

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 6, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Labor Peace: A Capitalist View

... page 2

An Open Letter to Ignazio Silone

... page 6

London Letter:

Aylwin-Gibson Girls vs. the Bummares

... page 3

ENGINEERING THE COLLEGES:

The Schools as an Appendage to Business

... page 5

Va. Referendum Is Not Going to End the Battle

By BETTY PERKINS.

Early in January the white-supremacists of Virginia voted two to one in favor of a proposal to use public money to pay tuition for students in private schools. Virginia thus became the first state to take official action on the threat to turn the public educational system over to private operation rather than to accept desegregation as required by the Supreme Court.

The plan, as called for by the governor-appointed Gray Commission, provides for a state election of delegates to a special convention to amend the state constitution to allow such payments to theoretically non-sectarian schools. The state legislature and eventually the voters will have to approve such an amendment, and it will probably also be tested before the U. S. Supreme Court. This plan is supposedly in addition to a desegregated public school system.

The commission justified its plan by an old legal doctrine called "interposition," which presumes the state has a right to interpose its sovereignty between a federal law or decision and the state's citizens when the national government oversteps its proper authority. The doctrine was one held by the Confederacy in the Civil War.

STEAMROLLED

The vote, largest recorded except for the 1952 presidential election (620,000 in 1952 against 450,000), was heavily stacked against integration by three factors:

(1) Virginia's poll tax, which requires a citizen to pay \$1.50 for three consecutive years and keep the receipts, undoubtedly kept many Negroes from voting, as did certain judiciously exercised economic pressures in the Southern and Eastern counties. The result was that less than 20 per cent of the adult Negroes voted.

(2) The one and only political party in the state, led by wealthy Democratic Senator Harry Byrd (who carried Virginia for Eisenhower in 1952, and who represents the wealth and prestige of the so-called First Families), was solidly behind the Gray proposal with the entire state machine.

(3) The proposal was steam-rolled through after only a month's discussion, giving the opposition, led by the labor movement, the NAACP and church groups, little time to organize. By the time of the vote, opposition to the proposal had already reached such proportions that prominent Virginians began hedging in their support of the Gray plan, and the state government was forced to work even harder to corral support.

Opposition to the Gray plan is obviously strong, and should be supported and encouraged by every interested group at every step in the long legal procedure. Many people feel that this plan opens the way to support of parochial or semi-sectarian schools, while others know that Virginia's already poor school system (43rd in rank in the U. S.) cannot bear the financial strain and maintain even its present level.

Also, the Gray plan makes it possible for districts, if they so desire, to integrate their public schools, and the speedy

(Turn to last page)

Balance Sheet of a Propaganda Thrust-and-Parry

By PHILIP COBEN

President Eisenhower's reply to the Kremlin's proposals for a bilateral "friendship" treaty has been greeted in this country with largely unmixed approval from leaders of both parties, including everybody running for office. Ex-President Truman was enthusiastic. In addition, Prime Minister Eden, approaching these shores for his session with Eisenhower, has given it his blessing.

This approach to unanimity contrasts with the storm of denunciation that greeted two recent foreign-policy pronouncements of the same administration, by the incredible Mr. Dulles, namely, the famous "brink of war" manifesto on art and the declaration of solidarity with fascist Portugal on its Goan colony.

The contrast is instructive. The "brink of war" and Goan atrocities certainly pictured the administration's foreign policy accurately, specifically its inherent attachment to military solutions (instead of political warfare against Stalinism) and to pro-colonialist and pro-imperialist policies (as against a democratic foreign policy). The picture of this bipartisan foreign policy was all the more vivid, and to that extent all the more instructive, because it was a caricature of itself.

Though Dean Acheson, in Truman's

days, was following essentially the same foreign policy, as virtually everyone knows, it is impossible to imagine the more sophisticated Acheson pulling a public boner like the crude, bragging, politically insensitive article in *Life* magazine which set off the recent tempest. Yet in point of historical fact it was the Truman-Acheson administration which did take the world to "the verge of war" when it jumped off the smaller brink into the Korean war. But it took a Dulles to boast of the artistry involved.

"BEST FOOT"

Such exaggerated versions of the bipartisan policy, such stupidly frank revelations of the meaning of this policy, as were exhibited by Dulles in the Goa and "brink" cases are, therefore, not at all inherent in or inevitable from the reactionary nature of American foreign policy. There is no inevitability that a re-



actionary must also be an idiot, in other words. Dulles' blunders were "excesses" —very revealing excesses.

Hence the contrast:

In his reply to Bulganin's propaganda move, Eisenhower and his advisers were trying to put their best foot forward, within the limits of their foreign policy.

(Turn to last page)

How Auto's Big 3 Manufacturers Milk Both the Dealer and Buyer

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Jan. 29

While the painful process of more layoffs due to production cutbacks continues in the auto industry, a series of events elsewhere highlight another major point of conflict between the giant corporations and the rest of the country.

The Senate Commerce subcommittee on automotive marketing practices has held hearings which emphasize two points: The ruthless character of the auto industry's drive for business with complete disregard of the 30,000 car dealers, and (2) what a terrible beating the American consumer has taken from the sales practices of the auto industry.

The forthcoming convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association in Washington this week will add fuel to these fires of controversy, for the point of revolt has been reached by these "economic slaves" (as one auto-industry expert called the dealers at the Senate hearings.)

That this is no small matter may be seen by comparing the auto industry's manufacturing segment, with an investment of \$7 billion employing around 780,000 persons, to the auto dealers' agencies, with an investment of nearly \$5 billion and employing 660,000 persons.

What is being revealed, of course, in all these disputes is the nature of the

functioning of a major part of the capitalist economy, and the picture is not a very pleasant one.

Take a matter like "car bootlegging," something that the dealers have been crying about:

Somewhere, somehow, a group of unauthorized or second-hand dealers or (in some cases) racketeers get control of hundreds of new cars. They ship them elsewhere, and sell them below regular car prices just enough to ruin the franchised dealers. The auto corporations, when this practice is exposed, issue pon-



tifical statements denouncing it and make speeches about honest business methods, etc.

It turns out, however, that the source of this whole practice is very well known. It seems that Michigan car dealers, with close contact at the plants, as a rule ordered twice as many new cars as they themselves sold. Guess where the rest went?

At the height of the public indignation over this controversy, the auto companies claimed their hands were tied. They couldn't do anything. Actually, as the pressure of the 1955 sales campaigns got greater, the Big Three (General Motors, Ford and Chrysler) showed how powerful they were by ruthlessly taking away franchises from any dealer who didn't live up to their artificial quotas of sales.

GOUGING THE PUBLIC

The conclusion is inescapable that the Big Three used all these practices, including car bootlegging, in a determined effort to get a great share of the market no matter what the cost to any dealers anywhere, and no matter what the method.

When one GM dealer complained he couldn't make a fair profit under practices like these, company officials told him to make his profit on car services. Which brings out another scandalous practice revealed recently. It is called

(Turn to last page)

WITH HIS FEET ON THE GROUND

A Capitalist View of This Era of Labor Peace

By BEN HALL

An unusual guest flew all the way from Pittsburgh to San Francisco last week to address the West Coast conference of the American Management Association. It was David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers. He told his hosts that it was "high time that we in labor and you in management stopped playing the hero and villain roles in respect to each other."

For this is officially an era of peace and harmony and anyone who refers to labor-employer conflicts is somewhat rude. When Benjamin Fairless, representative of the associated steel corporations, meets McDonald, he says "Hello, Dave," and Dave replies with a familiar smile "How do, Ben." And they talk together of how to get along. On such etiquette, labor is admonished to build its future.

What are the facts of life? If no one suggests the truth to labor, a whole staff of ideologues is ready to give counsel to capital.

"Like It Or Not"

The latest word of caution comes from the eminently sober and respectably dull pages of the *Harvard Business Review*, whose editor introduces an article in its November-December issue with a little squib as follows:

"Whether we like it or not, there are certain basic and irreconcilable conflicts of interest between labor and management that cannot be wished away or hammered out of existence. A union leader and an executive are most unlikely to see eye to eye on problems like employee security and division of profits. . . . The only realistic goal for management is to maintain a balance of power; and the only practical way to achieve that balance is to hold the allegiance of enough workers to keep the union from gaining a preponderance of strength. More than that is impossible: Less is not enough."

The author who is preoccupied with the so-called era of labor peace from the employers' standpoint is Robert N. McMurry, vice-president of McMurry, Hamstra and Co., industrial relations firm. He writes on "War and Peace in Labor Relations." He leaves no lingering doubt as to his own sympathies:

"Just because the unions are here to stay is no reason not to try to place a check on the power and arrogance of some of them."

Here is a man, definitely not "subversive," who has passed his security check, and his opinions get clearance. He sees the shadow of class antagonisms through the veil of official good-fellowship and uses his wisdom to alert the employers. It is instructive to eavesdrop upon his report.

Fair-Weather Plant

McMurry cautions that labor peace is exaggerated; in fact, where others see peace he detects disruption:

"The recent demand of the UAW-CIO for the guaranteed annual wage had highlighted once more the fact that labor peace is as best tenuous and transitory."

For class harmony is a fair-weather plant, nurtured in the warm sun of 15 years of prosperity:

"During this boom period, the employer has been able to afford to be liberal and accede to union demands without seriously endangering his competitive position. . . . But will management and the union be able to accommodate their interests to one another in a less propitious climate?"

He doesn't think so.

This conclusion would ordinarily seem trite and it would be positively banal to repeat it. But public spokesmen for labor flee from such a commonplace;

they would probably not deny it; quite the contrary, they are aware that they would be forced to fight or retreat if their unions were weakened by recession. They simply refuse to face the question. Far easier to console themselves and their members by dreams of class cooperation.

The Issue of Power

Let us not malign the author, Mr. McMurry. He repeats the catechism—"While labor and management do have common interests and goals . . ."—but he doesn't let such a trifle stand in the way of realism: "there are also deeply rooted and irreconcilable conflicts between employer and wage earners and between management and unions."

For one thing, labor demands security, and "Security is the demand which most managements are least in a position to grant in the measure which their workers want and need."

