

LABOR ACTION

JANUARY 13, 1958

TEN CENTS

Dispute in the Communist Party

... page 6

Review of 1957 Race Relations

... page 3

George Meany's Speech to the AFL-CIO Industrial Unions and Craft Unions

... page 7

The Issue for 1958: A Policy for Peace!

Gaither and Rockefeller Reports: A Drift Toward Preventive War?

By SAM BOTTONE

The main issue before Congress as the second session of the 85th Congress opens will be military and foreign policy. It will be discussed from one point of view: how to increase military spending. This will be the substitute for any real thinking in Congress about a foreign policy that can actually lead to an alternative to the arms race.

Political reputations will be created or enhanced by the degree to which congressmen embody in their speeches the proper sense of urgency. Any one who does not propose a vast increase in the military stands the risk of being dismissed as a person of no social vision. While any congressman who demands a vast multi-billion dollar program on missiles, nuclear weapons as well as an expanded conventional weapons arsenal will be hailed as a statesman who understands the urgency of the present situation. He will be considered a man to be reckoned with, and an intelligent student of all facets of our national policy.

The panic in Washington, where any backroom politician can rise to the status of statesman and social thinker if he can shout long and loud enough about our weak military posture, is resulting in a first class political disaster overseas. The world is aghast at this spectacle, but this is being dismissed as merely the result of the fact that the U. S. isn't as strong in relation to Russia as it once was. Once this present imbalance is righted, it is assumed, the U. S. will once again reassume its position as the unchallenged leader and spokesman of the free world.

This mood has been fired up by the leaks about the contents of the Gaither report. This report, as yet unpublished, is said to be a comprehensive review of military policy. It was prepared by a top-drawer committee of corporation executives, scientists, military men in and out of uniform and high officials in the State and Defense Department under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations.

SENSE OF URGENCY

The main thing about the Report is that it sets the tone of a sense of urgency, if not panic. Starting out as a review of civil defense policy and whether \$40 billion ought to be spent on building bomb shelters, it rapidly expanded into a full-fledged review of military policy. Its dominant point is that in a few years, given the rate of advance of Russian industry and science, the U. S. can become a second-class power. The way to avoid this is to increase the military budget by about \$8 billion a year by 1961 and to spend \$5 billion a year for the next 4 years for bomb shelters.

The amazing thing about this still-unpublished top secret report is that it is widely accepted as an accurate and sober statement of the problem of the U. S. in the age of nuclear weapons and missiles. It has been further bolstered up by the report of the Rockefeller Fund which came to

similar conclusion, a not surprising thing in view of the overlapping personnel involved in preparing both of them.

These Reports are examples of the military mind at work. And there is no need to be in uniform to qualify. Both are said to have studied the full range of the problems that confront the American people. But is there any indication that anything other than military considerations were brought into play? The basic assumption is that the focal point of national policy is to concentrate all efforts on taking steps to insure U. S. lead in military strength. But is this the basis for security? Is the only defense against nuclear war to build bigger and better

(Continued on page 6)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Teamsters Out, What Next For AFL-CIO?

By BEN HALL

Teamsters Union, Bakers Union and Laundry Workers Union with a total a total membership near 1,600,000 stand expelled from the AFL-CIO. What now?

When these three unions were ousted by the convention it was a token of the long awaited defeat of the ultra-right wing in the labor movement. It was the beginning, on a big scale, of the uprooting of rackets from unions. But still, only a beginning.

For decades progressives demanded action like this; but in vain. The CIO could build a new union movement and keep it honest but in was powerless to clean out the old AFL. At the AFL convention in 1940, President William Green exclaimed, "I challenge those who condemn the AFL to point out where there is any racketeering." In 1941, the convention conceded that there might be "a few dishonest individuals" among its 5 million members but pointed to autonomy: "there is no power in the officers and Executive Council of the AFL to exercise disciplinary authority for any offense committed by an officer or member of a national or international union." Meanwhile, grafting was rife in the building trades in Metropolitan New York. By 1950, New York City police had credited at least 20 murders to fights among ILA gangs.

This combination of passivity and apologetics behind which rackets took refuge is shattered. Unity of AFL and CIO whose

The Russian Political Offensive And the American Reaction To It

By GORDON HASKELL

The world picture is dominated, at the beginning of 1958, by the skillful political offensive being waged by the Communist rulers of Russia. The circumstances of this offensive, and its degree of success, are specially striking if one looks back and remembers that it is just a year ago that Russian international prestige was at an all-time low as a result of the Polish and Hungarian revolutions. The contrast is far more a monument to the lost opportunities and confused political thinking widespread in the capitalist world than it is to the undeniable intelligence of the Kremlin rulers.

In the current campaign for negotiations at the summit, the Russians seem to be using a script long favored in Washington. That is, they are proposing to negotiate from the strength of their proved first place in the race for the "ultimate" weapons, the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles with nuclear warheads. But it is not this alone which gives their current campaign its political force. It is far more the fact that they know how to exploit their position of strength to maximum political advantage.

When the Americans were ahead in the

arms race (and they were ahead as long as they had the monopoly on the A and H-bombs, plus the air bases from which to deliver them anywhere over Russian territory), they showed little ability to exploit this position politically. True, they were able to form the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other military alliances in the attempt at containment. But beyond vague mumblings about "liberation" of the peoples subjugated by Russia after World War II, they had nothing to offer which could either be utilized to induce a Russian withdrawal from these territories, or to win mass popular support to the American side as a champion of peace and freedom.

A MODEL OFFENSIVE

But the current Russian political offensive is a model of the use of diplomacy for political ends, even though a deadly one. Having demonstrated their lead in the arms race by the launching of their sputniks, they do not go around the world emphasizing their present or proximate ability to wipe out Europe or the United States at one blow. True, they firmly point out to the peoples of the world, in open letters to their governments, the danger they incur if they permit the United States to use their territory as launching sites for missiles in an all-out war. But they do not confine themselves to this; it is not even at the center of their campaign. What they have proposed, in Bulganin's letters which were sent out just prior to the recent meeting of the heads of governments of the NATO powers, is: (a) a standstill agreement on the present level of armaments pending discussion of disarmament. (b) A zone free of atomic weapons in Central Europe. (c) Withdrawal to their own borders of all troops in Europe.

