socialist Outlook* when it pursued a fairly pro-Stalinist line prior to his removal when the paper's supporters had turned down his editorial policy and displaced him as editor.

The article was typified by the way in which Lawrence attempted to convey the impression that automation in Russia was comparable to that in the United States—thereby displaying not only considerable ignorance of the facts but also trying to create the impression that Russia is an example of the way in which his so-called "workers' state" can match up to the industrial machine of America. Lawrence even went so far as to repeat the old Stalinist fairy tales that, because of automation, some Russian

workers are able to spend most of their working-day playing chess!

However, in spite of the limitations imposed upon Lawrence through his acceptance of the half-baked notion that Russia is some form of workers' state which is advancing the world socialist revolution in spite of its own deformities, the article did serve as an introduction to many who were probably a little in the dark about the subject.

*Tribune* is by no means alone in devoting space to automation. This month Political and Economic Planning, which describes itself as "an independent research organization," published a broadsheet entitled *Towards the Automatic Factory*. As PEP sees it: "The engineers are enthusiastic; the businessmen, who have to find the capital for the high initial outlay, are apprehensive; many skilled and semi-skilled workers view automation with distrust and dismay."

It puts its finger on the vital spot when it states that the crucial issues are economic, social and organizational rather than technical.

## POINTING DIRECTION

Recognition of this fact was also made by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress some months ago. In a statement issued last March it said: "the General Council are convinced that trade unions will continue to do their utmost to put their point of view effectively on all questions connected with industrial efficiency and development and that they will ensure the benefits of automation are used to improve living and working standards."

The views of the trade-unionists were further expanded only yesterday at a conference on automation organized by the Institute of Production Engineers—a professional organization which only admits into its membership highly qualified engineers and which deals only with questions of technical character; it is not a trade union.

This body has been holding a five-day conference on automation and has been listening to learned papers on the subject read by all manner of experts. Yesterday it had a change and invited Eric Fletcher, the economist and statistician in charge of the TUC's production department, to put the workers' point of view.

Fletcher is reported to have told the conference that the trade unions welcomed automation because its contribution to industrial efficiency will make it possible to extract higher wages. He warned that the unions would keep a close watch on the employment position arising as a consequence of automation and said that unless the unions were kept fully informed "considerable friction" would arise. He stated that if mass unemployment arose the trade unions would want more effective government control of the economy and perhaps further measures of nationalization.

## HELPS NATIONALIZATION

This last statement is pregnant with possibilities and points the direction in which many in the British labor movement think the automation of British industry should be tackled.

Because of the high level of political development of British labor, as evidenced by its own political party, the solution to the problems created by automation can be tackled in a much broader fashion than they can in the United States, where labor lacks any mass political party. As many in the Labor Party see it, automation will tend toward a higher degree of concentration in industry; it will tend to break down the smaller firms, who will be unable to either afford the capital outlay or to compete with the automated plants, and it will centralize production. Such a process will considerably strengthen the hands of those who are pressing for an extension of nationalization.

One of the arguments used by those in the Labor Party who wish to go slow in this direction has been that many industries, engineering for example, are so split up in their ownership and activities that nationalization on a large scale is a

practical impossibility. This argument, which holds a certain degree of validity, will be smashed to pieces as automation proceeds in British industry. Thus pressure for the extension of public ownership is a very likely outcome, as is more agitation for greater measure of control in industry by the workers themselves.

## ROLE OF POLITICS

A further aspect of automation which is being talked around within the Labor Party concerns the distribution of its benefits. This does not mean between the workers and capitalists—for nearly all of the Labor Party is in agreement on that point—but among the working class itself.

In a situation where the workers lack a mass party but have organized trade unions, the answer is imposed by existing conditions—the unions fight for a bigger slice for those particular workers organized within its ranks. When, however, the workers have a mass political party another solution presents itself.

## FRANCE

# French Leftists Organize Anti-Colonialist Movement

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, June 16—A committee has been formed in Paris to strengthen and coordinate the activity of the various anti-colonialist bodies in France. Coming at a critical time for the population of the French colonies this initiative is particularly welcome.

The leading personalities of the committee come from the SP, from the New Left and from the Catholic left. Among others, the committee

includes Claude Bourdet and Yves Déchezelles from the New Left, Claude Gérard, editor of *Afrique-Informations*, Jean Rous, secretary of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, Guy Thorel, of the "Courrier Syndical" minority in FO, Robert Barrat and Georges Montaron of "Témoignage Chrétien," André Bidet, Pierre Mauriac, Marceau Pivert, Robert Verdier and others from the SP.

The committee has set itself the task of preparing a "Movement for Justice and Freedom Overseas," and will seek to link its action to the "Movement for Colonial Freedom" recently founded in London.

Its guiding line is established on the basis of the following demands: (1) the right of colonial people to independence; (2) a just distribution of wealth; (3) the four freedoms for all peoples; (4) technical assistance for underdeveloped countries; (5) application of internationalist principles in economic and political relations.

## PROGRAM

Its main activity in the immediate future will be one of information and propaganda, especially in the labor movement. The movement will organize public meetings and debates, will publicize the position of the colonial independence movements and will inform the French people on the political, social and economic situation in the overseas territories.

At its first meeting, held a week ago, the movement adopted a resolution dealing with the major issues that have arisen in territories under French administration. Concerning Indochina, the movement "demands that France should loyally apply the Geneva agreements and honor its commitments."

"It strongly approves of the solution arrived at in Tunisia, . . . hopes that the Franco-Tunisian conventions will be applied with firmness, and that they will set an example for a peaceful solution of France's overseas problems;

—"protests against the policy of violence and repression in Algeria, which tends to transform the present conflict into a civil war;

—"considers that a democratically controlled consultation of the Algerian people, after a dissolution of both assemblies, the liberation of the militants of the nationalist parties, and the exercise of all freedoms, can alone bring about a solution of the Tunisian type in Algeria;

—"deplores the aggravation of the situation in Morocco, which can only be

The political party can advance the claim that some of the benefits produced by automation shall be handed over by the capitalists for distribution among the working class as a whole. This can be done quite simply by slapping bigger taxes on the capitalists and at the same time increasing the family allowances, sickness benefits, pension payments and other aspects of what is known as the "Welfare State."

Such a demand becomes a practical possibility only when the workers have a political party which is able to take over government and carry these demands into operation. Such, of course, is the situation in Britain; and such is a possible line of approach which is being talked over by various members of the Labor Party.

It appears that although automation has only recently been "discovered" by sections of the British public, and that by general agreement the word has been co-opted into the language, it will be the subject of very interesting developments in British politics in the very near future. Because of a higher degree of political development the answer should be in advance of that so far put forward by American labor; this in spite of the fact that technically American industry is streets ahead of its British counterpart.

stopped by a solution of the dynastic problem;

—"protests against the arrest of organizers of the UMT;

—"demands the immediate liberation of all militants imprisoned for their opinions or their political activities, particularly in Madagascar and in Tropical Africa;

—"denounces the repressive measures recently applied in Togoland and protests against the current repression in the Cameroons;

—"finally, draws the government's attention to the necessity of ending the policy of assimilation carried on in Tropical Africa, in disregard of all the local cultural traditions, and demands that the principles of the French Constitution be applied to this region, in particular concerning the right of peoples to administer their own affairs."