For another: a fight always takes place over the "division of the spoils," and "where there are profits, the question inevitably arises: who gets what and how much."

He warns finally that **"Even a moderate recession can bring violent and protracted unrest onto the labor scene." Labor peace cannot last forever: "The real question is not how to avoid or prevent labor warfare, but how to confine it within manageable bounds."**

What to do? Labor may live in the clouds, but employers keep their feet on the ground:

"The fact remains that the issue of power in labor relations is the cardinal factor in every contract negotiation. It determines in the final analysis how much and what management will give and what the union will yield if anything. Its form may vary—it may be economic or political or simply brute force—and people may confuse the issue by talking about 'labor's rights' or management prerogatives' but the relative power of the contestants is nearly always the decisive factor."

No Magic Formula

This is putting things bluntly, even a bit crudely, but it serves as a good rule of thumb for bosses, calculated to shake them up and guard against complacency. Coarse it may be but there is more wisdom packed into it than in millions of words on labor peace.

Despite his frank avowal of "power" as a tool, McMurry discards "brute force" as a policy: it is, in his view, "unrealistic." He suggests a campaign to undermine workers' union loyalty: "Now, the key to power in labor relations is to be found in the allegiance of the workers." And it is this allegiance that must be undermined.

But how? No one has discovered the magic formula; the man who could teach the art, could build a multi-million dollar industrial-relations firm; but alas, it is not Mr. McMurry.

Of course, bosses could easily loosen the hold of unions over their workers by giving higher wages and shorter hours on their own initiative, without waiting to be forced into action. But there is no enthusiasm for that . . . it is something like committing suicide to collect life insurance.

So McMurry shies away from "major issues such as wages and hours" and turns instead to the "thousand and one petty frustrations and annoyances that highlight and render the worker inescapably conscious of his subordinate status." Sometimes drinking water is too warm; or there are no lockers. Sometimes even, he points out, a worker reaches into a parts bin and a rat bites his hand. Things like that must go . . . and the boss must take the initiative to end such glaring injustices.

McMurry doesn't have anything very practical to sell. But he performs a service to his class, gratis, by reminding it of the basic facts of class conflict.

He is not alone. The capitalist class will not be cloyed to death by labor gladhanders. It is amply guarded against illusions by the literary and practical efforts of conservative journals, hard-headed writers, and anti-union activists. While the employers are alerted against labor, it remains for the assorted lib-

erals to dream of eternal labor peace. Meanwhile, who is to warn the working class against illusions?

But then, things are not really so bad: everyone talks of labor peace, but no one really believes it. It takes decades to create a good strong myth and this one just hasn't the time.

Question-Mark

Because meanwhile life, in all its sordidness, goes on. Everyone knows how peace was shattered at Perfect Circle and at Kohler. And how Ford and General Motors, fresh from harmony in Detroit, went to Ohio to finance a political campaign against the very guaranteed-wage plan they had granted the UAW. And now?

"Business Launches Drive to Kill GAW in Michigan Plants" is the headline in the Michigan CIO News on January 19. It reports the creation of an employers' Michigan Information Committee to combat the legalization of the GAW plan.

"The big question mark in Michigan is the role to be played by the auto's Big Three—Ford, General Motors and Chrysler," reads the CIO report. "All three signed contracts containing the GAW plan." What! An era of labor peace and still a question mark?

In Illinois, the same. *Labor's Daily* reports on January 21 that five employers' groups have formed a united front to outlaw supplementary unemployment payments under GAW.

On January 18 a private meeting of nationally important industrialists gathered in Washington, D. C. to map a campaign of propaganda against unionism. *Labor's Daily* quotes its stated purpose as follows: "to prepare educational material designed to inform the American people of those activities of organized groups which, if carried on to excess, will destroy free collective bargaining and eventually free competitive enterprise."

Let an unwary reader conclude that this new employers' crusade is marching along in the big war on the Communist Party, we list its first projects: (1) to expose union political action; (2) restrictions on job opportunities, especially by unions; (3) restraint on trade, above all by unions.

Yellow Dogs Are Back

And meanwhile, the Westinghouse strike passes its 100th day. In the big Columbus plant, where an IUE member died after police attacked picket lines, the company inspires the formation of a captive "independent" union as the first step toward decertifying the IUE.

In Miami, the yellow-dog contract returns in the hotel strike. The Hotel Fontainebleau forces its employees to sign the following contract or be fired:

"I am satisfied with the hours, wages, and working conditions of my employment at the Fontainebleau Hotel and I do not wish to negotiate for a change in any of the conditions of my employment and I do not wish to authorize any union to represent me in discussions and negotiations in connection with my employment with the Fontainebleau."

But David J. McDonald, president of the Steelworkers, is thinking of bigger things; he has just finished his address to the American Management Association; the kind invitation was enough; he oozes good-fellowship; and he flies back to Pittsburgh to tell his executive board how impressive a gesture he made for labor peace.

FRIDAY—Feb. 17—8 p.m.

RALLY TO RESTORE KUTCHER'S JOB!

Speakers

JAMES A. WECHSLER
Editor, N. Y. Post

MORRIS IUSHEWITZ
Sec.-Treas. Greater New York CIO Council

JAMES KUTCHER

COMMUNITY CHURCH
35 Street betw. Park & Madison

Auspices:

KUTCHER CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Launching ISL Drive For \$10,000

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Once again the Independent Socialist League annual Fund Drive is about to open. February 15 marks the opening day of the \$10,000 campaign in support of LABOR ACTION and the *New International*.

The past year has been a tough one. Readers of our press know the great fight we made in the fight for civil liberties, which would not have been half so valuable if we had had to do it without our press.

In the Shachtman passport case and in the fight against the attorney general's List the paper and magazine were the most important means we had to make known these activities and to present the record of the events.

If we gained an important and historic legal victory in the passport case in defeating the arbitrary position of the State Department, and forced at least a partial hearing from the attorney general, it was at the same time an expensive experience.

In the passport case we did it alone without the financial aid of anyone. While the Workers Defense League and its secretary Rowland Watts have aided us nobly in the case against the attorney general, much of the financial burden for that too has been borne by the ISL and its friends.

We are faced with prospect of a completion of the hearing by the Department of Justice this year and we will need the assistance of all our friends and sympathizers. That is why the Fund Drive for 1956 is more important than ever.

QUOTAS FOR ALL

As in previous drives, we have allotted quotas to the various cities. We have done that in consideration of the prospects in these areas and on the basis of experience in other campaigns. The quotas set are as follows:

National Office	\$1250
New York	3800
Chicago	2000
Los Angeles	650
Bay Area	400
Newark	400
Philadelphia	200
Buffalo	150
Detroit	350
Pittsburgh	200
Seattle	150
Cleveland	150
Indiana	100
Akron	25
Reading	50
Oregon	50
St. Louis	50
Streator	25

\$10,000

We feel quite certain in our judgment that we will go over the top again, though we know that it will take a long, hard pull to push us over. The responses we have already received give us confidence that we will make it.

SHACHTMAN TOUR

As an adjunct to the 1956 drive, we have organized a coast-to-coast tour for Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL. Shachtman will speak at public meetings, symposiums and other affairs, and we know that these meetings will as usual be the high point of the Fund Drive.

Meetings for Shachtman will be organized on the topics: "The United Labor Movement and Political Perspectives in the United States," and "The Geneva Spirit." These topics concern themselves with the larger political questions of our times.

LABOR ACTION will carry announcements of the Shachtman meetings and we advise our readers to watch its columns for meeting dates and places in the various cities which he will cover.

The tour schedule is the following:

Reading	Feb. 11
Philadelphia	Feb. 12-13
Newark	Feb. 14
Pittsburgh	Feb. 17-19
Cleveland	Feb. 20-21
Detroit	Feb. 22-24
Chicago	Feb. 25-27
Seattle	Feb. 29-Mar. 2
San Francisco	Mar. 3-6
Los Angeles	Mar. 7-10
St. Louis	Mar. 25

LONDON LETTER

The Aylwin-Gibson Girls vs. The Bummarees at Smithfield

By OWEN ROBERTS

Everyone in Britain knows of Smithfield. It is an old English institution and a landmark as well known as Buckingham Palace or the Houses of Parliament. Not that Smithfield is either regal or political. It is in fact a meat market in London with a history that reaches back in time to the twelfth century. In its 640-foot-long arcade there are some 400 stalls from which retail butchers can purchase supplies of beef, mutton, lamb, poultry, eggs, bacon and the other things that are seen hanging up or strewn about in the butcher's shop.

Recently Smithfield Market has become the scene of a small industrial dispute that was featured in all the newspaper headlines and has sparked off controversy all over the country.

It all began a week ago when a London retail butcher, David Durrant, decided to go to law. His complaint was that he was forced to hire licensed porters in the market to carry away the meat which he had purchased from the wholesalers.

This, said Durrant, involved him in unnecessary delay and expense. The case was heard in the Lord Mayor's Court at Guildhall before Judge Block—a fitting name for one entrusted with the responsibility of unraveling the technicalities involved in meat portage.

Judge Block was a very outspoken man. He said it was obvious that Durrant was being held to ransom by the Transport and General Workers' Union—which organizes the licensed porters, or (to give them their correct name) the bummarees. Judge Block said that Durrant had every right to carry away his own meat—and quoted the City of London by-law which said that all meat must be handled by licensed porters except that retailers, or persons in their employ, may remove meat that they have purchased in the market. He granted Durrant declarations allowing him to remove his purchases in accordance with the by-law.

TRIBE ON WAR PATH

Durrant was a happy man and the judge's decision was hailed by the press as a victory for those who wished to remove the "restrictive practices" imposed by trade unions. But Durrant's smiles quickly vanished.

When he next visited the market he was four times refused meat by wholesale butchers unless he would agree to their terms—and these were that the meat was handled by the bummarees. The wholesale butchers explained that they were most reluctant to take this step, but what else could they do?

For the 100 bummarees, plus 600 other porters who work for carrying companies, had threatened to down the meat if Durrant insisted on carrying his own purchases. The wholesale butchers explained that they were not prepared to let Durrant have his pound of flesh and bring the whole of the market to a standstill as a consequence.