What is wrong with these proposals? On the face of them, each and every one of them would tend to ease the armaments race and to draw the potential combatants farther apart. While they in no way inhibit the United States from continuing its efforts to produce its own ICBMs, and thus from catching up in the realm of this country's pet notion of the deterrent power of instant retaliation, the creation of a Central European zone cleared of Russian and American troops appears to create a far graver political danger for Russia than it does for the United States. After all, it is not the presence of American troops in Western Europe which keeps that area in the NATO pact. But who is to say

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

AUTO WORKERS

Anti-Union Attacks Mount As UAW Faces Negotiations

By JACK WILSON

Attacked on a variety of fronts, and clearly on the defensive, the United Autoworkers Union meets shortly here in a crash convention with one decisive question looming before it: Can Walter Reuther and the UAW come up with a program of action which will turn the tables on its enemies, and put the union on the offensive as a preliminary to the crucial 1958 negotiations this summer.

There are at least four major fronts where the union is under fire, and having rough going.

The impudence of the Senate Rackets committee to intervene in two fields where proper federal action has already decided the issues is one example. With an arrogance of the late Senator McCarthy, the Republican members of the McClellan committee sent to Detroit a hand-picked investigator who checked into three phases of the UAW's operations.

The investigation into the Kohler strike and the expenditure of union money for strike benefit purposes came after the National Labor Relations Board had conducted extensive hearings into labor-management practices, and its trial examiner had come up with a decision condemning the Kohler management. In this fishing expedition, the McClellan committee is obviously going into the matter purely for political purposes calculated to serve the Republican party, as many national publications have pointed out.

WON COURT CASE

The UAW won its court case against an indictment obtained by the Eisenhower administration that the UAW was violating the corrupt practices Act with its PAC-Education work on radio and TV. Yet this is the second field into which the Republican committee members expect to wander.

In many respects, the third phase of the announced hearings concerning the UAW are the most incredible of all. It involves the attempted assassination of Walter Reuther in 1948 and a trial going on in Detroit as a fantastic repercussion of that tragic event.

At the moment the UAW is on trial in a \$4,000,000 libel suit brought against it by Carl Renda, son-in-law of Santo Perrone, a man whose dubious dealings were the subject of illumination of the Kefauver committee in 1951.

It may be recalled that a Canadian small-time operator named Carl Renda and three other individuals as the men who tried to kill Walter Reuther. Later this man, Donald Ritchie, fled from the hands of the police, returned to Canada, and repudiated his confession and statement.

As a result, no indictment was obtained against Renda, and the others, and all charges were dropped. Since the UAW was very instrumental in obtaining the statement from Ritchie, in a real cloak and dagger sort of business, Renda is suing the UAW for libel.

MURDER-IN-REVERSE

The death of the late Prosecutor Gerald O'Brien, who handled the case, and then the recent drowning of Ralph Winstead, the chief UAW investigator, have deprived the UAW of valuable defense witnesses.

In many respects, the trial is a sort of murder-in-reverse hearing. The once accused murderer is suing the accuser.

What is the McClellan committee doing in this matter? Its special investigator announced in Detroit he was checking to see how union funds were used in this affair. The attorney for Renda has been making quite a play during the court trial here on the point that the UAW used money investigating the shooting, while listing the transaction in a secretive fashion. Apparently, the Republicans hope to hang their hats on that point.

Both the Renda suit and the McClellan hearings are calculated to harrass the UAW at a time when its major pre-occupation should be with the big nego-

tiations with General Motors, Ford and Chrysler. The coincidence of these events can hardly be called accidental.

Only Senator Pat McNamara of Michigan, a union member himself, has had the guts to blast the machinations within the McClellan committee.

There is another phase to the hearings on the Kohler strike which the anti-UAW elements hope to exploit. By dragging out the story of the strike now almost 4 years old, the hope of these reactionaries is that just a telling of the strike duration will serve to frighten UAW ranks over any prospect of strike action this summer against one of the Big Three. Predictions of a long strike in auto are already a dime a dozen in every big newspaper and magazine from the *Wall Street Journal* to *Fortune* and *Business Week*.

A further assault on the UAW is the steady increase in unemployment going on in most auto areas. Before the convention takes place late this month, at least 20 per cent of all autoworkers will be laid off, in most cases for the remainder of the 1958 model. It's just short of remarkable how little of the news of lay-offs in the auto shops gets in the press, even though the Christmas cut-backs did make it. They were so sensational that they simply couldn't be ignored.

The closest that one gets to any official figures is the public estimate of the Michigan Unemployment Commission that unemployment will increase to average over a quarter of a million by summer. Already it is over 200,000. And these figures are conservative.

In the many shops, Cadillac, DeSoto, Dodge, Chrysler, Ford and elsewhere where each week more and more people are being laid off, the managements are taking full advantage of the situation to squeeze union bargainers on work conditions, and other gains of the union.

MOOD OF CRISIS

There is a very understandable mood of an impending crisis in many sections of the UAW leadership because of the piling up of these events. For so many years the overwhelming bulk of the leadership and the ranks have looked to Walter Reuther to provide answers.

Many industry spokesmen, as indicated by their interviews to press and magazine representatives, have concluded that this over-all picture furnishes a perfect time for them to take on the UAW and cut it down to size.

They have forgotten the history of the UAW and its strike struggles. Industry leaders are deceiving themselves into believing that the vast amount of criticism they hear in the shops "against the union," is anti-union. Quite the contrary, in most cases it is a criticism from the left. The ranks are sore because the union is not doing more fighting, more winning.

Reuther has one supreme advantage which he obviously hasn't used. Summon the ranks in a genuine struggle as he did in the 1946 General Motors strike. Such a program, with an aggressive leadership carrying the ball, would quickly turn the tables on the Big Three, and send them reeling in retreat.