## FOCUS FOR LEFT

Aside from its obvious value as an anti-colonialist center, the "Movement for Justice and Freedom Overseas" represents the first instance of systematic collaboration between the left wings of the SP and of FO and elements of the New Left and of the Catholic left—the raw material from which an independent socialist movement will arise, if and when it does. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this collaboration will be extended to other levels.

The heavy SP participation is also a new and encouraging phenomenon. This is the first time in recent years that leaders of the SP, other than those of its small left minority, have committed themselves to a policy of support to the independence movements in the French colonies.

Jean Rous, Pierre Mauriac, Louis Houdeville, Robert Barrat and Simon Wichene have been put in charge of a temporary secretariat. All correspondence should be addressed to Pierre Mauriac, 41, boulevard Magenta, Paris.

**Three New Pamphlets  
by Leon Trotsky  
on the 1905 Revolution**  
"1905: Before and After" .25c  
"1905: Results and  
Perspectives" .25c  
"In Defense of  
Insurrection" .10c  
**All three for 50c.**  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.



## PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

### A Pro-Stalinist War Line Versus the Third Camp

To the Editor:

A recent letter of mine claimed that the ISL was moving in the direction of "lesser-evilism." You replied calling me a mud-slinger and a slanderer. A very short time later (May 23) LABOR ACTION published a long article on Indochina which was heavily tinged with that very lesser evilism which you deny exists.

In the May 23 issue we read: "South Vietnam, which is the next country on the list for Stalinist conquest is in the midst of a revolution which alone can save it from that fate. . . ." Doesn't this mean that you are, in fact, interested in saving (i.e., defending) South Vietnam from North Vietnam? Doesn't this imply that you would give critical support to the South in case of war with the North? Since you yourself admit that the Diem government is undemocratic and is but a tool of U. S. imperialism, doesn't this imply a definite leaning toward the entire "free-world" camp? The fact that you advocate social revolution is beside the point since you advocate it not as an end in itself but as a means of saving the "free-world" (in this case the puppet Diem) from Stalinism.

One more point. The Stalinism you wish to stop is not the Russian or Chinese armies but the native national Stalinist state of Vietnam which you yourself admit "set up a Vietnam that was sovereign and efficiently run."

WILLIAM STANLEY

Berkeley, Cal.

(1) The particular "slander" which we noted about Stanley's last letter (May 2) was his charge that the ISL "has moved in [the] direction" of concluding that "we must rule out the possibility of socialist revolution" against Stalinism. He does not refer to this again, but this time concentrates on his charge of "lesser-evilism."

(2) As a supporter of the Stalinist regime in Indochina, Stanley apparently sees "lesser-evilism" in any viewpoint which rejects such support to Stalinism; just as, indeed, the Stalinists themselves always claim that anyone who is against them must be for the capitalist camp.

For such types (either the straight Stalinist type or the Stalinoid who merely believes in supporting Stalinism's wars), it is often quite useless for us Third Camp socialists to attack any support to capitalist imperialism. This type knows we "really" support capitalism, for otherwise why would we be attacking Stalinism? . . . ?

So Stanley isn't going to be fooled just because the great bulk of my May 23 article on Vietnam was directed against French and U. S. imperialist intervention, or just because this article looked to revolutionary action by the Vietnamese people against both the capitalist-imperialist camp and the Stalinist camp. He knows. . . .

(3) Of course we want to "save" South Vietnam and any other people from the fate of Stalinist conquest, and we have said so several hundred times in LABOR ACTION with regard to a series of cold-war situations, in the very course of emphasizing a Third Camp view against both imperialisms.

Stanley, on the contrary, wants to hand Vietnam over to the Stalinists.

Very well, he has a right to this disastrous opinion. But instead of defending it, he thinks it more useful to devote his letter to the charge that anyone who disagrees with him must . . . show a "definite leaning" toward the capitalist camp and "lesser-evilism," etc. This is not useful for serious discussion.

(4) Stanley disingenuously asks whether we would "give critical support to the South in case of war with the North." Although I know he's quite well acquainted with the Third Camp answer, or should be, here's a concise reply anyway.

It is, of course, the same point of view on the basis of which we opposed the Korean war, with its "defense" of the South against the North, and on the basis of which we also (in its time) discussed possible defense of Tito-Yugoslavia against Russian aggression.

A basic condition for socialist support to such a war can be roughly given in one word—*independence*, i.e., its independence from the imperialist cold war of the rival war camps, which blankets the world. Let us leave aside, however, the question whether such separation is the most likely possibility under foreseeable conditions; if (for example) the Vietnam Stalinists were to attack the South, it would be a rash person who would confidently predict that the U. S. (or France) would stand aside.

Some criteria of independence: (a) a South Vietnam regime is sovereign and independent of foreign imperialism; (b) this hypothetical war is not subordinated as part of a larger conflict in which South Vietnam is "defended" by the imperialist forces; (c) the politics from which such a war flows is in fact defense of the people against Stalinist conquest, and not any other interest, such as the outside interest of imperialism or the internal interest of reactionary chauvinism in some form—like Rhee's.

In general, elaboration on these views can be found in our resolutions and articles about political opposition to the Korean war.

(5) My reference to the Ho regime as "sovereign and efficiently run" was in a sentence contrasting the "image" held by the mass of peasants of the South Vietnam regime with that of the North. In my own name I would not attest to the degree of sovereignty or independence of that regime from Russian imperialism or Chinese sub-imperialism; but perhaps it needs repeating that our opposition to Stalinist conquest includes opposition to conquest by native Stalinists too. Only recently, for example, we discussed in these columns the fact that Peiping is not a "puppet" of Moscow; this does not make us softer toward the Chinese Stalinists.

(6) The nature of Stanley's thinking can perhaps be best evaluated in his peculiar charge that we do not advocate social revolution "as an end in itself." It is hard to believe that he knows what he is saying, here more than elsewhere.

For socialists, the "end" or goal of social revolution is only a "means" to more basic ends or goals: abolition of war, complete democracy for the first time, economic security and well-being, etc. We add very loudly today: it is a necessary road also to defeat the Stalinist threat, and not only capitalism. At this point, Stanley's pro-Stalinist sympathies translate: "See, they're just Stalinophobes, not really interested in socialism at all" . . . and he sends in a letter.

HAL DRAPER

## Why the State Department Wants Peron to Hang On

By HAL DRAPER

Juan Peron's personal status in the Argentine regime still remains suspended in doubt at this writing; and no new information is available to cast light from any other direction on the question-marks that hang over the recent revolt in the country. One sidelight, however, can be filled in from a very interesting article in the Wall Street Journal for June 27.

This concerns the relatively recent feelings of love and affection between Washington and dictator Peron, who was pro-Nazi when that seemed to be the paying business.

The Wall Street Journal emphasizes the movement of American capital into Argentina and Peron's anxiety to have it continue. What it underlines is the remark made under the cartoon in last week's LABOR ACTION: Here's one revolt against a Latin American government that the American CIA didn't plot.

"A growing flock of U. S. businesses have a dollars-and-cents stake in the political fortunes of Argentina's Juan Domingo Peron," said the Journal. The reason: U. S. officials "rate him a powerful advocate of bigger U. S. investments in Argentina and of more U. S.-Argentina trade." None of Peron's rivals "would be likely to match Mr. Peron on this score."