The press arose in indignation at what they considered a deliberate flouting of the law by a bunch of bloody-handed trade-unionists. Their wrath was further provoked by a neat summing up of the situation by Spencer Tribe, the market organizer of the TGWU.

Said Spencer Tribe: "It is this way: the judge said he could; the butcher said he would; we said he couldn't—and he didn't."

LADIES WITH A BEEF

Thus aroused, the editors of Fleet Street handed out the poison pens to their scribes and told them to whip up a slick campaign against Mr. Tribe, his bummarees and trade unions in general.

For a few days there were more reporters in Smithfield than there were butchers and bummarees put together. And they featured screaming stories of how the actions of these men with the peculiar sounding trade was putting a penny a pound on the price of meat. A penny which the poor old housewife had to pay.

This did the trick and the Housewives' Association announced its intention of marching in full force to Smithfield Market to tell the bummarees just what they were. The Association, which is a Tory front organization, promised that a thousand angry housewives would march on the market.

London, Jan. 24

bums, and that it was shocking that they should be wasting their time "while our boys are in Cyprus."

When the bummarees tired of the sport, and the police wanted to go home, the five who were prepared to take on the whole trade union movement were gently ushered away.

But the story isn't really as hilarious as appears.

At this precise moment the Tory party and its supporting newspapers have started stepping up the war against what they call the "monopolistic and restrictive practices" of trade unions. And they are using the case of Smithfield Market and the bummarees to illustrate their point.

They say that the bummarees are not needed, that they are earning fantastically high wages, that they are acting as though there were more men than jobs instead of the other way round as is the case. In short they are using the present dispute as evidence for the necessity for some action to be taken to break the power of the unions.

Most of the anti-unionists are appealing, first of all, to the "responsible" leaders of the unions to take action and sweep away all the conditions which the unions have imposed which restrict the rate of the bosses' exploitation. They are warning that, if the trade-union leaders don't put their own house in order, the government might have to enact legislation which will force them to do it.

But with the evidence of the bummarees at hand, it's quite obvious that the rank-and-file trade-unionists aren't going to be moved. Not by the bosses, the judges, or even the Housewives Association.

On the chosen day reporters, newsreel cameramen and a large section of the London police force stationed themselves at the market to await the arrival of the angry women. They eventually arrived; there were exactly five of them.

BATTLE OF SMITHFIELD

They were led by a dignified old lady wearing a broadtailed coat, and a black-corded silk beret, armed with a lethal-looking umbrella. She was Dr. K. W. Aylwin-Gibson, J.P., and she had arrived at the starting point of the demonstration by taxi.

Carrying banners which proclaimed that "London housewives stand for liberty," the gallant five old dears made a mass march into the market, with an escort of 30 policemen, and sought an interview with the top brass of the wholesale butchers' association to urge them to stand up to the threats of the trade unions.

The bummarees just loved this. They cheered the five females through the market and sang ribald songs, including a good old Cockney favorite which has as its chorus "Come round any old time and make yourself at home."

One of the ladies was very upset and told the bummarees that they were just

BOLIVIA

Turmoil in Ruling Party as Paz Regime Turns Right

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Jan. 23

The alliance between the petty-bourgeoisie and the workers, who are represented by their unions which are in turn controlled by the government party (MNR—National Revolutionary Movement), continues to place its stamp on the peculiar Bolivian situation, as the MNR party convention shows once again.

The nationalist bourgeoisie depends for its power completely on the voluntary support it gets from the labor movement. This is based, in turn, on the confidence which they give the regime because it decreed the nationalization of the mines and agrarian reform.

And this is so despite the fact that the nationalization of the mines has caused a deep crisis in the Bolivian economy. Since the price of tin dropped, the government has not had the capital reserve with which to cover the deficits, and has sought to "cover" them by printing paper money. Thus it is the majority of the workers who are actually paying the cost of nationalization.

Nevertheless, they continue to back the regime. The same is true of the peasants who still support the government despite the ineffectiveness of the agrarian reform.

Since the old opposition party has been destroyed, the antagonisms which exist can express themselves only inside the single government party. Thus, a sharp clash between the Nationalists and the labor movement took place at the last party convention.

The convention began with a political struggle over the problem of the presidential succession. Paz Estenssoro is "tired," and wants to designate Siles Suazo as his successor. But this personal problem of the succession actually expresses the impasse of the "national revolution," for while Paz Estenssoro represents the equilibrium between the two forces (labor and the capitalists), Siles is considered to be the leader of the right wing of the MNR and the standard bearer of "capitalist restoration."

The labor federation (COB—Central Obrera Boliviana) under the leadership

of Juan Lechin mobilized its members against this proposed change in the presidency, and demanded that Paz Estenssoro stay in office to maintain the status quo. The party convention confirmed Paz as its leader, and Siles as vice leader, despite strong criticisms of the latter.

Juan Lechin offered the regime the support of the workers, but he strongly criticized the admission to it of the "progressive bourgeoisie," which brings about a change in the relation of forces in the government camp.

BLOW-UP

But in spite of this conciliatory approach, the crisis broke out when Walter Guevara Arze, foreign minister and one of the leaders of the MNR, attacked Lechin's caucus, and blamed it for the massacres of mine workers at Catavi in 1942. Guevara challenged Lechin to assume power, and "not to exercise it from behind the throne."

This attack on Lechin provoked so much excitement that Guevara offered to resign from his office. In addition, the chief of government propaganda, Fellman Velarde, barred Edwin Moller, a COB secretary, from the convention. This was described by COB leaders as an "interficial blow by reactionaries against the workers."

The COB leaders are threatening a general strike. It appears that the situation is highly charged, because Paz Estenssoro has accepted the resignation of Guevara, who is one of the oldest leaders of the MNR and has been a cabinet minister throughout the history of the Nationalist regime.

I should also explain that the E. Moller who was "barred" was at one time the general secretary of the POR (4th International) and then went over to the MNR. He is now an assistant to Lechin, and is one of the COB secretaries. Fellman Velarde was Paz Estenssoro's private secretary, sent into the COB to strengthen the influence of the president there. As chief of government propaganda, he is a member of the cabinet.

[A representative of the Bolivian Consulate in New York gives the version

(Continued on page 4)

DISCUSSION *Is the Polish Opposition Adapting to Stalinist Regime?*

By A. RUDZIENSKI

News from Poland and from the Polish emigration may indicate it is possible that a new relationship between Russia and occupied Poland is coming into being.

While the Polish question does not play today the same role in world politics as it did in the time of Marx and Engels (from the standpoint of revolutionary socialism this role could rather be ascribed to the Germany of today), nevertheless an independent Polish policy, and especially a revolutionary Polish policy, could play a great role toward the victory or defeat of Russian expansion in Europe and of the Russian bureaucracy.

First, let us trace the steps by which the Kremlin has been attempting to win the collaboration of the Polish people. It takes us back to older days of the Polish boundary question.

The delivery of Poland to Russian domination by the Yalta and Potsdam agreements is reminiscent of the partition of Poland at the Congress of Vienna, with one modification: that this time not only was the whole historical territory of the Polish-Lithuanian state delivered to Russia, but also a large part of German territory was added too. The position of Russia in Europe was stronger at Potsdam than it was at Vienna in 1815.

The creation of the "Polish Popular Republic" reminds one of the Kingdom of Poland of 1815 set up under the scepter of Alexander I. The incorporation of the territories of the Great Duchy of Lithuania directly into the Russian empire reminds one of the present annexation of Galicia, Volynia and the district of Vilna to Russia.

Stalin imitated the policy of Tsar Alexander and improved on it. He not only separated the remaining Ukrainian and Lithuanian territories which had belonged to Poland since the Polish-Lithuanian Union (1385), thus subjugating the peoples of the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Lithuania to Russian domination, but he "rewarded" the Poles with the incorporation of Silesia, Pomerania and part of Prussia for the loss of their eastern territories.

Acting in this way, Stalin has fulfilled the program of the National-Democracy, the most reactionary party of the Polish bourgeoisie, which had proclaimed the doctrine of the political autonomy of ethnic Poland (the Polish Kingdom) inside

Paz Regime —

(Continued from page 3)

that Velarde challenged E. Moller's credentials, claiming that he was not a bona-fide member of the MNR but rather of "some kind of communist party."—Ed.]

The "personalities" of the MNR convention—the resignation of Guevara, the exclusion of Moller, and the declarations of Lechin—reflect the impasse of the "national revolution" in Bolivia. Under the workers' pressure, the government of Paz Estenssoro decreed the agrarian reform and the nationalization of the mines. But it neither desires nor is capable of going over to more radical, i.e., socialist measures.

RETREAT

Hence Paz wants to resign and turn the power over to Siles as the standard-bearer of a "national retreat" and "consolidation of the revolutionary conquests." This signifies a change in the relation of forces and a reduction of the weight of Lechin's caucus as well as the COB.

The only remedy for this would be an offensive of the unions under the banner of a demand for a worker-peasant government, that is, of a COB government with the support of the entire left. But Lechin is afraid of his own government and wants only to preserve the status quo.

Naturally, this "fear of power" expresses the objective immaturity of the Bolivian situation; the Bolivian workers are not prepared to take power and emancipate themselves from the influence of the nationalist bourgeoisie. That is the whole problem, and the basis of the dramatic events in La Paz. In spite of the fact that Bolivia is a small Indian country and La Paz a small city, political developments there have great importance, because the Bolivian labor movement generally stands in the vanguard of the working class of Latin America.

the Russian Empire. With this display of "magnanimity" Stalin hoped to win the support of Polish nationalism and solidify the Russian domination of Poland.

The realization of this Russian imperialist program for Poland encountered the resistance of the whole Polish people, and especially of the strong and well-organized underground. In order to clear his road to conquest, Stalin first incited the Poles to rise up against the Nazis, and then, at the time of the Warsaw Insurrection, repeated the Molotov-Ribbentrop policy on a small scale by delivering the Warsaw uprising to the Germans; this he did by detaining the Russian offensive which should have come to its aid. The job of General Suvorov, the Russian butcher of 1795, was this time carried out by the Nazis, and the Russians paraded into the ruined empty city as saviors.