GET ACQUAINTED with Independent Socialism

For further information and literature, write to the Independent Socialist League, 114 West 14 St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$2 a year.

LABOR SCOPE

1957 Strike Record At Post-War Low

Fewer workers went on strike in 1957 than in any year since the end of the war: 1,400,000 were involved in strikes compared to 1,900,000 in 1956 and 4,600,000 in 1946 the year of the big strike wave. Three per cent of the total number employed in non-agricultural industries went on strike, involving only one-tenth of one per cent of total estimated working time. This is a post-war low. But these facts are not accompanied by the usual predictions of a new era of labor-management harmony. Negotiations for 1958 are yet to come.

Ominous Note

The old year ended on an ominous note when the IUE faced decertification of its local at the Hertner Electric Company at Strongsville, Ohio near Cleveland. On July 11, last year 135 members struck and the company hired strike-breakers to add to 32 former union members who went back to work. Now the company has petitioned for an election. Under the Taft-Hartley law, only scabs and strike-breakers can vote; the outcome is a foregone conclusion. By a similar process, the United Rubber Workers was recently decertified at the O'Sullivan Rubber Co in Winchester, Va; the UAW at the Park Drop Forge Co; and the UE at the Fawick Airflex Co.

No Pay Freeze for '58

At the AFL-CIO convention, all talk of a pay freeze was instantly and hotly repudiated. Richard Gray, president of the Building and Construction Trades Council suggested a one-year wage freeze as a device to combat inflation but he was castigated roundly by everyone.

False Profit Picture

Late in December, George Meany charged that a report by the Department of Commerce had created "a false impression of corporate profits." He contended that the Department used statistical methods that understated profits by three to four billion dollars, and failed to take into account a new method of figuring depreciation. It was another round in the war of words in preparation for 1958 bargaining. The National Association of Manufacturers, through its executive vice-president, George Sligh Jr. replied that Meany was "deliberately trying to mislead public opinion." Not a very felicitous opening for harmonious relations.

ACLU Fighting Worthy Passport Case

The State Department's assumption of authority to restrict the travel of Americans to certain areas abroad again has been labeled unconstitutional.

In a test case of major importance, the American Civil Liberties Union asserted that passports could properly be withheld only if the United States were at war with a nation, or ample evidence of a "clear and present danger to our democratic survival," or the person was a fugitive from justice.

The Union's views were set forth in a brief submitted to the State Department's Board of Passport Appeals in behalf of William Worthy, Jr., a staff member of the Baltimore *Afro-American*. Worthy's application for renewal of his passport was denied after he returned from a trip overseas, during which he visited Hungary and Communist China. The Department stamps passports "not valid" for travel to those areas.

Even before William M. Kuntzler, ACLU cooperating attorney, filed the brief, the Union warned that it would carry Worthy's case to Federal courts in

Wages vs. Recession

In August, the UAW publicly insisted that auto prices be reduced, contending that profits were so high that prices could go down and still leave plenty of room for more pay. The Big Three indignantly rejected union "interference" in their right to set prices and soon announced increases for 1958. By June of this year, union contracts with Chrysler, General Motors and Ford will have expired. The union insists on combatting depression by increasing purchasing power. Harlow Curtice, president of GM, however predicts imminent economic catastrophe if union demands are granted.

The UAW replied: "Mr. Curtice should know by this time that what Americans need most is not confidence. Their greatest need is for purchasing power—for money in their hands, so that they can buy the things they and their families need. So long as America's giant corporations, including most particularly the General Motors Corporation, continue to increase their prices to higher levels, confidence will continue to decrease, thousands more workers will be left without jobs, production will shrink and the 'short-term' uncertainties which Mr. Curtice blithely refers to will become long-term realities." On January 22-24, 3,000 UAW delegates will meet in Detroit for a special convention to map out specific demands and pass resolutions on wages, on hours and on prices.

Aircraft Contracts

Aircraft contracts too expire this year. Most of the industry's 800,000 workers are represented by the UAW and the International Association of Machinists. In March, a UAW contract with North American and an IAM contract with Lockheed expire. The UAW and IAM have agreed to coordinate bargaining and to present uniform demands. On Jan. 4, representatives of UAW and IAM locals on the West Coast will meet together at a joint conference.

Other Negotiations

Contracts come up for review in other industries too: farm implements, glass, maritime and perhaps coal.

Declining production and spreading unemployment will make many unions reluctant to go on strike but, by the same token, the employers will be encouraged to resist granting the union demands and to force them to a show of strength.

"Only" 1,400,000 were on strike in 1957. It was a relatively quiet year. But a lot has been left over for 1958.

event of an adverse judgment. The State Department's passport appeals board is the last administrative agency available to applicants who fight denial of passports.

"There can be no doubt that the State Department could not limit freedom of speech on the ground that it might be detrimental to some aspect of our foreign policy," Kuntzler's brief commented in discussing existing regulations under which travel to certain Communist bloc nations is prohibited as not being in the best interests of the United States.

"With due regard to the weightiness of the right of travel and its involvement with First Amendment freedoms, such a restriction on travel ought likewise to fall. The fact that travel abroad might inconvenience our organs of government in the discharge of their responsibility is one part of the price we pay for democratic freedoms. It is difficult to believe that denials of passports to individuals not accused of subversion can constitute a proper instrument of foreign policy."

ACLU Feature Press Service

Review of the Civil Rights Struggle in the U. S., 1957

The following press release was issued by Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a year-end summary of the highlights of the struggle for civil rights. We believe it will be found useful and informative by readers of Labor Action. ED.

Three major developments on the race relations front in 1957 were of such significance as to overshadow all other events of the year in the continuing struggle to eliminate racial discrimination and segregation. They were (1) the enactment of the Civil Rights law, the first such statute to be passed by Congress in 82 years; (2) the use of United States troops to sustain a federal court decree ordering the admission of nine Negro children to the previously all-white Central High School of Little Rock, Ark.; and (3) the enactment of a New York City ordinance banning racial and religious discrimination in private housing, the first measure of that kind ever enacted into law in any American community.