So our very democratic State Department is enthusiastically pro-Peron, for this excellent reason, explains the Wall Street organ. . . . State Department students of Argentina agree on one point: American investors stand their best chance of a warm welcome in Argentina if Mr. Peron survives the present crisis with his power pretty much intact."

### LURING DOLLARS

The dollar signs tell the story of why the State Department doesn't get excited by the prospect of democratization in Argentina.

In 1953, American firms had some \$406 million invested in Argentine enterprises; only about \$100 million less than the U. S. stake in Mexico. Many well-known U. S. corporations were among the list of interests. Then, with Peron's second "Five Year Plan" to industrialize the country, he put forward as a key feature a law aimed at drawing even more U. S. capital. It promised U. S. firms the right to take out a certain amount of profit each year, on more advantageous terms.

Hence more U. S. corporations have been going in with big programs planned: Monsanto Chemical, Merck, Standard Oil, and others. A special agreement between Argentina and the dukedom of Standard Oil has been awaiting ratification by Peron's Congress. If it works out, other oil companies plan to follow.

Many other companies did not rush in because they wanted to see whether Peron's attitude toward the Yanqui imperialist investors had really softened. Wall Street Journal reports that many were satisfied when the Peron regime seemed to take a very soft line in settling its dispute with American & Foreign Power.

"Impressed by Mr. Peron's ardor for U. S. investment, the Export-Import Bank, a government loan-making agency designed to spur U. S. sales abroad, last year okayed a \$60 million loan to an Argentine steel company owned partly by the government. . . . Ex-Im Bank officials say they foresee no hitch arising from the current Argentine tension but 'we're waiting until we know what is going on before we do anything more about it.'"

### "SECRETLY SORRY"

So the Journal article continues:

"All this evidence of increasing U. S. economic interest in Argentina is just one reason why a lot of influential State Department officials would be secretly sorry to see Mr. Peron tumbled from power. Equally important in their eyes is what one diplomat calls 'the security factor.' Mr. Peron, he notes, has generally supported the U. S. in the East-West struggle. [That is, we can add, since Mr. Peron stopped nuzzling with Hitler—H. D.] 'Even in the bitter days four or five years ago when Peron was blasting us every day, Argentina supported us in the United Nations surprisingly often,' a State Department man recounts. "Mr. Peron also backed up the anti-

Communists in the Guatemalan crisis, when the Red-tinged government of that Central American state was thrown out in a brief civil war, and went along with the U. S. government's efforts to set up a 'collective security' pact in Latin America. 'On the biggest issue in the world today, the Communist issue, Peron has been on our side, and we have to take that into consideration,' a Dulles aide remarks."

Surely this quotation from the Journal needs no editorial comment, whether for socialists or liberals, or for Catholics who think that the Argentine hierarchy was fighting for democratization.

Just to dot the i's, however, the Journal's Washington reporter, who is telling this story, specifically explains that the State Department officials "are putting none of their hopes on the Radicals," i.e., the bourgeois legal opposition party to Peron, partly because they don't think this conservative democratic group can win and "partly because if they did win they might be more violently anti-American than Mr. Peron at his worst."

### COUPLE OF THEORIES

Now, outside of the intrinsic interest of this lovely account by the Wall Street Journal—esthetically touching as it is in its very candidness about democracy and dollars—is there any connection between all this and the motivations behind the recent events in Argentina?

In view of the existence of so many unanswered questions about the whole situation, that is hard to say. Perhaps the clearest thing is negative. It is hardly within the bounds of possibility that Washington's pressure was behind the anti-Peron forces, in view of the relations described. But this is worth even mentioning only because last week's issue of our contemporary The Militant carried an article implying that this was the case; in view of the facts, this can be considered little less than crackpot.

There is another connection suggested elsewhere which deserves more attention perhaps, though it does not instantly commend itself to this writer. This is a theory, put forward by one Latin American authority, that Peron, in his enthusiasm for luring more and more U. S. investments, found himself hampered by the fact that the Argentine constitution severely limits the rights of foreign capital. He therefore wanted to change the constitution. But he did not want to call a constitutional convention for this purpose. Therefore the dictator got up the fight with the Catholic Church so as to get a pretext for a constitutional convention that would be called to change the church-state relationship, ostensibly, but really to change the provision on foreign investments. . . .

We can think of more reasons why this explanation is improbable than can be listed in our remaining space; above all, the fact that we cannot imagine Peron breaking with the hierarchy for so flimsy a motive, especially since there are several other possible ways by which he could have skinned this particular cat. As we have indicated, therefore, the theory does not sound attractive, but there it is. Personally, unfortunately, we still find little with which to round out the picture we tried to draw two issues ago, though there are all kinds of unanswered questions left hanging which cry for such a rounding-out.

### Automation—Squared

Westinghouse Electric Corporation has announced that it will build a multi-million dollar plant at Youngwood, Pa., to turn out parts required for the automation of factories.

This factory will, itself, be operated more automatically than any of the company's 56 other plants.

### YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.



## LABOR ACTION

July 11, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 28

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

### World History—Year by Year

## The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-53.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1962 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



## No Illusions About 'Negotiations'

The question of nuclear weapons has been in the news to an increasing extent during the past few years. As more and more information has come from behind the red-tape curtain in Washington, there has been a growth of popular sentiment against these weapons throughout the world. This was operative in two recent developments.

After the air raid alert last month, the government, in an almost incredible action, released "hypothetical" casualty figures. The day after the raid, fifteen million Americans were theoretically dead, three million in New York City alone. The figures were even more grisly than this short recital would indicate: in New York, they included statistics on stretcher cases, the ambulatory wounded, those treated at first-aid stations, and so on.

The second development is not quite as specific. It is more a matter of mood, of atmosphere, particularly in Europe. Its concrete political form is usually that of an appeal for Big Power negotiations, a demand that the issues of the cold war be negotiated. In Europe, this has expressed itself not so much in political movements but in countless expressions of neutralist sentiment in all quarters.

### NEED ALTERNATIVE

In one sense, it is impossible not to go along with this general sentiment. The development of modern nuclear weapons has reached a point where socialists, pacifist and non-pacifist, must take a clear stand. By now, it should be obvious that the use of such weapons against cities is an act which is morally and politically unjustifiable. Therefore, they must be categorically opposed.

Yet such a principled opposition is not, of itself, sufficient. For the danger of nuclear weapons today exists in a concrete political situation. And it is here that we must differentiate ourselves from much of the vague, amorphous, neutralist sentiment against war. We do so because we believe that this kind of sentiment cannot effectively result in actually stopping a Third World War.

For the nuclear weapons exist in the context of the struggle between the United States and Russia. It may be that even these imperialist governments are inhibited, by the very explosiveness of these weapons, from using them. But this is not a guarantee. It is a hypothesis

that may be fervently wished, but such a wish is not a durable basis for peace.

Seeing the problem of nuclear weapons as existing in the context of the rivalry between the United States and Russia, it is necessary to formulate some kind of political position which poses an alternative to these governments, which promises to remove the root cause of the possibility that they might use nuclear weapons. Condemnation is not enough. Negotiation is certainly not enough. Only a real, alternative political program will suffice.