DISAPPOINTED BY WEST

During this period the majority of the Polish nation was against the Russian regime; they waited for salvation by the "Western allies," and considered the loss of Polish independence as temporary. But the "West's" policy of concessions to Russia disappointed the Poles, and destroyed the hope of some of a new armed conflict against Russia in the course of which Poland would be rapidly liberated.

On the other hand the Polish underground was exhausted by the long war against the Nazis and by the Warsaw uprising, and facing the fact of Russian domination, there grew up a program of "biological conservation of the nation," of "enduring the bad times"—that is, of adapting to the new political situation. Thus the armed underground decided to liquidate its organization and legalize its people. After the period of the mixed Bierut-Mikolajczyk regime, that is, of the "soft" policy, Stalin ordered a "hard course," with trials of former underground fighters (in spite of the amnesty) as well as of Stalinists who had carried out the soft policy of an agreement with the democratic opposition.

It is characteristic that Russian policy, while persecuting the Socialists, the peasants and the Gomulka wing of the Stalinists, sought an understanding with the most radical group of Polish nationalists, such as the fascist group of Piasecki, legalizing them as the "loyal Catholics." Some ex-nationalist leaders and theoreticians, such as Professor Grabski and Woj-

Phila. Third Camp Comm. Hears Talk on Politics

By FRANK HARPER

Philadelphia, Jan. 19

On January 18, the local Third Camp Contact Committee enjoyed a discussion led by Max Martin of the Young Socialist League. The topic was "Political Action and the Third Camp."

The speaker briefly outlined the general program and backgrounds of the Third Camp movement, and advocated that Third Camp supporters in the United States work toward the formation of an independent labor party. The two old parties of capitalism have certainly proven that they cannot avoid global armed conflict.

Some members of the audience voiced some doubt about the wisdom of such a program now, on the basis that the union movement had less radical content than ever before in its history. Granting these facts to be correct the speaker reminded the audience that American labor was far stronger than ever before in its history and that it is engaged in organized political action on a scale almost untried for a few years ago.

ciechowski, finished their careers as dignitaries of the Warsaw regime.

A part of the Polish nationalists, such as representatives of the former bourgeoisie, landowners and backward "intelligentsia," are collaborating with the regime, while the socialist workers and peasants are in opposition. The bureaucratic regime is absorbing a large part of the pre-war reactionary bourgeois elements, landowners and "intelligentsia," thus increasing their disposition to collaborate with and reach an understanding with Russia.

DEAL WITH THE RIGHT

Naturally, the "thaw" policy has deepened the feeling of security of these elements who have now become members of the new bureaucratic class. And what helped it along was the old ideological tradition of the Polish National-Democracy (*Endecja*), the policy of an understanding with tsardom at the price of a purely ethnic unification of all Polish territories, including those of Polish Silesia, Pomerania and Prussia, at the price of abandoning the "dream of independence" and leaving the Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians to their own fate. This policy was directed against the Socialists and the camp of Pilsudski, but was defeated with the return of independence in 1918.

But now, after the national defeat, the loss of independence and the disappointment with the "West's" policy toward Poland, this policy could be revived, barring the way to a new Polish policy directed against Russia. Stalin knew very well the antecedents of Polish policy before the Russian Revolution, and tried to win the collaboration of this part of Polish nationalism which had always been for collaboration with tsarism.

Is it possible that the "thaw" policy, as far as the Russians are concerned, aims at attaining the collaboration of Polish nationalism against the "West" on the basis of a defense of the status quo, especially of the western border of the "Polish Popular Republic"? It is possible, but only if the Kremlin's policy were absolutely definite; that is, if Russia were determined to defend the status quo in Europe at any price, including war, and in the first place the partition of Germany and the preservation of the present organization of the satellite countries.

PART OF NEW POLICY

But Russian international policy is a function of the internal situation in Russia, where the struggle for power goes on and the opposition is growing. Therefore the Russian "grace" to Poland depends not only on the good will of the Poles, but also on the needs of Russian international policy, in which the Kremlin defends the status quo today but might tomorrow be ready to pay with Polish territories and the destiny of Poland for an alliance with Germany.

Hence the policy of "thaw" in Poland may well be deeper than in other satellite countries, possibly even deeper than in Russia itself. It could take different forms.

It is quite natural that a growing disposition to collaboration with Russia should appear in Polish society, not only because of the ideological tradition of Polish National-Democracy, but because of social and economic factors. The bureaucratic class in Poland is growing, and because of the weakness of the old Stalinist cadres it is more heterogeneous politically than in Russia. Naturally, this could create a new type of Stalinism and a new type of Stalinist regime, in spite of the bad precedent of the unfortunate Gomulka, who remains the most popular figure in Poland in spite of his isolation.

In this context, the invitation extended to the emigration to return to Poland is

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

not a whim-but part of this new policy. The Kremlin is trying to reduce, if not to liquidate, the political-centers-in-exile of the satellite countries. The Polish emigration is the largest and the best organized and the most dangerous anti-Russian center, whose conquest for the new policy in Poland could signify a great success for the Kremlin.

It appears that among the Poles in exile the imperialist policies of the United States and Great Britain, which resulted in the delivery of Poland to the Russians at Potsdam, has laid the groundwork for accommodation to the Russians. To this was added the fiasco of the collaboration between American Intelligence and the exiled Poles of the Nationalist Party, in the matter known as the "Berg affair," which delivered many victims to the UB (security police) who were then sentenced to death in Poland. These death sentences of Poles, who had offered their services to the cause of resistance in good faith, exasperated many people with U. S. policy and strengthened the tendency toward accommodation.

The very popular, conservative writer Stanislaw Mackiewicz, ideologue of the former landowners of the Wilno district, is subjecting American policy to a harsh criticism, and comes out for a new Polish policy. His social class was traditionally for collaboration with tsarism. The "regime Catholics" in Poland, under the leadership of Piasecki (ex-fascist), Horodynski, etc., have been collaborating for some time now.

CAPITULATORY TRENDS

At the democratic (peasant) left Professor Kot, ex-ambassador to Moscow during the period of the Sikorsky government and ex-collaborator of Mikolajczyk, now proposes a new Polish-Russian understanding at the price of liquidating the "Communist dictatorship," the creation of a coalition government in Poland, and the defense of the western borders against Germany and the U. S.

From the socialist wing Zygmunt Zaremba, leader of the "left," has demanded the holding of elections, the convening of an elected parliament, and the liquidation of the "one party dictatorship." The flight of Szczypiorski to Poland seems not to have been an isolated, accidental event, but a result of a political crisis in the Socialist Party which stems from its collaboration with the Nationalists who were compromised in the Berg affair. This crisis is deepening.

Further, the prime minister of the Zaleski government-in-exile demanded the creation of a neutral zone composed of the satellite states, despite his opposition to Russian policy.

The National Committee, composed of Nationalists, Socialists, Peasants and Democrats, is resisting the new turn and clinging to its anti-Russian and pro-Western orientation, but the voices of prominent exiled Polish politicians is very significant.

The Poles are losing their faith in help from the "West," they don't want to be cannon-fodder for the United States, and they are inclining toward an understanding with Russia as the only alternative they see to the "Western betrayal" of Poland.

Only the future will tell if a new era of Polish-Russian relations is possible. If the Kremlin could win a majority of the Polish leaders to collaboration at the price of some concessions, it would have obtained a new political victory in Europe. The policy of the United States and Great Britain would then have lost them their allies and millions of unknown soldiers behind the Iron Curtain.



LABOR ACTION

February 6, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 6

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, REN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

ENGINEERING THE COLLEGES

The Schools as an Appendage to Business

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Socialism, as any half-informed reader of the bourgeois press should be able to tell you, stifles initiative. It involves bureaucratic controls over the lives of people; it turns persons into numbers. Capitalism, however, allows for freedom of choice.

So the dreary argument has run for years now. And meanwhile capitalism has been constantly revolutionizing itself in the direction of more rationalized production, bigger and bigger units, bureaucratic control. The expropriation of entrepreneurial initiative which seemed to have reached dizzying heights by the end of World War II has continued on at a rapid pace in the past decade. And the social consequences of this fact are enormous.

This is particularly true in the field of education. Just as early capitalism needed a certain basic minimum of literacy, so today business is concerned with higher and higher levels of education. An article in the *New York Times*, occasioned by the meeting of the American Institute of Physics, recently made a graphic emphasis of this point.

The *Times* told of the tremendous rush of business into the field of technical education. With 50,000 engineering jobs open and 25,000 candidates for degrees this June, companies have taken to gigantic recruiting campaigns among the college youth trained in the sciences.

As the *Times* writes it, "It is a scramble described by those caught in the middle of it as 'panic,' 'frenzy,' 'chaos' and 'stampede.' And it is a competition waged with the vocabulary of war—'recruiters,' 'task forces,' 'invasions,' 'raids,' 'crash programs,' and 'logistics.'"

WAR-ECONOMY ROOTS

And of course, all this means that company influence in education has increased: "The thin line between an honest interest in aiding the education of badly needed technical personnel and paying cash for the delivery of that personnel has become smudged. One company offers institutions \$3,000 for every graduate it gets."

The background for this development is primarily made up of changes in the nature of capitalism itself. In 1900, the *Times* reports, industry used one engineer for every 250 workers. In 1950 the figure was a ratio of one for sixty. And since then—especially since the Korean War—the ratio has continued to decrease at a fast pace.

Part of this is, of course, simply the normal process of capitalist development as it moves from its entrepreneurial stage into monopoly. With the continuous rationalization of production into larger and larger units, there is an increase in the importance of engineering and skilled type jobs.

But to this "normal" feature of capitalist evolution has been added an ac-

Accelerating factor: the Permanent War Economy.

Here, for example, is the *Times*' summation: "The reason for the present situation is deep-rooted. The United States has entered upon a new age—the age of technology. The military forces on the frontiers of science and the civilians live in a mechanical wonderland. To design and build hydrogen bombs and intercontinental ballistics missiles and earth satellites takes armies of engineers. And so, too, does the production of radar, kitchens, television sets, computers and mechanical monsters to vend cigarettes."