CIVIL RIGHTS

There were, of course, other happenings during the year which had important bearings on the course of race relations throughout the country. Some of these were positive, contributing to the realization of the American goal of equal opportunity; others were negative, feeding the flames of racial strife.

However, the advances made in 1957 were encouraging. The Civil Rights Act empowered the federal government to intervene to protect the right to vote and set up machinery for the execution of this power. In addition, the law established a bi-partisan Civil Rights Commission charged with the responsibility of investigating violations of the right to vote and of other civil rights.

When he sent troops into Little Rock to uphold a federal court order, President Eisenhower served notice that the Executive Branch of the government is prepared to sustain the federal judiciary in its desegregation orders. This was the administration's reply to the southern doctrine of interposition which, if acceded to, would have meant anarchy. While the need for such action was widely regretted, there was general recognition that the President had been goaded into taking the only stand he could by the intransigence of Gov. Orval Faubus of Arkansas. The Governor had placed troops of the Arkansas National Guard at Central High School to keep the Negro students out in defiance of the court order.

Housing has long been the most pressing problem confronting Negro citizens in urban centers. The limitation on the Negro's living space has sometimes been more severe in the North than in the South. This denial of freedom of residence has fostered *de facto* segregation in public schools and in other public facilities, even in states in which such segregation is legally banned. Accordingly, the New York City ordinance against discrimination in private housing is a measure of vital importance to every community in which a large number of Negroes reside.

Earlier legislation in New York and elsewhere had outlawed discrimination in publicly-aided housing. This has been helpful but it left the owners of the vast majority of dwellings free to refuse to sell or to rent to persons because of their race, religion or national origin. The new law in New York City was designed to meet this problem.

PEACE PILGRIMAGE

Other important developments on the positive side include the successful Prayer Pilgrimage which brought some 27,000 persons to Washington on May 17 in a demonstration of unity on behalf of civil rights; the continuing desegregation of the schools which added another 50,000 to the 300,000 Negro school children who were

already attending classes in desegregated school systems; the mass refusal of Negro citizens in Tuskegee, Alabama, to purchase consumer goods of local merchants after city officials had redrawn the city lines to exclude all but ten of the city's 400 registered Negro voters.

Likewise of great significance was the declaration by 74 Protestant clergymen in Atlanta calling for compliance with the law, preservation of the public schools, freedom of speech and the re-opening of communication between the races.

This action by the city's leading clergymen indicated the re-emergence of the long silent voice of moderation in the South. On the political front a similar expression of moderation may be found in the municipal election in Little Rock on Nov. 6. In that election only one of seven pro-segregation candidates was elected to the city's new Board of Directors although the maintenance of segregation was made the No. 1 issue in the campaign. Six "moderates" were elected.

On the debit side, persecution of the NAACP as an organization was continued through the passage of new laws in Arkansas and Texas to force it to disclose the names and addresses of its members. However, the Texas law passed by only one vote and early in the year the legislatures of both Florida and North Carolina refused to pass such laws.

Also on the debit side, certain Southern states, notably Georgia, Mississippi and Alabama have announced their intention to adopt more restrictive tests for prospective voters so as to circumvent the new Civil Rights law and prevent the registration of Negro citizens. In contrast, Negro citizens appear to be experiencing no more than the usual difficulties in the South Carolina statewide re-registration campaign now in progress.

TENSION

A state of tension is kept in being throughout the Deep South states by continuing pronouncements by important political and public personages counseling defiance of the Federal judiciary, the White House, and all dissenters from the segregation doctrine. Threats and violence are thus encouraged, with both whites and Negroes as targets. A bomb was exploded at the home of a white South Carolina woman of an old and respected family simply because she wrote an article mildly advocating a moderate approach to the issue.

Despite these and other manifestations of resistance, the new year is certain to see more changes in the old order. The hard core will probably remain for some time, but both its area and influence are being reduced. The inescapable fact is that the New South will never be able to realize its potential if nine millions of its citizens are held in segregated second-class citizenship. The other inescapable fact is that at this stage in world history the United States cannot afford to perpetuate second-class citizenship based upon color.

Labor Action FORUM New York

MAX SHACHTMAN
National Chairman, ISL
**AMERICAN SOCIALISM
RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT**

Two Sessions

PART I

Friday, Jan. 17

PART II

Friday, Jan. 24

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

(Please note that from now on Labor Action Forum will be on Friday instead of Thursday evening.)

CIVIL LIBERTIES BRIEFS

Two Supreme Court Wiretap Decisions

Two recent U. S. Supreme Court decisions on wire tapping are expected to have far-reaching effects on current and future cases.

In an unanimous ruling, the high tribunal held that New York State law enforcement officers violated Federal law by tapping a telephone, even though the action was authorized by state law, and such wire tap evidence was not admissible in the federal courts.

It said there could be no exceptions to the plain language of Section 605 of the Federal Communication Act of 1934, which states:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect or meaning of such intercepted communication."

In a second ruling, delivered the same day, the Supreme Court asserted that a policeman listening to a conversation on an extension telephone—at the request of the person called—did not intercept within the meaning of the Federal law. Dissenters in the 7-2 decision held that the only exception, as stated in the Communication Act, was an interception "authorized by the sender."

The first decision may affect several pending cases, including a perjury in-

dictment against James R. Hoffa, president-elect of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and an income tax evasion conviction against Frank Costello.

However, Federal Judge John F. X. McGohey refused to set aside the conviction, which had been challenged on the basis of wire taps of the gambler's phone by the New York District Attorney's office. Judge McGohey ruled that there was sufficient non-wire tap evidence to sustain the conviction. Costello's lawyers plan an appeal.

In long range, the decision could deter the practice of tapping wires for evidence to use in state courts, for it declared that such action by state officials violates the Federal statute, even though the action may be sanctioned by state law.

"Section 605 contains an express, absolute prohibition against the divulgence of wire tapping," said the unanimous decision. "Had Congress intended to allow the states to make exception to Section 605, it would have said so. . . . We find that Congress, setting out a prohibition in plain terms, did not mean to allow state legislation which would contradict that section and that policy." Previously, the Supreme Court had held that state courts could adopt their own regulations governing admission of evidence obtained illegally.