### TO GUARANTEE PEACE

We have asserted time and time again that the way out of the impasse lies in the Third Camp—in struggle against both imperialisms in the name of socialism and democracy. This remains true today, but we must relate it to a different situation.

In a way, the illusions about negotiations proceed from a victory of the Third Camp, if we take that concept in the broadest sense of the word. For one of the major pressures upon the imperialist blocs has been that of the sentiment of the people of the world. Even in its amorphous and vague form, it has had its result. The danger is that the question will be left there; that negotiations will be conceived of as a panacea for this age of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, in stating our condemnation of the mass slaughter of the bombs from A to H, we must, at the same time, reiterate the necessity for political struggle. For only when a clear political alternative is provided can we safely say that peace is guaranteed.

### NEW YORK YSL

#### New Summer Class Starting July 13

#### THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM

WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

- (1) July 13  
Ideas of Scientific Socialism
- (2) July 20  
What is Capitalism?
- (3) July 27  
What is Stalinism?
- (4) Aug. 3  
Why a Labor Party?
- (5) Aug. 10  
How Socialists Work for Peace
- (6) Aug. 17  
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

### YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

#### Perspective on History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

- July 12—MAX SHACHTMAN  
The Russian Revolution—II
- July 19—HAL DRAPER  
The European Revolution and the Comintern, 1918-1920
- July 26—ABE STEIN  
Germany, 1914-1924
- Aug. 2—ABE STEIN  
Germany, 1924-1934
- Aug. 16—ANNE RUSSELL  
The Spanish Revolution and Civil War
- Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—I
- Aug. 30—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—II
- 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

## The Camera Sees the Classes In the Blackboard Jungle

By EDWARD HILL

In neighborhood theatres all over the country, American audiences are now being confronted with the twin problems of education and juvenile delinquency. The movie which raises these issues is, of course, "The Blackboard Jungle."

In this film, there is no holding back on the seriousness of the situation. To the jazzy rhythms of rick 'n' roll, the moviegoer is introduced to a manual-trades high school in an unspecified, New York-like city. The students are working-class boys, ethnically mixed, involved in a jungle world of gangs, crime, and the baiting of teachers.

In terms of the racial-ethnic angle, the movie exhibits Hollywood's recent liberalism. The hero lectures his students on tolerance, and although he slips into racism at a moment of anger (actually, one of the most "realistic" scenes), his point of view and that of the plot is toward integration, brotherhood, etc.

Again, on the question of teacher's salaries, the movie takes a liberal line. The hero explodes at one point and compares the salaries of teachers with those of unskilled workers, truck drivers and so on. His plea is not, of course, spelled out in political terms, but it is clear that the sympathies of the movie go toward an increased pay-scale for the teaching profession.

All of this is in a tradition that has been operative in Hollywood for almost a decade. It is part of a trend which includes "Crossfire," "Gentlemen's Agreement," "Pinky," "Lost Boundaries," and a whole list of other "problem" movies. The total impact of this development has been toward realism in presentation and liberalism in point of view. In this sense, "Blackboard Jungle" does not particularly represent an innovation, but a continuation of a trend.

### CLASS CONTRAST

But the most interesting part of this movie is not in its application of a now-respectable Hollywood liberalism to the problem of education and juvenile delinquency. Rather it is in the contradiction between the visual evidence of the film and its political comment that its startling characteristic appears.

Visually, the movie makes it clear that the school is part of a run-down, slum neighborhood. The setting is a sort of cross between Harlem and the Bowery, complete with elevated tracks. The school itself is presented as a battered, old, completely inadequate structure which contributes to the intensification of the anarchic situation between students and teachers.

The same kind of point is made with regard to the students. The racial problem, mentioned before, is prominent. The question of poverty is raised by the camera every time it turns upon the students. In the very title, there is the metaphor comparing the environment

and existence in the neighborhood to that of a jungle.

And so that the point will not be lost, a sharp contrast is present. The disheartened teacher visits an old professor of his who teaches in a modern (and obviously middle-class) school. Here the facilities are up-to-date, the students neat and clean, the vistas of the neighborhood pleasing. As the camera passes quickly through the school, we see patriotic students singing, their faces shining with respect for law and obedience of constituted authority. The comparison between this school and the blackboard jungle is that of two worlds which have nothing to do with each other.

### THE CAMERA SEES

This is the evidence of the cameraman. If this movie were a silent, one would call it a biting social commentary, a brilliant presentation of the class differences in education. But the movie is not silent—and the sound track more or less ignores what the camera sees.

When the "Blackboard Jungle" does present its spoken commentary upon the problem which it treats, there is reference to the situation of a generation brought up during the war when the fathers were in the army and the mothers in the plant. The villain of the piece is parental irresponsibility. But nowhere is any relation made between the family structure of the "Blackboard Jungle" and the vivid images of the social structure of the whole neighborhood.

If there is any analysis of the cause of the irresponsibility, it is in the remarks about the social situation during the war. The striking visual contrast of the manual-trades school and the middle-class school remains purely visual. No voice articulates the generalization which almost leaps out of the screen to confront the audience. In this issue, the "Blackboard Jungle" is schizophrenic, torn between its script and its camera.

One wonders, why? The men who made the film could not have been unaware of the split which they were perpetrating. Were they afraid of drawing the obvious moral for fear of charges of materialism, Marxism, or the like? Did they feel that the spoken words would sound un-American, but that the visual image was beyond reproach (cameras never lie)? It is impossible to answer these questions at a distance, since they concern motivation.

Yet one feels impelled to state generally that some kind of conscious motive was inhibiting these movie-makers. The only other hypothesis is that the "Blackboard Jungle" was filmed by mutes and written by the blind.

### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.



# The Khrushchev-Tito Peace-Pipe And the Role of Stalinist Ideology

By PHILIP COBEN

When Khrushchev and Bulganin made their sensational pilgrimage to Belgrade and (following *Pravda's* statement) recognized Titoist "socialism," the switch was widely heralded. And deservedly; for the Kremlin's decision to make up with its chief heretic was one of the outstanding moves in the new Russian "peace" campaign in its political war. LABOR ACTION discussed it from this angle at the time.

**It has also been greeted, however, as an indication of a deep-going ideological shift in Stalinism. And this is something else again.**

To be sure, this tack has been taken aggressively mainly by Stalinoid elements who (a) were already quite convinced that "Stalinism is dead" because Stalin has died, or at least saw every eye-twinkle in the Kremlin as proof of this proposition; and (b) were anxious to utilize every opportunity to press the line of a new Popular Front with the Stalinists. A typical case already mentioned in our pages is that of Claude Bourdet's *France-Observateur*.

It should therefore be mentioned that it is not true that this is the first time the Russians have recognized the possibility of different roads to "socialism."

On the contrary; everywhere in the "Popular Democracies," during the first period of their consolidations with dupes from the bourgeois regimes like Masaryk and Benes in Czechoslovakia, the official line was: We are following our own separate, national, special and different roads to "socialism."

This was only a few years ago. When the bourgeois dupes were kicked aside, having been squeezed, and direct Stalinization was the order of the day, this line too was cast aside.