RAIDING SCHOOLS

It is interesting that the *Times* lists the war-economy aspect of the engineering problem ahead of the peacetime, domestic production. It is the military foraging and the construction of ballistics missiles which are in the center of the stage. This is further emphasized by the fact that the Korean War in 1950 gave a tremendous boost to this entire process, according to the *Times*.

The net result of all of this is that today's typical corporate giant—the example is that of General Electric—now employs one engineer to every ten workers, a total of 18,000 technical employees. And still it is 2000 technicians short. To obtain these men, the company can raid other corporations—or it can become a factor in the field of education. The latter course is now quite common.

The process of business interest in the technical student begins, according to the *Times*, at the high-school level. There, literature is circulated telling of the advantages of engineering training. Some students are helped in entering a good college.

The process is stepped up when the youth actually reaches colleges. Scholarships and fellowships are available; trips are made to plants to help the student "get acquainted."

Then in February the companies set up shop on the campus to do their recruiting. At Columbia there are 250 visits scheduled for this spring.

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

An interesting point is the values which the companies stress in the course of these interviews. The *Times* notes: "Open money competition is avoided. The recruiters stress the intellectual challenge of their companies' work, the security it offers, the living advantages of areas where its plants are located, and opportunities for advancement."

But money is not, of course, a forbidden subject. The going rate has doubled in a decade, from \$200 a month to \$400, and has increased by 25 per cent in the course of the last three years. One company guaranteed success for itself by the simple expedient of hiring the students while they were still in college.

In addition to this intensive campaign directed toward the student, there is also the technique of raiding other companies for skilled technical help.

The social consequences of this kind of activity ramify in every direction. Some of the effects are immediate, the result of a particular situation in the American war economy. And some are long-range tendencies of capitalist development.

Among the immediate results of this situation—caused more than anything else by the tremendous demand for technical talent in the creation of the means of destruction of the war economy—is a squeeze which develops in the companies

NEW YSL UNIT IN SAN FRANCISCO

This week, the Young Socialist League's national office formally chartered the new San Francisco unit of the League.

This addition to the Bay Area organization was formed through the distribution of YSL leaflets and literature at various schools in the city and through the holding of classes by the YSL. The new unit was created as a result of the efforts of the comrades of the Berkeley YSL, who deserve the commendation they have received.

We plan to print reports of the San Francisco unit's activities in the near future. *Challenge* readers who are interested in getting further information about the unit should send their inquiries to: Young Socialist League, P. O. Box 3092, Rincon Annex, San Francisco.

themselves. With the tremendous increase in starting wages in the last decade, the differential between a newly hired engineer and one who has been working for a corporation for years decreases. In other words, there has not been a corresponding increase on all levels of the companies.

This is not calculated to make the older engineers happy. And it also raises the possibility that the students who start high will find a low ceiling on the earnings as they grow older.

INTERLOCKING BOSSES

Another consequence, whose impact is both short and long-range, is the move of business into the field of education. The bounty of \$3000 cited earlier is one case in point. So are the scholarships and fellowships which the schools receive and the professors who are put on retainer by the various corporations. All of this amounts to a growing interrelation between capital and school.

As the *Times* notes, "Ostensibly this is all in the interest of better education. But its close link to influencing the students' choice of employment is lost on no one—and deplored by some."

But over and above this company jockeying for graduates, there is the factor which develops primarily out of the war-economy aspect of the problem. The Russian Stalinists, as some American leaders have often pointed out, have laid great stress upon technical education. They have been able to do so through the use of both totalitarian coercion and totalitarian rewards. On the international, cold-war level, America has fallen behind in the engineering competition and this is a danger to its general military position.

This part of the situation relates, of course, to the peculiarly capitalist nature of the problem in the United States. The businesses are willing to compete with each other for engineers, to vie in the establishment of their influence at various universities, yet the society still keeps its education within the bounds of its class structure.

In other words, the short supply of technical skill is a capitalist characteristic just as much as the short supply of raw materials. And this should be a warning to the courted engineering students, too: the short supply is not an eternal capitalist phenomenon.

But much more important than these short-range consequences of the shortage in trained technical youth is its long-range significance. In this regard, the social effects of the situation are para-

mount. For we have here just one more case of the dominance by business of all spheres of American life—of creeping corporatism, if you will.

Some years back *Fortune* ran a piece on how the big corporations controlled their junior executives. This control went so far as to specify the type of car the executive was to have at a particular stage in his career, the country club he could join, the kind of girl he should marry. The corporate Big Brother was interested in all of these personal facts and many more. Indeed, the company more or less set the whole pattern of life for its careerists.

Now we have additional evidence of this kind of development in education. It is symptomatic of the social power of capital in this bursting garrison economy. For in addition to the recruiting teams and the gifts of money to the universities and the occasional bounties, business has entrenched its power in the American educational system in many other ways.

There is, for example, the relatively recent tendency to think of a university president as primarily a fund-raiser. This has led to the appointment of businessmen and military leaders to top academic posts. It has resulted in the growth of pressures which are hardly conducive to the freedom of the University.

ON THE LEASH

To be sure, the commodity system of college teaching envisioned by William Buckley in *God and Man at Yale* is not yet with us, but there is a pattern of increasing outside (business) control over the academic community.

The life of an industrial society is necessary bureaucratic, if one means by that word the hierarchical subordination of tasks. The complex functioning of such a civilization brings to life a complex structure. The crucial question is not one of entrepreneurial freedom versus statism, as the American press would have it. The crucial question is how the control of the complex structure will be effectuated.

In Russia—in all Stalinist countries—the answer is simple. Control is vested in the bureaucracy as a class ruling in its own right.

In America, all kinds of institutions which, in the early days of capitalism, were once allowed out on a leash are coming increasingly under the direct control of business. This is true of the state. It is true, as the *Times* article indicates, of education. To be sure, the extent of this control is not totalitarian, as it is under Stalinism. But it is everywhere on the rise.

The only real answer is democratic control of the complex modern structure. In this case, it is a democratic system of higher education, open to all, purged of the restrictions of class and the control of capital.

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.

Read and subscribe to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL The Marxist review for serious students of social issues 50 cents \$2 a year

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

FIRST SESSION OF

Hal Draper's class on the Theory of the PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Tuesday, Feb. 7 at 8:15 p.m. DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEORY IN RUSSIA, AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Labor Action Hall 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

"Why Have You Changed Your Position on the War Blocs?"

AN OPEN LETTER TO IGNAZIO SILONE

DEAR COMRADE SILONE:

We were glad to publish your political statement in LABOR ACTION last week, for we know that what you have to say will be of justifiably great interest to all who admire your novels as well as all who respect your past contributions to the struggle for socialism and human rights.

If we seek to continue the dialogue now, it is because of our feeling that your statement does not do justice to the need which prompted it. That need is: the need, which every politically responsible person faces, of confronting his views of today with his views of yesterday and accounting for the transformation.

We have no thought of questioning the propriety of changing one's mind, even of changing one's mind from being a principled opponent of imperialist war to being a critical supporter of one of the imperialist war blocs. But do you feel that you have adequately faced, and presented, the grounds on which you have gone through this political transubstantiation?

We can go only on your present statement, for we know of no other place where you have discussed this quintessential point, this heart of contemporary socialist politics, this touchstone for the revitalization of an independent socialist movement.

And therefore we have some questions to pose on whether this statement of yours has truly presented a rationale for support of the "Atlantic" camp of imperialism, as against the Stalinist camp of imperialism, or whether it has avoided answering the insistent questions which demand replies from your politics.

SPOTLIGHT ON ONE QUESTION

Before doing so, we had better make clear what we are not questioning at this point, to avoid misunderstanding.

We are, it goes without saying, happy at your insistence, even today, on liberation of the oppressed peoples not by external warmakers but by their own revolution; and at your continued adherence to the socialist aim. Nor are we questioning, in this space, your views on Marxism, on Proudhonism, on orthodoxies, on philosophy, on the difficulties of the Italian socialist movement or the clashes within it, on the composition of the Italian CP or the dynamics of its crisis, etc.—interesting and important as all these matters are.

We are here raising only the question: Why have you abandoned the ideas of Third Camp internationalism, as you explained them in your brilliant 1939 interview reprinted elsewhere in these pages? and why have you become a critical supporter of one of the war blocs?

We are interested in *your* reasons, not those of the multitude of backsliders and renegades from socialism whose name is legion in the United States. From them we have heard many political motivations, with many variants, and so we have a modest acquaintanceship with the possibilities that exist. But why have you gone in this direction? That is what we do not find to be clear in your statement—not to us, if to you.

We do not find such an explanation in the section which you head "The Third Front." There we find a peculiar re-definition of the term which makes it mean merely "the home front," the terrain on which the decisive fight should take place. It apparently no longer means the anti-war political position which you explained in 1939. In any case, in no way does it attempt to deal with, explain, or even reject this anti-war political position. You quote your theses, but you do not quote anything which either supports or opposes the war; you quote some general considerations, some of which are partly true in themselves, but which largely can be made to face either way.

WHY ARE WE "FORCED"?

As far as we can see, the nearest you come to formulating your reasons for abandoning the Third Camp position, and supporting the Atlantic Pact, is in the section you quote from the 1950 PSU statement, which, we take it, you present also as your own opinion. Here the sole motivation is that "the continuing Soviet pressure has brought about the conclusion of an Atlantic Pact which has forced European socialism, without renouncing its [European] federalist aims, to continue the struggle for peace on positions withdrawn further back, like those constituted by the Atlantic Pact...."

But why does the conclusion of a military alliance by the imperialists "force" socialists to retreat from their anti-war position and adopt ("withdraw to") a critical pro-war-bloc position?

Why exactly did you decide that the function of socialists in this war crisis is not to fight both imperialist blocs but rather to make sure that the "democratic" imperialists remain "purely defensive," unmilitaristic, free from reactionary tendencies, and otherwise unsullied—to produce a perfectly antiseptic imperialism, in

Ignazio Silone's statement to LABOR ACTION, "My Political Faith," was published here last week.

The 1939 interview by Silone in which he explained his Third Camp position, referred to in this letter, is published on the page opposite.

other words, while international misunderstandings are to be taken care of by "negotiations, mediation, arbitration," etc.?