Groups May Use NY Schools Freely

In a decision expected to have far-reaching effects, the Appellate Division has held that the Yonkers Committee for Peace should be permitted to hold a meeting in a public school building. The court's ruling will aid organizations in New York State who wish to use public school facilities.

The case, which dates back to 1952, was brought to the courts by the New York Civil Liberties Union, through its counsel, Emanuel Redfield.

Justice Sydney F. Foster, in the 4 to 1 decision, which reversed an earlier ruling of the State Supreme Court, held that "it was plain common sense" that if school authorities opened the schools to the public they must treat all similar organizations alike, unless there was "fair proof" of disorder and damage possibly resulting.

In his opinion, Justice Foster held that the Yonkers Board of Education had re-

jected the Yonkers Committee's request for use of a school because James E. Ellis, the Committee president, had placed advertisements in Communist periodicals pertaining to his linoleum business. The school board, he said, is "not a censor" and its duty "as far as school buildings are concerned is merely to regulate and protect them."

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Francis Bergan wrote that school boards are "entitled to impose limitations of their use for non-educational purposes."

Commenting on the decision, NYCLU executive director George E. Rundquist stated that it "will serve as a precedent in cases where a board of education arbitrarily denies a permit to a group because it does not agree with their ideas, and will no longer be able to discriminate against groups merely because they are unpopular in the community."

ACLU Weekly Bulletin

Army Promulgates Own 'Subversive List'

The following article is reprinted in its entirety from the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 1. It appears that a full court testing of this army policy is in the offing. The results of this test are of great importance to youth drafted and then forcibly enrolled in the reserves for years afterward. Their political rights will be circumscribed to whatever extent the Army is successful in laying down its own standards for curtailment of political activities by reservists.

The Army asserted yesterday that reservists, both active and inactive, are subject to its security program.

It also announced that membership in organizations not on the Attorney General's subversive list can constitute membership in a subversive organization.

The policy positions were made clear in statements to The Chronicle by a Pentagon spokesman in Washington.

They followed inquiries about three Chinese-American soldiers who had completed their active service but were being prosecuted for membership in an organization the Army considers subversive—even though it is not on the Attorney general's list.

The charges against the men were

based on membership in the San Francisco Chinese-American Democratic Youth League—since 1954 the Chinese-American Youth Club.

The Army claims the organization is political and "supports and serves Communist China."

"This leaves the door wide open," commented Ernest Besig, local American Civil Liberties Union director. "The Secretary of the Army can decide the Chamber of Commerce is Communist dominated and call a man a security risk for belonging."

Besig is defending the three men, one of whom has already had a hearing. The second hearing is scheduled at the Presidio January 8. No date has been set for the third.

After the first hearing the accused soldier was given an honorable discharge, but he was called a security risk. This means, the Army said, that he can't get security clearance to work on classified projects.

At the first hearing a witness claimed the Youth Club was social and athletic. Money for its support came from dues of 50 cents a month and contributions by merchants, the witness said.

Besig complained that neither he nor the accused soldiers were allowed to see documents on which the Army based its charges.



on the HOME FRONT

cars and the economy

Gloomy Picture at Year's End

By JACK WILSON

Detroit

The auto industry served notice on its workers, and the nation as a whole at Christmas time that the 1958 economic outlook for this sector of the economy would at best only go down to the level of the 1954 recession. More probably, the situation would be worse.

Creeping unemployment, short work weeks, and very uncertain production schedules for the first quarter of 1958 faced the vast majority of workers in the body, parts and accessory plants.

WARD'S REPORTS

Even Ward's Automotive reports conceded on Dec. 21 that, "the first real signs of output softening are beginning to appear in the auto factories," as it projected an 8.6 per cent drop in sales of domestic built cars for 1958.

More than 70,000 autoworkers were given notice of lay-offs over the holiday season in time, of course, to dampen all Christmas and New Year spirits. This was admitted to be a harbinger of the next period in the auto industry.

Unlike other years, including the recessions of 1954 and 1948, there are no optimists in the auto industry. Even L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler, who has always issued more glowing reports than other manufacturers, said last week that he was revising his figures downward for the projected 6,000,000 car sales he estimated.

From top to bottom, the auto industry has been shocked by the failure of the 1958 models to sell anywhere near the plans of the manufacturers. Usually the first three months of a model signify high production schedules, overtime for the workers, and handsome profit for the dealers. Now terms like "the collapse of the market," are found in increasing use in industry circles.

It began, really, with the unbelievable flop of the medium priced Edsel, into which the Ford motor car company had sunk a quarter of a billion dollars. It has been selling at one tenth the rate at which Ford officials expected.

Other medium priced cars found the same sales resistance, and quickly cut back production schedules. Only the highest priced cars, and Ford, Chevrolet and Plymouth made almost normal sales. In the case of Ford and Chevrolet, every trick in the book is being employed to jack up sales records in an effort to capture the mythical number one spot for the year. But new car inventories climbed so swiftly in the past month that Chevrolet and Ford were forced to slow down their mad race. More than 510,000 cars are in dealers hands, including 90,000 unsold 1957's.

For the first time in post-war history there is unanimous agreement in all auto circles that the coming year would

Russian Example?

"The noted Soviet scientist, Peter Kapitza, who is considered by American physicists to be the world's leading authority on hydrogen, had refused to work on the hydrogen bomb project in the Soviet. The noted scientist's rebellion came at the very time both the U. S. and Russia were first beginning their efforts to build the hydrogen bomb. For his refusal to cooperate, Stalin held Kapitza under house arrest.

"British newspaper men recently confirmed from London by long-distance telephone conversation with Kapitza that he has still refused to do any work on military atomic projects and was being permitted by the Soviets to work only on peace-time developments of atomic energy."

Between the Lines, May 15, 1957

not signify a step forward, but rather a decline. The consensus of opinion is that domestic car sales will maybe reach 5,300,000; a figure that resembles the 1951 picture. Truck sales are expected to reach 1,000,000 and the small foreign cars take another 300,000 customers.