In 1948, in their polemics against the Cominform, the Titoists made much of the official pronouncements of this period, adding that they were merely following its precepts in working out their own road to "socialism." The Cominformists, of course, especially in reaction to Titoism, bent the line over in the opposite direction.

## THEORY AS TACTIC

The line has now been bent back. To be sure, under quite different conditions, for Moscow has suffered a terrific objective defeat in having to recognize Titoism. But whatever different views there may be on the exact significance of this change, one thing should be established: the ignorance, or bad memory, or disingenuousness, of the Stalinoids who pretend that the new Stalinist line on Belgrade is a basic shift precisely ideologically.

Neither then nor now do the Russian rulers take their "ideological" line seriously in terms of theory. In either case, for them, it is a tactic in a power struggle. It is only their dupes who hang on to their theoretical pronouncements as if they had any autonomous importance.

The Stalinists, as a bureaucratic ruling class in a power system, do have an ideology or ideologies, but only in the same sense that every ruling class has an ideological framework of its own quite apart from anything its ideologists may work out to serve as class myth. Thus, the fact that there is no single capitalist ideology for all times or places does not gainsay the fact that there is such a thing as "capitalist ideology," though the place to look for its accurate presentation is never the official repositories of doctrine.

We mention this only to make clear that, when we say that the Russian rulers do not take their "ideology" seriously, we are not saying that they have no ideology. But then, this picture was pretty widely recognized about the Nazis—who did, and did not, have an "ideology" in the same sense—and so needs no further elucidation.

## TIT FOR TAT

There are two other interesting sides to the Kremlin's pronouncement about the Titoist variant of "socialism."

One, which we are pointing out for the first time anywhere as far as we know, is that a bisymmetric shift took place in the line of the Titoists themselves. Tit for tat.

For after all, while all this time the Russians have been denouncing the Titoists as betrayers of socialism, etc., the Yugoslavs have been doing the same. At any rate, sometime after the break (not immediately), the Titoists proclaimed that Russia was not socialist, that the Stalin-

ist system was state-capitalist and the antithesis of socialism, etc. As I recall, this line was enunciated in 1950 or 1951. It is also pertinent to note that the theoretician who was the spokesman for the regime in working out the new analysis of Russian Stalinism was Milovan Djilas, now purged.

After the *Pravda* statement; and with the Khrushchev-Bulganin visit, the question obviously had to come up: Were the Titoists, on their side, going to revise their characterization of Russian Stalinism as non-socialist and anti-socialist?

No information on this came out with the dispatches from Belgrade while the love-fest was going on.

We can now document the fact that the Titoists had made their ideological revision even before the Russians. It is already in print in the April issue of Belgrade's propaganda magazine published in the English language, "Review of International Affairs." Quite clearly, though not bluntly stated in so many words, Moscow "socialism" has been reinstated among the variants of socialism—by the Titoists.

This appears from an interview with Edvard Kardelj, Tito's now unquestioned No. 2 man, in replies to questions posed by a Danish journalist. The editorial

note accompanying the interview states the questions had been submitted last December and that the answers were published in the Danish review "Internationale Perspektiven" in March. (It does not say when the answers were given.)

None of the questions asks directly about the nature of Russian Stalinism. Nor does Kardelj mention for a moment that any change has taken place.

One of the Dane's questions referred to "authoritarian socialism, or Stalinism." Kardelj's answers follow the same kind of terminology. In much of what he says it is implicit that the Moscow regime is to be considered as one form of socialism. In another place, he refers to "state capitalist forms, which in the long run are only another stage in the transition to socialism." This formulation is no doubt an attempt to erect a bridge between the old line and the new.

## BIG "DEMOCRAT"

A footnote for all dupes of Titoist "democracy":

Kardelj, as we just noted, is now quite willing to recognize Moscow "authoritarianism" as one form of socialist development, albeit not as good as the Titoist brand. But while a totalitarian regime like the Russian can be a "socialist development," he rejects the "forms of classical democracy" as an "impracticable, useless and even undemocratic form" for said socialist development. By classical democracy, of course, he means in the first place: any political freedom for more than the ruling party.

The second side we wish to point up involves those misguided anti-Stalinists

## A FRENCH COMMENT ON TITO'S POSITION



—from *Le Canard Enchaîné* (Paris)

who hastened to see in Titoism a fundamental break with Stalinism, rather than only a national-Stalinism. For them, Moscow was still the bitter enemy of socialism, but Belgrade was the dawn of a new and genuine socialism.

Now the enemy of socialism has granted his "ideological" imprimatur to the "new and genuine socialism." They will have to account for this somehow, within the framework of their ideology. It is not easy, though perhaps possible, especially for people who have long recognized that the Kremlin views any real socialist development, any genuine revolutionary alternative to itself, as the worst threat in the world, even more dangerous to it than capitalism.

# More Comment on Shachtman Case

Editorial on the Shachtman passport decision in two Chicago papers stress (in hindsight) the similarity between the Passport Office procedure and the habits of the totalitarian states.

The Chicago *Sun-Times* wrote, for example:

"And by implication at least, the court decided that the [State] Department's passport authority cannot be used as an instrument of foreign policy. The Department's claim in this respect represented an unwarranted and arbitrary prolongation of a necessary wartime policy. Its use now resembles closely the repressive measures of the dictatorship which holds that the state is supreme and the citizen only its slave."

"In fact, the nation's movement toward sanity in its security program may reflect an awareness that for too long we tolerated or even embraced the tactics of the dictatorship in our attempts to protect ourselves from one."

The Chicago *Daily News* said editorially on the same day:

"Our recent passport practice has become in some cases so grudging and suspicious and arbitrary as to parallel that of the police states we oppose."

All this is very fine, even though we have to keep in mind that, while such totalitarian practice was blanketing the land, these newspapers and others kept silent till a court spoke up on a particular case. But if these editorialists, and others, now find it possible to write so bravely and democratically today, it is because (implicitly) the idea is that this unfortunate period of darkness is all over and a thing of the past. This is far from true. There is still a long way to go. As we indicated last week, Shachtman himself has still a long way to go before he gets his passport. And a few days after the court ruling, the same Passport Office refused a passport, on its usual grounds, to a Stalinist journalist (Clark of the *Daily Worker*).—Or isn't the practice totalitarian any longer when the victim is himself a totalitarian? We have not the slightest sympathy with Clark himself, but we will not wait to point to his case with an accusing finger until a court rebuffs the State Department.

## In Britain

A lengthy write-up of the case in the *Manchester Guardian* put a good deal of stress on a passage in the court of Appeals decision which few others noted (outside of LABOR ACTION's own

story last week). The famous British paper's Washington correspondent wrote:

"The court expressed the belief in its judgment that even the State Department now questions whether the Independent Socialist League was subversive. . . ."

"The court said that the wording of the Department's letter indicated that the listing of the League as 'Communist' was no longer relied upon. The hearing appeared to have convinced the Department that the League was hostile to the Communist International."

This may perhaps be considered rather too optimistic an interpretation of the court's statement, but it does draw attention to the section where the judges point out that the State Department has contradicted the attorney general.

## Bill of Rights

The editorial in the *San Francisco Chronicle* affords an interesting insight into the schizophrenic approach to passport rights.