In 1939 you explained why the "conservative" (i.e., pro-status-quo) democracies could not effectively fight a totalitarian system which put forward "false solutions, easy solutions, ersatz solutions—but all the same, solutions of the real problems of our time." Why have you decided to turn a blind eye to this thought, when, with regard to Stalinism and its dynamic appeal to the masses, it is clearly twice as true now?

In 1939 you stressed that there could be no real peace, or real liberty, except under socialism. Has the era of H-bomb capitalism and totalitarian Stalinism caused you to revise this estimate?

In 1939 you saw that the alternatives of "status quo or regression" were false ones. Have you decided now that it is right for a socialist to devote his energies to defending the "conservative" (i.e., capitalist) status quo, in order to escape the greater evil of Stalinism?

SOCIALISM IN MOTH-BALLS

In 1939 you saw with utter clarity the suicidal nature of such social-patriotic "realism" from the point of view of fighting the totalitarian enemy itself as well as from the point of view of emancipating the working class from the present evils of that social order which has oppressed them much longer than the new exploiting system of Stalinism. You were able to say:

"When the socialists, with the best possible anti-fascist [or anti-Stalinist] intentions, renounce their own program, put their own theories in moth balls, and accept the negative positions of conservative democracy, they think they are doing their bit in the struggle to crush fascism [or Stalinism]. Actually, they leave to fascism [or Stalinism] the distinction of alone daring to bring forward in public certain problems, thus driving into the fascists' [or Stalinists'] arms thousands of workers who will not accept the status quo."

Is this not a hundred times truer today? Isn't this the reason why, despite party crises and all the crimes and betrayals committed by Stalinism, the CP still retains massive working-class support in countries like Italy and France, and why this workers' support has not been weaned away by socialist groups which have put their own program "in mothballs"?

No doubt many things have changed since 1939, and it would be superfluous to call attention to this well-known fact polemically; but have you formulated to yourself just why the reactionary changes that have taken place in the world should push you to put "your own theories in moth balls" in the belief that (this time, anyway!) this is the clever way of combating the Stalinist menace?

'EQUIDISTANCE'

Surely, it cannot be the fact that today you see the "sophism of equidistance," unlike the unreconstructed anti-war fighters of yesterday. For you already exposed this "sophism" in 1939, more clearly than you do today.

We refer to the section in your 1939 interview in which, in the very course of explaining your principled Third Camp view, you took pains to "make clear at the outset" that "it would be a serious mistake to put bourgeois democracy and fascism on the same level, in view of the great differences between these two forms of political organization." You implemented this distinction by a reference to the famous Stalinist "social-fascist" policy and analysis. You put this necessary distinction in its proper perspective by showing that, to oppose both camps of imperialism, it is not necessary to identify or equate both camps of imperialism.

You did not, then, put forward any theory of "equidistance." It was not a geometrical but a political solution that you put forward in explaining why the totalitarian menace could not be beaten back by supporting the "conservative" status quo.

Whose, then, is this "sophism of equidistance" against which you now polemize? And after this "sophism" has been ignominiously refuted, what dent has been made in the unsophisticated position of the anti-war socialism which you used to hold and have now abandoned?

Is it not more relevant, however, to look at what you simultaneously counterpose to this "sophism" in your

final section, the section in which you sum up your views on "Anti-Communism"? You choose to do this through a quotation from the program of the Committee for Cultural Freedom.

It is only with the greatest hesitation that we would accept assurance that you really allow this organization to sum up your politics. In this quotation we find that the trouble with capitalism (which appears there only under the pseudonym of the "democratic regimes") is its—"imperfections"; and we find that your role vis-à-vis your own state is summed up as that of "responsible citizens."...

Does this really speak for you? In that case, what have we to do here with quibbles about "equidistance," when it is a question of more basic positions on capitalism? Were you not a "responsible citizen" of Italy when you were fighting its fascist regime?

No, it is hard to believe that this speaks for you, and one would prefer to believe that you were slandering yourself in using this bourgeois sophism as the very climax of your political statement of faith. But then we have to remember that you are indeed a leader and officer of this very organization you quote.

THE POLITICS OF 'CULTURAL FREEDOM'

You say that this Italian section of the Congress of Cultural Freedom devotes four-fifths of its activities to "the defense of cultural freedom in Italy," and you apparently deny the charge that it is primarily and overwhelmingly concerned with being the propaganda mouthpiece among intellectuals of the Atlantic war bloc. We ourselves, of course, cannot pass on this, since we are not sufficiently well acquainted with the organization in Italy. All we can say is that it would be indeed remarkable if you are right, for we do know what this organization is in our own country, the U. S., from which it gets its inspiration. We have proved and documented the fact that the Cultural Freedom committee, which was founded here under the leadership of the "liberal" witchhunter Sidney Hook, was not even willing to come out against the infamous McCarran anti-alien law, which was denounced as "racist" by less "responsible" liberals than the valiant defenders of cultural freedom. We have proved that this organization devotes four-fifths of its work to pure-and-simple cold-war propaganda, not too far distant from the State Department's own brand, and that its one-fifth of attention to threats against internal liberty is devoted mainly to straightening out cases where staunch supporters of capitalism have been mistakenly witchhunted themselves.

But leaving aside characterization of the Cultural Freedom committee, there are some questions to be raised that are germane to the subject of this letter.

For example, we note with some appreciation that you inveigh against substituting the struggle of small groups for real work inside mass organizations: very well, though we do not know what mass organizations you would suggest. In any case, even assuming the justice of your complaints against the anonymous "imbeciles" in your country, which we do not understand any too well: how does this justify your personal decision to put your socialist program in moth balls and transfer your political activities to a group which is neither a small socialist organization nor a mass socialist organization, nor even a mass organization of any kind, but largely (in the U. S. at least) an Association for the Moth-Ball Storage of Ex-Radicals' Theories?

For, by the way, it is a mistake to believe that you have left "active political life." The Cultural Freedom committee is primarily a political organization, though of course not a "party." It is so by the terms of its orientation, activity and reason for existence. What you have left is active socialist political activity.

TO DEFEND DEMOCRACY

Do you think that in this way you "are doing your bit to crush Stalinism"? But if "all the ideological systems inherited from the last centuries" are in crisis, including all "variants" of Marxism, then surely you do not exempt the democratic ideology from this sweep? If all proposed alternatives to the outlived "conservative" status quo are in such mortal crisis, can it be that the most stable rock to be found is—that outlived conservative status quo itself?

If you have now "withdrawn your positions" from the advanced trenches of revolutionary socialism and its democracy to the more prudent rear-lines of bourgeois democracy, what experience of recent life or history has persuaded you that this is where the bastions of human values are to be best defended?

Perhaps it is the capacity of the "democratic regimes" for guaranteeing human liberties, as we have been finding out here in the U. S. before, during and since the reign of McCarthy? Is it perhaps the "democratic" capacity to outdo the Russian barbarians in exploding H-bombs over the Pacific? Is it perhaps the "democratic" capacity to de-Nazify the German reaction under our pet Adenauer, or de-militarize the Japanese warlords?

Is it perhaps the "democratic" capacity to break away even from Hitlerite allies like Franco? Is it perhaps the "democratic" capacity to break with butchers like Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee or the semi-fascist lords of Thailand who are America's only "bastions of democracy" in the Asian world?...

It is not our purpose to deny or gloss over the crisis of socialism in today's world, nor to present or claim to possess any easy formulas for overcoming it. This is not in question here. Indeed, one of the proofs that such a crisis exists is, *inter alia*, the matter we are discussing. But precisely because socialism faces its crisis, is it not the duty of every socialist, who has not been overcome by despair, to resist when "they try to force on us the dilemma: status quo or regression," and to devote himself to the unflagging task, in whatever manner, of seeking, finding and pursuing the revolutionary and democratic socialist way out of the shambles that has been made of this world by rival exploiters?

HAL DRAPER

TEXT OF AN INTERVIEW

The Old Silone's Challenge to the New

AN INTERVIEW WITH IGNAZIO SILONE

[A note by Clement Greenberg explains that the interview took place in the summer of 1939 and that the text was written out later by Silone himself, on the basis of Greenberg's notes.—ED.]

—In the event of a war between Italy and France, which country would you favor?
Tunisia.

—What do you mean?

The world is now divided into two great fronts: one composed of the conservatives, that is, of the democracies or other partisans of collective security; the other composed of the revisionists or fascists. Neither of these two fronts is capable of assuring peace or of solving the economic and political problems now confronting the world.

Real peace depends today on the rapidity with which a third front is created, on the rapidity with which revolutionary workers all over the world regain their political autonomy and resume the struggle to overthrow capitalism. This third front did once actually exist in the form of a revolutionary Russia and of militant workers' parties elsewhere, but at present it exists only in potentiality.

—Do you, as an anti-fascist, look forward to, and favor, a war as the quickest means of overthrowing the present regime in Italy?

Personally, I do not share the opinions of many of my fellow political emigrés. A "liberty" brought to Italy and Germany by foreign armies would be nothing less than disastrous. However, I do not deny that it would be easier to create revolutionary situations in Italy and Germany during a war, but these situations would have to be exploited by Italian and German revolutionaries themselves, and by no one else.

—What, in the light of their relations to political parties, do you think should be the role of revolutionary writers in the present situation?

Although until 1930 I was a member of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, at present I do not belong to any political organization. I do, however, consider myself an anti-fascist partisan in the civil war that is now being waged more or less throughout the world.

As an anti-fascist partisan, I believe that the true function of the revolutionary writer today is to herald and, so to speak, to represent in its ideal state that third front to which I just referred. This means that the revolutionary writer must risk isolation.

For example, there are many writers who have only a superficial understanding of the questions involved in the "collective security" policy, precisely because they believe the Stalinist parties to represent truly the interests of the masses and precisely because they fear the isolation that would result from a break with Stalinism. But today it is necessary to have the courage to stand alone, to risk hearing oneself called Fascist Agent, Hitler spy, and so forth, and to persist nevertheless in one's course. The third front, existing as yet only in an ideal state, must be kept pure as an ideal. And for that too, courage is required.