Translated in terms of labor force, for 1958 an average of 550,000 workers may expect employment. In 1951, before automation, it took an average of 707,900 workers to produce that many cars and trucks.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment has become increasingly a permanent feature of the auto picture. In 1956 employment averaged about 633,000 and in 1957 slightly less. These figures give only part of the story, for in many cases the companies go back to a four day week rather than layoff and pay out supplementary unemployment benefits.

There is another difference between the auto outlook now and in recent soft periods. In the past, other spurts like housing, capital goods expenditures, or extensive credit served to pace the economy and lift the auto industry out of its doldrums. But car credit is now a fantastic 16 billion dollars, which is three times higher than in 1951. Car prices likewise have reached impossible levels. Nor does any economist see anything less than a mild recession for the country as a whole for at least the first half of 1958. No one claims any longer that the auto industry is the bellwether of the economy, or that it can change the nation-wide trend. Quite the contrary. Recently the auto industry admitted its famous dictum, "come spring and everything will be all right," was an illusion.

Interestingly, only one car manufacturer expects a good year. Punchdrunk, almost collapsing, and losing money year after year, American Motors is now back in business, with its small Rambler—the only American answer to the attractive European small car import—increasing production schedules. It may sell 150,000 cars in 1958—a real increase.

If this economic picture holds steady for 1958, it is obvious that the UAW's contract convention to be held in Detroit later this month will face a difficult problem. Unemployment may consume far more of its time than had been anticipated when this gathering was first planned. As to the program to build a 100 million dollar strike fund to back up negotiations this summer, it is meeting even more than the usual resistance by workers many of whom are now on a four-day week.

UAW DILEMMA

The UAW's dilemma is painfully clear to everyone in the present situation. Prior to this conference, the union has proclaimed some pretty high goals for its 1958 negotiations. As the leader of the workers in mass-production industries, it is looked to to set the pattern for all. If it retreats from its major goals, the whole labor movement will be affected. But to stick to them in the context of a really bad year for the auto industry could mean a knock-down-drag-out fight under unfavorable conditions.

Is the UAW really prepared to meet this situation? That is what the January conference should show. And there can be little doubt of the outcome if the conference is prepared and organized not so much as an occasion to carry out the strike-fund plan, but rather as one step in the preparation and education of the membership to the real problems of the hard struggle ahead.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious students of social issues

50 cents

\$2 a year

YOU and SCIENCE

Guns, Butter and the Scientist 'Shortage'

By OSCAR FINE

A great deal has been written in recent months about the crisis in the U. S. "defense" effort. While occasionally someone says something intelligent, the mountainous accumulation of nonsense far outbalances it. When a deep thinker starts looking around for a fundamental cause, the strangest things can turn up. Let us first take up an idea that runs through the musings of a very large number of experts. Side by side with second thoughts about the luxury of democratic freedoms in a time of supreme crisis, these gentlemen have been pointing to our "consumerism" as the real source of weakness, the soft spot that will have to go if we are to catch up with the Russians.

This peculiar phrase is meant to focus attention on the lack of consumer goods in Russia. Certainly it is true that the bureaucracy there has built up a massive heavy industrial machine at the expense of the people. But this presupposes the notion that the production of consumer goods in the U. S. flows from some humane orientation in our economy. Often democracy is seen as the cause of this consumerism. The people who think this way implicitly accept the identification of democracy with "our free economy," the "democratic way of life" being identical with "free enterprise." The people are called upon to tighten their belts and prepare themselves for a supreme effort by this verbiage. But that is mostly "crisis" talk. For in fact, there is no necessary conflict between a bigger budget and continued "consumerism." The liberals (Keynesians all) have been quick to point this out, the ADA leaping forward with a proposal for a doubled arms budget and a decrease in taxes.

LITTLE CONFLICT

The main reason that there is little conflict between guns and butter can be found in the pattern of modern weapons spending. At one time the bulk of weapons monies went into mass production of standard items. Today the bulk of it goes into experimental production of a few very expensive weapons, which is very evident in the missiles field. Thousands of highly skilled workers and immense technological facilities are necessary, but the breakthrough into final models and mass production is still a long way off. Only some of these experimental production programs will pay off, and many will become obsolescent before they even achieve the breakthrough.

The aircraft industry has already laid off some 40,000 workers since last summer and estimates run as high as 400,000 who will be out of jobs when the coming "shakeout" is over. This euphemistic term refers to the Air Corps' shelving of its Strategic Air Force which was the base of all mass production, and the abandonment of the guided missile program (the Navaho at North American, the Ramjet at Curtis Wright, etc.) which these companies had hoped would replace the old mass production base in the future. The new armaments programs will eat up enormous sums and provide many jobs in time, but they don't use up large quantities of steel and other materials now. Civilian goods will not become scarce in the next period; the liberal economists expect an expanded economy alongside an expanded arms budget.

HOW ARE THEY USED?

Since every deep thinker has called for more scientists and engineers for research, it is worthwhile taking a look at how American industry uses them today. If a company has a large scientific staff and facilities, it stands a better chance of securing government contracts. But when a program is abandoned, it is the company and not the government that is left with a huge payroll. Hence the engineer, to avoid pounding the pavements following such events is usually on the lookout for a civilian job. In some indus-

tries these are hard to find, but there are many more jobs outside of arms than in it.

"Our difficulty today is not the absolute shortage of scientists and engineers as so many believe. Recent news items have even told of scientists and engineers now looking vainly for jobs. If we had equalled the Soviet Union this year by graduating 80,000—rather than 31,000—engineers, we would probably have a problem of what to do with more than half of them."

EMPLOYMENT PATTERN

C. Wright Mills gives the current employment pattern in *The Power Elite*:

"Although there are perhaps 600,000 engineers and scientists in the United States, only some 125,000 of them are active in research, and of these perhaps 75,000 are researching for industry in its pursuit of new commercial products, and another 40,000 are in developmental engineering. There are only 10,000 scientists engaged in fundamental research in all branches, and informed opinion has it that the top rate creators number no more than one or two thousand."