On the one hand, and for 15 columns, the editorial hails the Court of Appeals decision. The Passport Office is rightly security-conscious, it says, "But the Court of Appeals saw Shachtman's case from the higher viewpoint of the individual citizen's right to due process of law. . . . Then the Court of Appeals laid down the law to the Executive branch of the government in a way which should help to bulwark everyone's freedom. . . . The concept that the Bill of Rights protects a citizen when he wants to travel out of the country (as it has long protected his right to move freely within) will be a novel idea in the Passport Office. . . ."

Underlining this last point, a cartoon takes up a quarter of the editorial page to show a citizen unrolling a scroll which reads:

"U. S. BILL OF RIGHTS  
Entitles Bearer to  
One (1)  
Passport"

Yet the editorial winds up with one short final paragraph in which everything gets slammed into reverse: Passports are not only a right but a "responsibility"; they "must not be devalued and debased." And "We do not want this liberal decision to become a trapdoor for people to slip through who intend going

abroad for the purpose of harming the United States and its interests."

But a right guaranteed by the Bill of Rights does not depend on anybody's determination or opinion about what is or is not harmful to "the United States and its interests," particularly if this is made synonymous with the current politics of a given administration.

## Why a Letter?

A feature story in the travel section of the Sunday *N. Y. Times* describes the Passport Office's plans for reforming itself—physically. Although headed "Due Process' for Passports" and taking off from the Shachtman decision, the plans turn out to be mainly for physical rehabilitation of the bureau's offices so that it can process applications more quickly.

One new item: the new director, Mrs. Knight, claims to be interested in reducing the red-tape involved in getting a passport. "She was asked the value of the letter, now required from the applicant or his employer, explaining why he wants to travel, and she listened with interest to the popular argument that this is of no concern of the Passport Division, especially in the light of the Court of Appeals ruling."

The argument deserves to be popular, but it is to be seen how great is Mrs. Knight's interest.

## A New Collection!

### MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only 2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.



ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

# Race Prejudice Shows Up in Three Murder Cases in N. Y. C.

By SCOTT ARDEN

Three recent murder cases in New York City indicate that the city's courts and newspapers are perhaps a little less colorblind than is generally believed.

One case arose when Frank Santana, a Puerto Rican youth, shot and killed a white boy, William Blankenship, in the Bronx, in a poolroom brawl which focused national attention on New York's teenage gang-warfare.

Santana, 17, did not deny shooting Blankenship, 15, and by pleading guilty to second-degree murder has been allowed to escape the electric chair—which is where he was headed till just a few weeks ago.

The inarticulate Puerto Rican boy was virtually sentenced to the chair by a wave of hysterical racial bigotry built up by Blankenship's father, the daily press, and others not too interested in the actual facts in the case.

Blankenship's father, at the time of the murder, made a big splash in the press by stating that he was moving his family from New York because the city was being overrun by hoodlums.

The press picked up his frantic outcries and widely publicized his grief over the loss of his "model son." The white boy was played up as a "model youth"—the Puerto Rican as a bloodthirsty gangster. Nationally known columnist and racist author Robert Ruark called for the Puerto Rican's head, and the picture generally given was that of a decent white man trying to raise his model son in New York until the son was killed by a "foreign" hoodlum.

Blankenship's decision to move from the city was built up in such a way as to raise the question (dear to the heart of racists) as to whether "all decent white people" will eventually be "forced to move out" and "leave New York to the Puerto Ricans."

A week or so ago, however, an assistant district attorney blew the whole dirty business up by a simple statement of some of the facts, which up to then had been carefully ignored. This evidence demonstrated that Blankenship was far from the "model boy" his father and the press had been praising. Rather, he was a member of a rival gang which had gone out of its way to start a "rumble" with the Puerto Rican and his gang.

Further, it now seems that the "model boy" (white) actually struck the first blow in the fight that led to his death. These facts were available 48 hours after the murder, on April 30, according to the Baltimore Afro-American, and were presented to the grand jury investigating the case. But all through May and into June the press and radio presented Blankenship as a good boy murdered by a Puerto Rican without provocation.

With this "new evidence" the authorities have been forced to admit that they cannot convict Santana on a first-degree (electric chair) charge. He faces, instead, from 20 years to life imprisonment.

But what if the assistant DA had kept quiet, with the press screaming for blood and whipping up anti-Puerto Rican sentiment?

Another case involves the murder of a white man in the Bronx by three boys. Murray Hoffman, a TV salesman, was shot in 1954 in a holdup attempt. The police arrested two white boys and one Negro boy. The white boys denied any knowledge of the incident but the colored boy "confessed."

It now turns out the murder was committed by "three other boys," and the Negro's "confession" was a phony. The question here that concerns us is obvious. What would make an innocent youth confess to a murder when he had nothing to do with it, and why didn't the white boys make the same confession? The brutal methods employed by New York's cops in dealing with members of minority groups has long been a national scandal—but this doesn't mean it's old-hat. Every case must be spotlighted until the situation is cleaned up.

A little courthouse cleaning seems indicated by the third case. Judge Liebowitz termed it "the saddest day" in his life when he sentenced a 16-year-old Negro youth to the electric chair for his role in a murder last October.

The press now reports that one of the white jurors who sat on the "blue ribbon jury" which heard the case is a racial bigot who boasted that he had prejudged the youth. Because of this evidence, the boy stands to get a second trial.

We are not here concerned, as we well might be, with the broader questions of juvenile delinquency or the death sentence (especially in cases involving teenagers). What is in question are basic aspects of "American justice" as it applies to minority-group youth in the center of Northern liberal thought.

## Scandal at Fisk

On the academic freedom front, another rearward post has fallen. Tennessee's Fisk University, nationally known Negro educational center, retreated in a case heavily tainted with the spoor of Jim Crow.

The case is that of Dr. Lee Lorch, whose teaching contract at Fisk was "not renewed" (he lacked tenure) after he had refused information to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Lorch, who is white, had tried to enter his young daughter in a Negro public school near Fisk after the Supreme Court's decision on school integration.

With almost indecent delay he was hauled before the Un-American Committee to explain alleged past political associations.

This provided Fisk's Board of Trustees, who have resented his militant activities on race issues, to give him the sack. It should be noted that, as with many Negro colleges in the South, Fisk's board is made up mainly of Southern whites (only nine out of the 34-man board are Negro, and only one Negro sat on the ten-man Executive Committee which fired him).

Lorch and his supporters charge, according to the Pittsburgh "Courier," that he was sacked because he dared to challenge the Jim Crow traditions of the South and that he is being victimized by a group of influential white members of the Fisk Board of Trustees on that basis alone.

In an editorial statement the Afro-American suggested that some school "not so enthralled by white money or so dominated by white trustees" might offer Lorch a position, and Lorch has indicated that he has no intention of being driven out of the South by the firing.

The board's spokesman, Carter Wesley, was not even a member of the board. Wesley, a former member, defeated for re-election by the alumni, was imported for the occasion from Houston, Texas, about 1000 miles from Fisk.

He stated that the board was not motivated by Lorch's anti-Jim-Crow activities or by the question of his political beliefs or associations. Rather, he claimed that Lorch had slandered the school as "prejudice-ridden" and had attempted to discredit, or get removed, the school's Phi Beta Kappa chapter. Lorch has publicly denied both these charges and insisted that Wesley (or the board) produce some evidence to back them—which to date they have not done.