The reactionary trend of our epoch is shown precisely by the absence of such a "third front." They try to force on us the dilemma: status quo or regression? Most of the progressive forces have already accepted this Hobson's choice. They are content to struggle to preserve the existing order, lest they fall under the fascist yoke.

One thing I must make clear at the outset: I think it would be a serious mistake to put bourgeois democracy and fascism on the same level, in view of the great differences between these two forms of political organization. The Stalinists, who until 1934 denied the existence of any such difference and who fought against social-democracy and liberal democracy as the equivalents of fascism, these gentlemen in actuality made possible Hitler's victory.

But it would also be a mistake, through fear of fascism, to turn conservative. Fascism's power, its mass appeal, its contagious influence, all are due to the fact that fascism means false solutions, easy solutions, ersatz solutions—but, all the same, solutions of the real problems of our time. We can conquer fascism only by proposing and carrying out other solutions—just, humane, progressive solutions of these same problems.

But conservative democracy denies the existence of these problems. She does not see them, does not wish to

see them, is unable to see them. That is why, in spite of her military strength, her material wealth and her monopoly of raw materials, when conservative democracy is brought face to face with fascism, she is forced back onto the defensive. That is why she has until now been beaten by fascism. That is why she is weak.

The democrats are right when they call the Nazi "abolition of unemployment" fictitious, unstable and a stopgap measure, but their criticism will be more convincing when they themselves find and carry out a healthy and permanent solution of the same problem.

It is true that Fascist nationalism conflicts with the peaceful collaboration of all peoples which is a historical necessity, now that the economic integration of the globe has laid the foundation for a progressive world-unity. But the Versailles system is also based on nationalism, it too is opposed to historical development, and so it cannot be set up as an effective barrier against fascism.

When the socialists, with the best possible anti-fascist intentions, renounce their own program, put their own theories in moth balls, and accept the negative positions of conservative democracy, they think they are doing their bit in the struggle to crush fascism. Actually, they leave to fascism the distinction of alone daring to bring forward in public certain problems, thus driving into the fascists' arms thousands of workers who will not accept the status quo.

In short, I see the struggle against fascism as primarily not a military but a political and social question. We anti-fascists have been beaten by the fascists in the political and social spheres; it is cheap to seek revenge in the military sphere. War will not make an end of fascism. It is even probable that the first result of war will be the fascization of the democratic countries.

—But don't you think the military defeat of Hitler and Mussolini will inevitably mean the end of their regimes?

I think that the establishment of a truly free regime in Italy and Germany depends entirely on the Italian and German people. If they cannot free themselves, no one else can free them. Freedom cannot come as a gift from a foreign army: to pay for liberty, a people must dig down deep into its own pocket.

Obviously, a war can produce certain favorable conditions for revolution. The same conditions can also be produced by cholera, earthquake, famine. But the advocates of liberty have never been the advocates of cholera, nor of earthquakes nor of famine, and they cannot any more be the advocates of war, even though they stand to profit by favorable conditions which it may produce. The worst misfortune which could happen to German socialism—which achieved power in 1918 under such unfortunate circumstances—would be for it to regain power after the next military defeat of Germany and as a natural result of the defeat. Nothing worse could happen to socialism than to become synonymous with national defeat.

—When you speak of liberty, do you mean socialist liberty?

Yes, I think of socialism as an element from now on indispensable to a regime of real freedom—that is to say, of liberties that are concrete and actual, not formal and "constitutional." Big business and political liberty have become incompatible.

But I do not see liberty as the necessary, natural and predestined consequence of socialism: I do not consider economics, politics and culture to be as mechanically interrelated as many Marxists seem to. Just as we have very different political regimes growing from the common soil of capitalist production, so too Russia warns us that, on the base of state socialist production, there can arise a culture of cannibals, a culture much inferior to the culture which bourgeois democracy had created.

Socialism rids us of one enemy of human liberty, but it can also introduce new ones, unknown to past history. And there is no formula which can protect us from these new enemies, no automatic mechanism, no constitutional guarantees. There is nothing, that is, which can force men to be free. Fortunately! Perhaps after I have finished writing the novel I am working on now, I will try to write a "School of Liberty" as a sequel to the *School for Dictators* you already know.

—What is your opinion of contemporary left-wing literature?

Left-wing literature? You must admit that the expression is ambiguous. One should reserve the adjectives "left," "right," "center" and their nuances for political parties and their propaganda.

However, I understand what you are referring to. There are a few great left-wing writers and there is a

NOTE

In Ignazio Silone's statement "My Political Faith," published in LABOR ACTION last week, under the subheading "The Third Front," Silone wrote of his activity around 1941:

"The recollection of that period gives me the opportunity to set down the significance I attributed to the formula of the 'Third Front,' which I had already pointed to in an interview with Clement Greenberg in the Partisan Review (Autumn 1939) and in another with Jean-Germain Tricot that appeared in Nouvelles Litteraires (Paris, August 26, 1939)."

He then quotes the first three out of 13 "Theses on the Third Front" which he wrote around the same time as a program for the Italian socialists. Unfortunately, nowhere in these three points quoted is there any clear statement of opposition to, or support of, the war; but Silone's statement proceeds to assume that it meant conditional support. Perhaps this was made clear in the other 10 points, which we have not seen.

In any case, among these three quoted points is a definition of the term "third front." This is explained as meaning simply "the home front of each country." It is the place or terrain WHERE problems are to be solved. And "The only adversary capable of defeating fascism on the third front is socialism." It is apparently not presented as a political position of opposition to the two warring camps.

However, this was all fundamentally different from the 1939 position of Silone to which he himself refers:

The 1939 interview to which he points presented a thoroughgoing Third Camp position on the coming war in exactly the same sense as we use that term today, to sum up a revolutionary position of clear opposition to both the war camps.

We present these texts not to show that Silone has changed (that would be superfluous) but to counterpose his cogent views of then to his views of today on support of war, in connection with the Open Letter which we publish on page 6.

Two notes: (1) In the case of both interviews, we reproduce below all sections that are at all germane to the present questions raised by Silone. (2) The interview with Tricot, or at least the part published, did not in fact deal with "Third Front," despite Silone's recollection. But we have translated below whatever is at all relevant.—ED.

left-wing literary industry, nourished by a left-wing literary philistinism which has become especially abundant and vulgar since the Kremlin discovered literature as "instrumentum regni."

Stalinism is really the horn-of-plenty of this literature. Writers find themselves flattered in all their vague aspirations and, into the bargain, they risk nothing. In a society where they were accustomed to being considered merely a luxury, they are now given the illusion of playing a leading role. They are called together in congresses, they sign appeals, they are "popularized." All that is asked of them is that they approve everything the Party does—or at least that they do not disapprove in public. Nothing more!

There are also a good many writers, essentially bourgeois and reactionary in the quality of their writing, who conform to the etiquette of anti-fascism. Their hostility to fascism has this particular quality: they address themselves always to far-distant fascist regimes and have not a word to say about fascism and reaction in their own country. Truly, a platonic and tactful anti-fascism!

Their socialist convictions are also strictly export commodities: these writers are partisans of socialism in Russia but not in their own country. They are most eloquent about the victorious revolutions of the past—1789, 1848, etc.—but are silent on the revolutionary tasks of our own epoch. Already this whole left-wing literary industry is going to pieces as a result of the collapse of "popular front" politics.

The true left-wing writers are distinguished by characteristics the very opposite of those I have just described. They are, first of all and above all, opposed to fascism and reaction in their own country. They feel themselves bound in sympathy, first and foremost, with the working class and peasantry of their own country, and, through them, with the workers of every country in the world. They submit to no discipline beyond what every honest conscience and sincere thought provides of itself. And so they will tell the truth to everyone, at all times, to enemies and to friends, even when the friends do not want to hear disagreeable truths.

II

INTERVIEW WITH JEAN-GERMAIN TRICOT

—And the internal reconquest of the country?

... Italy can be liberated only by Italians. I am so firm on this point that I cannot wish—for it would seem to me to be a betrayal of my country—a military defeat in which fascism would collapse.

—In case some catastrophe—

Yes. The duty of the political opposition is to profit by situations. But it is not to create them. I admit only one struggle against fascism: that which is carried on inside the borders of each country. The most effective aid that a foreigner can render is to take care of the preservation of liberty in his own land.

—And what do you conceive to be the role of the intellectual, within this Europe in torment?

I think—alas, if it were only a matter of being a bad prophet!—I think (concludes Ignazio Silone) that we are moving toward a terrible era of armed conflicts and political upsets and turmoil. There is only one role for an intellectual: to reject the *boufrage de cranes* [head-stuffing—i.e., with propaganda and lies], that is to say, serve truth. That's what it is to be a man; that's what it is to defend the dignity of man.

Balance Sheet of a Thrust-and-Parry — —

(Continued from page 1)

The exchange thereby illuminated all the more decisively the inherent feebleness and ineffectiveness of the Washington line in the face of Stalinist demagoguery.

To be sure, if the exchange of epistles is to be viewed merely as an intellectual debate, then probably Eisenhower won hands down. It is undoubtedly true that Bulganin's three fudged-up points for a friendship treaty are all covered by the UN charter, as Eisenhower's reply argued at some length. And on his counter-challenges, Eisenhower was at several points on grounds that could be mighty in propaganda: the issue of German unity and the Kremlin's sabotage thereof; "the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; Russian restrictions on international exchanges, for example.

Even on this "debate" terrain, the imperialist heart of American policy permits it little more than a jibe or counter-punch on these points. To a third of the human race and upwards, when reference is made in propaganda documents to the right of choosing one's own form of government, it is not the Stalinist iron heel and its crushing tyranny over East Europe or China that will spring to mind (as it will to American newspaper scammers) but rather the presently more burning struggles over Cyprus, "French" North Africa, Goa, Kenya, South Africa, West New Guinea, Franco, and a long list of other oppressors who are financed and supported by the U. S.

There are, besides, not many Germans who really think that the U. S. has done anything but stand in the way of German unification, at the same time that they know how Molotov torpedoed their aspirations at the last Geneva wake over the spirit.