Just before the Korean war, when spending was still fairly high, the government advised young men to stay out of engineering. A raft of articles and editorials appeared decrying the too large enrollments in engineering courses since the economy had no room for all of them.

But even when things are rolling smoothly, industry does not use the engineers only in research and production. William H. Whyte, Jr. in *The Organization Man*, writes:

"Let's go back to the 'shortage' of engineers. Companies have been downright frenetic in their search for engineers; look at the business pages of the newspapers and the ads promise everything but the sun to the engineering graduate. But what do they do when they get him? Many companies don't use the graduates as engineers but as draftsmen. Other companies demand them for every opening in their trainee cadre [for managerial shots—O. F.], and since it wants the best to be executives, it puts them to work studying the non-engineering view of things they didn't get because the company wanted them to be engineers."

LOW SALARIES

It is also interesting to note that while the frenetic hunt offered the sun to the graduates, the ceilings on salaries for actual technical work did not rise appreciably, and most five, ten and fifteen year men stayed more or less on the same step. The road to success remains that of getting out of "narrow" technical work, and entering the "broad-gauged" areas of management, i.e., into the profitmaking end of the business, and out of the role of a (quite skilled to be sure) worker.

Thus we must conclude that there is no shortage of scientists in the U. S., but rather a limited need for them in the economy. The "shortage" only appears when the size of our graduating classes is compared with the Russian. How the Russians use them is another matter we cannot go into here, but it is evident that we don't have a place for them.

LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

January 13, 1958

Vol. 22, No. 1

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL

Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON

Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL
HERMAN BENSONMAX MARTIN
SAM BOTTORF

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

January 13, 1958

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

U. OF CHICAGO

Campus Political Life Shows Signs of Significant Revival

Student Govt.

In Student Government politics, the more liberal of the two caucuses, the Student Representative Party (SRP) won a strong majority over the Independent Student League (ISL) after having been soundly defeated in last year's election. SRP ran a well-publicized and enthusiastic campaign, while ISL seemed weak and notably uninspired. This victory for SRP is a good sign, but student government is at an all-time low here in the eyes of both students and administration and it will be hard to accomplish much in one short term, especially with SRP's limited personnel.

The U of C campus chapter of the NAACP which was reorganized in the middle of last year, made a strong and well publicized beginning on campus this fall when it published an open letter questioning the university administration on alleged discriminatory practices in some parts of the university community. The controversy in the Chicago Maroon lasted for several weeks although the administration did not reply to the letter. The NAACP has now started its own formal investigation of the charges and hopes to resolve or clarify most of these problems by the end of this school year.

While nothing "startling" in the way of increased interest in politics can be seen on this campus, there are definite signs of more activity on the part of radical groups, and a much more open interest on the part of students in these groups. One sign of a certain renewal of political interest is that all the groups have found it easier to sell literature. The Politics Club rapidly sold out its supply of Dissent. Anvil sales were far

above those of last year. Politics at the U of C, as elsewhere, are on the upswing.

Politics Club

A very successful fall quarter at the University of Chicago has been concluded by the Politics Club, a group of socialists, pacifists and left liberals in which the YSL participates. This group's public forums and smaller discussion meetings have provided the main source for political discussion on campus this fall.

William Worthy's lecture and film on China packed 200 people into the Social Science hall, and a symposium on Dilias' book, *The New Class* with Irving Howe from Dissent, David Herreshoff of the *American Socialist*, and Morton Kaplan from the U of C's Political Science Department attracted an audience of about 175.

The smaller discussions, on such subjects as—"what's wrong with things the way they are," "How much Nationalization," and "the cold war," were well attended and lively. The club found that, as the only broad radical-liberal group on campus, it filled a real need, and it now has 30 dues paying members.

A discussion with Norman Thomas and Max Shachtman, and a talk by I. F. Stone are planned as highlights of the club's program in the winter quarter.

Several smaller socialist groups functioned on campus this fall too. The Socialist Studies group, set up by sympathizers of the *American Socialist* held several discussions, and the YSL and YPSL both had classes off-campus. Even the Young Democrats held one meeting!

Mid-West NSA Meeting Flops

The fall conference of the Illinois-Wisconsin region of the National Student Association (NSA), held at the University of Wisconsin on December 7-8-9, adequately illustrated the ills of NSA nationally as it plowed its way through sessions relatively barren of enthusiasm or accomplishment.

The Illinois-Wisconsin region includes

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

Organ of the Young Socialist League, is a regular 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.

A Preliminary Report On the IUSY Congress

CHALLENGE reprints below some reports on the Congress of the International Union of Socialist Youth which was held last October. They are translated from "La Jeune Garde," Belgian Socialist youth paper affiliated to the IUSY. The YSL has some differences with the comrades of "La Jeune Garde," but we reprint these pieces for general information. We hope to have a fuller report from our own correspondent in Europe on IUSY matters at an early date.

The Fifth Congress of the International Union of Socialist Youth brought together a hundred delegates at its meeting in Rome. The Congress took place from October 26th to October 31st.

Three central political problems dominated the attention of the delegates at the Congress: the emancipation of the colonial people, the permanent menace of war, and Stalinism.

The debate on the first question developed around the Algerian question. By a near unanimous vote, the Congress came out in favor of Algerian independence, called for the withdrawal of French troops and took a stand for direct action in aid of the Algerian refugees.

An English motion which demanded the suspension of the SFIO (French Socialist Democratic Party) from the Socialist International was referred to the political commission by a feeble majority.

The election of a comrade from Ghana to the International Bureau concretized, in another way, the solidarity of the IUSY with the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

However, on other questions one must take a more critical view. In effect, an important section of the delegates placed the greatest emphasis upon a sterile anti-Communism which has no real political perspective.

When faced with the problem of war, these same delegates, even while demonstrating a consciousness of the risks of re-armament, placed their faith in

the old slogans, and deliberately ignored the possible action open to the working-class.