## Merrill Case

In Baltimore, recently, a Johns Hopkins student was fined on charges of assaulting a police detective and disorderly conduct for having participated in a picket demonstration against segregation in a local theatre.

The arresting officer himself admitted to the court that (1) when he approached the demonstrators he was not in uniform; (2) he ordered Merrill out of the line only because "he was the only white man in the line" (the other demonstrators were students from Morgan State College); and (3) he "didn't like" Merrill touching a child in the line (it developed that the child was Merrill's own 2-year-old daughter).

Merrill and other witnesses stated that he had resisted questioning and arrest by the burly (6 feet 1 inch, 215 pound) officer because there was no way of knowing he was a policeman and the student demonstrators against Jim Crow had been cautioned by a police inspector to ignore questioning by persons representing themselves as policemen unless they produced identification cards.

While he was forced to admit that Merrill's character was above reproach, the magistrate managed to ignore the evidence in the case and find him guilty. Attorneys for the student, who had pointed to the Jim Crow aspects of the case, immediately filed notice of appeal

and Merrill was released under \$600 bail.

## Powell Attacks

In Washington the kettle has been boiling and may soon boil over. The issue is segregation in the National Guard and the lineup is Representative Adam Clayton Powell versus President Eisenhower.

Powell has taken a militant stand on this issue, perhaps to regain the reputation which his conduct at the Bandung Conference nearly lost him. (His white-wash of American racism at Bandung and his statement that to be a Negro in America is a mark of distinction, while gaining him the applause of his congressional colleagues, drew withering blasts from his fellow Negro Americans.)

He fought through an anti-segregation amendment to the Manpower Reserve Bill, which resulted in Carl Vinson, Democrat of Georgia and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, "pocketing" the bill—since the bill with the Powell amendment is unacceptable to Dixie's congressional contingent.

Since the Powell amendment was democratically accepted in the House of Representatives, and since he will not withdraw it, the powerful legislators from the South have decided to kill the whole bill (regardless of the fact that nearly every "statesman" in Washington claims it is essential to the "National Defense") rather than see the National Guard integrated.

Obviously then, whatever our feelings about the bill may be, its passage is being obstructed by the Southern Democrats. Eisenhower, however, could not quite see it this way.

In an attack on Powell he stated: "It is entirely erroneous to try to get legislation of this character through by tacking it on to something that is so vital to the security of the U.S." Terming the Powell rider "extraneous legislation" he added a few choice words about people who want to have their own way all the time.

Answering Eisenhower's attempt to whitewash Vinson and his backers by attacking those struggling against Jim Crow, Powell and other Negro spokesmen stood firm.

The NAACP charged Eisenhower with "apathy" toward civil-rights legislation, and stated that he has "refused to rec-

ommend civil-rights legislation to the Congress." A. Phillip Randolph, president of the Pullman Porters Union, said that Negroes have "no alternative other than to support amendments to any bills" which would allow segregation.

Powell himself refused, absolutely, to withdraw his amendment and indicated that he was "shocked" and that his amendment was "mandatory." He stated that he would press for the defeat of "any Senate or Senate-House conference bill" which would omit his amendment.

Powell has already introduced a similar amendment to a bill providing federal aid to public schools. This amendment, which has already received the same sort of response from administration spokesmen, would withhold aid from states practicing segregation in their school systems.

If Powell's shameless conduct at Bandung was motivated (as seems likely) by a hope that a little gratuitous Uncle Tomming for the State Department would be paid off by the administration in the form of concessions in domestic legislation, his illusions have been thoroughly shattered.

Whatever his failings, however, Powell is an astute politician and can be counted on to remember not only on which side his bread is buttered but also that neither his bread nor his butter come from white sources.

If he continues to refuse to strike his guns on both the Guard and School Aid bills he may not make Ike's country club but he may well be instrumental in forcing through some meaningful anti-Jim-Crow legislation.

His tactical approach is excellent. If Southern National Guard units and schools will receive no federal funds until they integrate, integration becomes a far more likely reality. The "liberal press," until Eisenhower sounded off, managed almost completely to ignore Powell's amendments, much less take a position of militant support.

Now that their "representatives" in the House and Senate are one by one lining up behind Powell his amendments should receive increasing public attention and support.

LABOR ACTION readers throughout the country can aid in the struggle by pressing it in their clubs, political organizations and unions, as well through work in schools, in their NAACP chapters, and through letters-to-the-editor columns in their local newspapers—just to mention a few possibilities.

This struggle is certainly one we want to support vigorously.

## 'Temps Modernes' Surveys the Left

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS—*Les Temps Modernes* has published a special May issue on the problems of the Left. It is double the ordinary size of the magazine (480 pages) and contains numerous articles of very unequal value. The first part deals with "Definitions," the second with "History" and the third with "Tasks."

For our own purposes—that is, of brief and frankly partisan appraisal—we find it more expedient to adopt the following classification: The first category, which might be called "Pedantic Confusion," is of no value whatever. It includes all the editorial statements and the articles by the "mandarins": Simone de Beauvoir (again), Claude Lanzman, Dionys Mascolo, Jean Pouillon (all more or less concerned with defining the "Left" in such a way as to include the CP and to leave out Mendès-France) and Gilles Martinet (defining the program of the New Left as he sees it).

A category which could be entitled "Deformation" features an article by Marcel Peju on Trotsky and the development of the Russian Revolution, based on Deutscher's biography. Several levels lower, there are two articles by Stalinist hacks, which must have been included to placate the CP.

A third category, the only one that really matters, is composed of studies, some of which one should have liked to see in other magazines. Most of these articles are interesting contributions even if one disagrees with the author's politics, as this reviewer does in almost every case.

There are two studies on the SP: one, by Colette Audry, is written with special reference to Léon Blum and to his role; the other, by Maurice Duverger, is a detailed analysis of the SP (composition of the membership by age, class, political tendency, structure of the party, political history, etc.).

Pierre Naville does a similar job on the CP, showing, among other things, the growth of the petty-bourgeois element in it, and the increase in its average age.

Jacques Danos and Marcel Gibelin, the two authors of the only book existing on the sit-down strikes of the thirties ("Juin '36"), have each an article. Danos has written on the Popular Front of 1936, analyzing the reasons of its failure. His main point is that a new "Popular Front" must be based on a radical program instead of a moderate one, Gibelin's article is on the prospects for trade-union unity.

Claude Bourdet has contributed an article on the internal politics of the Resistance movement, its effort to find a united political expression after 1945 and its subsequent decomposition. Jean Rous writes on colonial nationalism and its relationship to revolutionary developments. Finally, the issue also includes articles analyzing France's economic situation, by Alfred Sauvy and others.

There are conspicuous absences among former collaborators of the review: Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who has recently broken with Sartre over the pro-Stalinist orientation of the latter, but only to move toward bourgeois positions (which are explained in his "Aventures de la Dialectique," just published); Claude Lefort, a revolutionary Marxist writer who successfully attacked Sartre's articles on "the Communists and Peace" and whose contributions are probably no longer desirable; finally, Daniel Guérin who, no doubt, would have had something valid to say on the problems of the Left.



# Major League Baseball Players Go Union, Business Agent 'n All

WASHINGTON — (PAI) — Baseball, America's national pastime, seems to be embracing another good institution: unionism.