And the fine lawyer's point about the priority of the UN charter is a little weakened when Eisenhower goes on to add that, if the Russians only yield on a whole series of points, he will (presumably) sign on the dotted line in spite of the superfluity of the gesture.

"PROPAGANDA"

But the real point is that this was not a parliamentary debate, or a courtroom hearing.

What it was, indeed, was loudly proclaimed by the press and government spokesmen — loudly and scornfully: "Propaganda!" they sniffed at the Bulganin note, with its oozing friendliness.

They even kindly explained how they deduced this perspicacious conclusion. They pointed out, for example, that Russian Ambassador Zaroubin had heralded

the delivery of the note with suspicious fanfare....

Brilliant analysts they are, and they owe Zaroubin a vote of thanks for making things easy for their mighty intellects. Yes, the Russian move was propaganda. Like all the rest.

For the Russians understand that which is alien to the very thinking of our all-American team of foreign experts: *political warfare*—political warfare for their own type of imperialism, political warfare on behalf of their own bid for world domination; but *political warfare*.

The whole episode is an excellent dramatization of one of the basic characteristics of American foreign policy in this period: its inability to take any initiative against the Stalinists, its restriction to counter-punching and defense.

At the very best, the U. S. leaders hope that this exchange of amiabilities with Bulganin turns out to be a standoff on the political-warfare front. If the U. S. comes out of it without another black eye, they will draw a breath of relief.

If Truman tells the press that this reply to Bulganin was the best thing Eisenhower has done, we can perhaps detect a note of partisan attack, rather than congratulations; for if this is the best thing that Washington has done in foreign policy, then truly it is no wonder that everywhere in the world the rival imperialists in Moscow are press-

ing their advantages in the struggle for the minds of men.

IN WORLD OPINION

But it is not at all likely that the total effect will be a standoff. While the American press features favorable reactions by the allied statesmen and leaders, who were never in any danger of being recruited by the Cominform, they wait with apprehension for the reaction they expect among the peoples in all countries who are under the fire of Stalinist "peace" propaganda:

"Never before on the summit level has the United States so sharply indicted the Russians for their failure to negotiate on concrete issues.

"Nevertheless, it was still an open question as to what the ultimate outcome of the exchange would be. Only when it had been completed would it be possible to assess the effect on world opinion and the respective positions of the U. S. and the USSR." (Times, Jan. 29.)

What they are properly afraid of is simply this: that after the dust has settled, the outcome that will stick in the minds of peoples is exactly that part of the exchange which determined every American headline: "Eisenhower Turns Down Russian Offer of Pact"—"Eisenhower Says No..."

In the U. S. press, headlines like these mean to the respectably anti-Communist American reader that Eisenhower is not

soft on those Rooshans. In most of the rest of the world, from the London worker to the Indian peasant, with varying degrees of sophisticated understanding, what they mean is that the Russians made a move toward peace and friendliness, toward "negotiations" and Peaceful Coexistence and such, and the Americans turned it down with the old cold-war complaints.

On the other hand, it is equally obvious, if not more so, that the propaganda gains would also have been Moscow's if Eisenhower had replied: "Sure let's be friends. I hereby sign on the dotted line..." (Let us tax our imagination to visualize that.)

What stands out is that, either way, on the basis of going U. S. policy, the Russians had a safe propaganda firecracker to throw into the seat of Uncle Sam's pants.

The reason is simple:

Because the political initiative is theirs, and has been theirs right along in this cold war, and that is why they have been winning it.

POLITICAL WARFARE

The political initiative is theirs because the U. S. has no program with which it can appeal to the allegiance of the uncommitted peoples of the world in a democratic mobilization against the totalitarian threat.

If the U. S., instead of hewing to its pro-militarist, pro-colonialist line, were able to go on the offensive with a genuinely democratic foreign-policy program based on the freedom of peoples, then no proposals for "negotiations" or "pacts" or other demagogic and hypocritical gestures by the Russians could embarrass it.

For the neutralists and pro-Stalinist dupes, "negotiations" means appeasement of the Kremlin. For Third-Camp socialists, "negotiations" mean an opportunity to confront them with political warfare, on a world-public arena.

A socialist America need not have said No to Bulganin's cunning pact proposal. It could say:

Yes, let us immediately have a meeting to negotiate, in the sight of the whole world, a pact to ensure peace and security by withdrawing foreign troops from every colony, satellite and small nation on the globe. . . . We are taking the following steps to bring about the immediate complete freedom and sovereignty of every people who have been groaning under capitalist-imperialist oppression; let us now negotiate your moves toward this "friendship"...

True, there would be no pact resulting — and for that matter, confronted by such a socialist America, it will not be the Russians that will be proposing round-table propaganda circuses—but then we Independent Socialists do not share the illusions of the neutralists that pacts and "negotiations" and Peaceful Coexistence are a road to peace. They are a method of *political warfare*, and such warfare on the basis of a democratic anti-imperialist program can blow up the Stalinist power without shooting or bombs.

The reactionary and outlived nature of capitalist-imperialism is underlined by the fact that it is inherently incapable of doing this, not even when it puts its best foot forward instead of in the mouth.

Auto's Big Three — —

(Continued from page 1)

flat-rating: The garage charges you an over-all rate in fixing your car even though part of that work is not needed or isn't done.

Gouging the American public has taken another form too. In the old days the steel industry earned an odious reputation not only for its feudal labor-relations policies but also for the notorious Pittsburgh-Plus plan. No matter where steel was manufactured and sold, its price was marked as if it were made in Pittsburgh, plus the cost of freight shipment. This practice was supposed to have disappeared following court actions in the 1930s.

Now it crops up as standard auto-industry practice. If you buy a car in New York or California, you pay the cost of manufacturing in Detroit, plus the estimated cost of freight charges; and since most cars do not get shipped that expensive way, it is a pure case of milking the

public. This is the "phantom freight" practice exposed by Senator Mooney's committee.

The kind of hold that the auto industry maintains over the dealers was testified to by many independent market experts. It was described as more feudal than capitalistic, since it operates on a lord-serf relationship and control that one would think would be unheard-of these days.

Car dealers' franchises are given by the companies and can be taken away at their own discretion at any time. The Big Three have investigators that go around checking on the dealers. If they get three bad marks, out they go, no matter how long they have been in business.

A case in point was the Buick dealer who last summer didn't sell the 18 cars he was given extra. He and his father had been in business 30 years! He had won a medal the year before as the top Buick dealer in America. He lost his franchise.

But GM was nice about it. They do have a board of appeals to review the case. Purely by coincidence, of course, the man who took the charter away happens also to be the chairman of the appeals board. The dealer wasn't even allowed to bring a lawyer into the hearing with him. The franchises are so written that the disenfranchised dealer can't sue for damages.

ALL-AMERICAN STORY

Our favorite story, however, is the one about the dealer who used to be an all-American football player. He was missing the day the GM factory team came to check his operations. Where was he? At the annual home-coming game of his college, watching the big event of the year, the game in which he had earned his own all-American honors. He had no business going to the game—he should be here selling cars, the GM investigators told his service manager. The dealer lost his franchise.

In a word, the auto industry functions just like the economic jungle its critics portray. The big eat the small, and the process never ends.

Given a 15 to 20 per cent reduction in production and sales, one may expect three things: the auto workers are going to have a hard time keeping their heads above water this year; (2) thousands of small dealers are going to be forced out of business; (3) and it will be a miracle if American Motors and Studebaker-Packard survive.

In 1954 American Motors lost \$11 million. In 1955, the biggest year in auto history, it lost \$7 million. As for the workers in those two smaller companies, they've given up wage and work standards that they spent years fighting to win.

All the economic and fringe gains of previous years become a mockery before that kind of situation. In the economic war of the auto industry, the weak fall by the wayside quickly, if not painlessly.

Jim Crow Judge Defies Court

By BETTY PERKINS

A two-year struggle to make a local elementary school board comply with the Ohio law requiring racial integration reached a climax when a federal judge refused to follow the order of his superior court.

Negro parents in Hillsboro, Ohio, charged that the school board had gerrymandered the district to throw all Negro children, regardless of where they lived, into one school. When the children attempted to attend the nearest (white) school, they were refused admittance. Rather than accept such treatment, the

parents have kept their children out of school, hiring private tutors and making frequent attempts to enroll their children in the proper school.

A year ago Federal Judge John H. Druffel of Cincinnati upheld the Hillsboro School Board. This year the U. S. Court of Appeals by a 2-1 majority directed Judge Druffel to order that the Negro children now out of school be admitted to the white school in February and that all segregation cease by September.

Judge Druffel refused to issue such an order unless the Hillsboro School Board agreed to it!

At first the board seemed ready to integrate but, after a closed session with Judge Druffel, they accepted his advice to ask for a rehearing of the case. The judge has also advised that the case be carried to the Supreme Court, if necessary in his name.

Plans of the Hillsboro School Board to accept desegregation in September may end the dispute. In the meantime, 20 Negro students are denied admittance in February.

Judge Druffel has made an arbitrary ruling supporting a Jim Crow practice, ignored the Court of Appeals, and set himself up as advisor to one of the parties of the legal action. This federal official, who has literally conspired to subvert the Constitution, shows how federal officialdom, even in the North, is shot through with Jim-Crowism.

The Ohio NAACP is investigating the possibility of charging Judge Druffel with "contempt." However, his actions have been so obviously illegal that his impeachment in Congress should be demanded by all the so-called friends of labor there.

Virginia — —

(Continued from page 1)

consummation of this part of the program should be pushed wherever possible.

The AFL and the CIO have given their support to the anti-Jim-Crow forces in this struggle.

There are other measures which these groups and all genuine supporters of democracy can demand on a national level: (1) a federal anti-poll tax law, which Northern Democrats, supposed friends of the Negro, should be called upon to introduce, and (2) a reduction of the number of congressmen from Virginia until all citizens are allowed to vote freely.

Such measures test the real devotion to democratic ideals expressed by political figures in their public speeches and allow the labor movement and the Negro to discover their true friends.

At last available!

The SECOND volume
of
Leon Trotsky's
THE FIRST
FIVE YEARS
OF THE
COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers
\$3.00

All orders must be accompanied
by payment.

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