Some 10 years ago unionism was apparently rejected by the players but new developments indicate that they are changing their minds and that some of the legal hurdles to unionism may be removed, too.

A major league ball players' committee was organized some years ago to handle grievances of the players. In effect it was a company union. The league treasuries patronizingly picked up the transportation and hotel tabs of the player representatives elected by each team.

Now, the players are paying the expenses of their representatives and other changes are being made. This is the way Shirley Povich, sports columnist of the Washington Post and Times Herald, put it:

"They are still calling it major league ball players' committee, but it is sprouting new features that are beginning to make it look suspiciously like the union idea the baseball athletes rejected a decade ago. The club owners should be finding it unamusing."

Povich gives a great deal of credit to New York Yankees' former star pitcher Allie Reynolds and outfielder Ralph Kiner, now with the Cleveland Indians, for the new developments. They got the idea of hiring an attorney to represent them in talks with the owners. He's J. Norman Lewis. He might be classified as a business agent.

At first, baseball commissioner Ford Frick was pretty tough and refused to meet with Lewis. In 1953 player representatives of 16 clubs made him back up, though, and now he accepts the attorney as their spokesman.

"Before they got themselves a lawyer," writes Povich, "the players didn't know how they stood with the bosses. They were sweet-talked into some agreements, and had no one to stand up to the battery of legal aids the club presidents invariably had at their side. In some of the conferences, the players were out brief-cased four to one."

The way it works now is that the players are assessed in the neighborhood of \$50 a season for Lewis' services. Two major gains have already been realized from this move. The minimum pay per

season has been raised from \$5000 to \$6000 and meal money expenses has been increased to \$8 a day.

Lewis also has some plans to improve the ball players' pension fund, too. Currently, retired ball players with 10 years service in the majors receive \$100 a month after 50. With the use of radio and television revenues in world series and all star games Lewis has a plan to increase the take up to \$400 a month.

Some changes are also indicated in the legal field. Several years ago the Supreme Court, in a ruling on the baseball reserve clause, held that baseball was a sport, not a business. It therefore allowed the reserve clause—which permits ball players to be owned by club managements like property—to stand.

More recently, however, the Supreme Court ruled that boxing was a business, not a sport, and was therefore subject to the anti-trust laws. Many feel that the Supreme Court might reverse its previous stand on baseball, now.

As far as the players themselves, they are not calling their committee a union but Povich feels that any similarity between the committee and a union is not coincidental.

—Michigan CIO News

## The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

## Big Four Horse-trading — —

(Continued from page 1)

inists have the effect of dampening the popular hopes for the conference? The answer is clear enough.

These hopes have stemmed from the ardent desire of the peoples for peace. So overwhelming is this desire that, given half a chance, millions of people are ready to accept even the slightest modification of the belligerent posture of the two war blocs as a portent of a new era of peaceful coexistence. Given half a chance, they are willing to believe that the rulers who ruthlessly divided the world at Yalta and Teheran, who wiped out sovereign nations, subjugated others and divided still others with the stroke of a pen, have now turned into benevolent apostles of peace, democracy and freedom, or at least reasonable facsimiles thereof.

The Stalinist "peace" offensive was the half chance they needed. But to keep up the illusion on which their hopes are based, the Stalinists would have to continue to act like ogres who have suddenly turned into fairy godfathers. That is, they would have to disgorge some of the booty they swallowed after the last war, to admit the crimes perpetrated against whole peoples (not only the propaganda crimes against Tito), and to make restitution for them.

Now they are showing caution, an attitude which ill behooves fairy godfathers, though quite appropriate to imperialist diplomats. This does not mean that the popular illusions will be shattered overnight. It only means that they are dampened.

### HINTS FADE

On the other side, the American bloc has approached this conference with caution from the beginning. They knew that if the Russians kept up their offensive it would be impossible for the capitalist governments to come to the conference with nothing more than the old proposals which fell flat last year at Berlin. Thus there has been a feverish search in the foreign offices of the governments

concerned for a new formula or series of formulas which could give them the initiative at best, or which could keep the conference from turning into a rout for them at worst.

Hints of a "new approach" have been dropped to newspaper correspondents right and left. One idea was to demand free elections in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe as part of a deal for the unification of Germany. Another was to counter the proposal for a neutralized Germany with a proposal for neutralized satellites. Another was to offer the Russians an all-European defense setup in which the military establishments of Eastern Europe would be supervised and controlled in the same way as are those of the NATO powers in Europe now.

But the closer the conference draws near, the less is heard of these various plans. Instead of seeking to fire the popular imagination in Europe for any or all of them in advance of the conference so as to put maximum pressure on the Stalinists, the tendency has been to keep them in the status of hints similar to that of the Russian "proposal" on the unification and neutralization of Germany.

### JOCKEYING

At the moment, the "leaks" to the press in the American camp tend to revolve more around the question of disarmament than of German unification. Since the Russians have proposed a reduction of conventional ground forces for all, accompanied by some kind of international inspection, the American bloc is playing around with the idea of seeking to make this the central issue at the conference.

They know, of course, that the Stalinists have tied their proposal for the reduction of ground forces to a demand for the withdrawal of all military forces to their national frontiers, and the dismantling of bases on foreign territory. The American government has no intention of giving up the military backbone of its world imperialist power by giving up its bases. It

may hope, however, that if it shouts real loud for the reduction of ground forces (this would mean a reduction by Russia and China only) it will be able to pose as the real "pacifist" at Geneva and gain popular credit thereby.

This jockeying for position on both sides looks much more like a continuation of the cold war than an end to it. Both sides are for the unification of Germany—on terms which the other will not accept. Both are for a reduction of armaments—but only on terms which will weaken the opponent. Both are for a lowering of tensions—but each accuses the other of responsibility for the tensions and questions the "sincerity" of his intentions.

### DEAL COOKING?

The Stalinist rulers have shown a flexibility of which they appeared incapable for a period. There can be no question of that. The American bloc may come up with proposals somewhat different from those they have made in the past. That is entirely possible. But at bottom their imperialist interests remain what they were before, and neither is going to yield anything at Geneva unless they expect to gain an additional imperialist advantage for that which they are willing to yield. That is the hard fact of the matter, and neither popular desires for peace nor popular illusions about the possibility of ogres changing into fairy godfathers can change it.

This is not to say that some kind of deal may not be worked out at Geneva. The caution and relative lack of propaganda fanfare with which both sides are approaching the meeting may well be based on the idea that this is not the time to push for a major political victory in the cold war such as could revolve around a Stalinist "unify and neutralize Germany" campaign.

Get All Your Books from  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

### Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

Instead, both sides may think that there is a possibility of some realistic horse-trading over the conference table over minor though not unimportant issues, and that an attempt to mobilize world opinion before the conference for the proposals of either side might make such horse-trading more difficult.

The popular desire for peace and for an end to the cold war is justified a million times over. But this desire will never be fulfilled in any meaningful sense by the governments which now rule the two war blocs. The sooner that illusion is abandoned, the sooner will the peoples of the world take the first steps toward organizing themselves for the purpose of taking the destiny of humanity out of the hands of the tiny minority on both sides who now control it, and concluding a real and durable peace among themselves.