We will report soon on the Congress in greater detail. However, it is now important to draw certain conclusions.

A left-wing minority has now come into being. And this was not a question of the opposition of a single delegation. The Belgian, English, Dutch and Norwegian student socialists; the Young Socialists of Belgium, the Falcons of Germany, the Swiss and the Greeks, all these defended positions which were fundamentally the same. Certainly this is not to say that there was a monolithic left at the Congress. Happily, this was not the case. Divergences exist on a series of issues—on the question of the Arab countries, for example.

One could summarize the essential brunt of the positions of the Internationalist Left as the following: support to the colonial peoples, the concrete struggle of the working class against the war and the struggle against Stalinism through contacts with the youth from the East, showing them a political perspective for their fight against the Stalinist bureaucracy.

For the first time at the IUSY, a Left Wing has manifested itself. Without organization, it nevertheless defended a range of similar positions. An enormous task remains to be accomplished. New relations with the Asian, African and South American organizations gives a perspective of growth to this Left Wing...

Gilbert Clajot, National Secretary

Belgian Socialist Youth Program

The following is the basic statement which the Belgian Socialists issued to the IUSY Congress.

On the occasion of the Congress of the IUSY, we feel that it is the duty of the Junes Gardes Socialistes to make this appeal to all the young socialists of the world, to call upon them to struggle together to create a solid socialist international of the youth, one which can become the guide for the youth of the world, giving direction to its movement.

Proud of our past, of our traditions of international solidarity, of our struggle against the war and for socialism, our International must elaborate a platform of action capable of mobilizing all the exploited youth of the world:

Young workers expect us to give a response to their incertitudes, to face the problem of how to make their daily life secure.

The youth of the colonial countries expect specific action from us to help them in winning their right to life.

The youth of the underdeveloped nations, who live in conditions which neighbor on permanent misery, expect us to elaborate a solution, one based upon the rational organization of their nation.

It is a weighty responsibility for our International to be obliged to respond

YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

DWIGHT MACDONALD

on

"MASS SOCIETY AND ITS CULTURE"

ADELPHI HALL

74 5th Ave. (corner 13th St.)

Sunday, Jan. 19 7:30 P.M.

admission 50c

Is This the Last Round?

The Fight in the Communist Party

By GORDON HASKELL

The fight in the American Communist Party which was not resolved at their convention a year ago has broken to the surface again. And from all indications, one may speculate that it is surfacing for the last time. Once this round is over, it hardly seems there will be enough people left in the party to work up a good fight among themselves, though the history of the political sects in America should give one pause in making any such prediction. But if the signs are read right in this corner, the outcome of this fight will be to leave the American Communist Party nothing but a shrunken, isolated and insignificant Stalinist sect.

CENTRAL STRUGGLE

The issue around which the factions are rallying in the party today is the declaration of the ruling parties of the Communist-run countries issued in Moscow last fall. But the central struggle in which this is but an episodic moment is still the one which raged in the CP before the last convention: between those who want to find a new road by which they can make a contribution to the regroupment and re-orientation of socialism in America, and those who continue to view the American CP essentially as a border guard of the Communist regime in Russia.

When the Moscow Declaration became public, it was immediately clear that this represented a new departure (even though an old direction) for the Russian rulers, a departure in the direction of tightening the screws on the world Communist movement once again. Obviously, the American party could not stand aside in a stance of neutrality to such a development. It was designed precisely, among other things, to give the Kremlin loyalists all over the world the encouragement and backing in settling their accounts, once and for all, with those elements in the world Communist movement who have been showing marked signs of restlessness and independence since the Khrushchev "revelations" about Stalin and the Hungarian revolution. William Z. Foster and his friends in the American party were not the last to read the signs and hear the call.

FOSTER LASHES OUT

In the December issue of *Political Affairs*, Foster lashed out in an article entitled "The Party Crisis and the Way Out." The crux of the article is to accuse Gates and his tendency of "Right Revisionism" which is described as "the most serious political error" experienced by the Party "in its entire history." That is saying a mouthful, but there is a good deal more.

In concluding the first section of the article (the second section "The Road Ahead" is announced for the January issue which was not out when LABOR ACTION went to press), Foster states that although the last convention "gave a strong political set-back to Right Revisionism; nevertheless the Right has remained entrenched organizationally throughout the Party. Together with its conciliators it is now strong in all the leading committees of the Party, and this is also true in various state committees. Its main strength is that it controls and uses the *Daily Worker* as its special mouthpiece."

Following Foster's blast in *Political Affairs*, the Fosterites in the party began a campaign against Gates which occupied a good deal of attention in the latter columns of the *Daily Worker*. It seems that in answering a question at a meeting in Boston, Gates had said that as an American he would take pride if the United States took the lead in suspending nuclear bomb tests, and as a Communist he would feel the same way if Russia were to take the lead.

"HYPHENATED PERSONS"

Despite the fact that this appears to have been said in the context of a speech which put the chief blame for the cold war on the United States, and which had as its purpose to push the CP line on "peaceful co-existence," the old-line Stalinist pack was soon baying at his heels. He was accused of "equating" the role of Russia and of the United States in the cold war; "he created the impression that American Communists are hyphenated persons and have divided loyalties," (Wm. Weinstone), and who knows what all else.

The replies to these attacks were, as has been customary with the Gatesites from the beginning, muffled, ambiguous, conciliatory. It would seem that the silent, or not so silent, departure of several thousand supporters from the party during the past year has not succeeded in convincing them of the futility of their moderate course. Or is it really that their restraint is a result more of divided souls and unclear perspectives than of a conscious decision on how they should carry on their fight?

At any event, their mildness has availed them little. An article appeared in the December 26 issue of the *New York Times* to the effect that a meeting of the National Executive Committee of the party had decided to give up the *Daily Worker* because of the financial crisis of the paper, and in the hope of saving *The Worker*, their weekend edition.

In the context of the article, the

Times reporter wrote that he had checked the story with editor John Gates, who had told him: "In the thirty-four-year history of the *Daily Worker* there have been many predictions of its death, but it has proved to have more lives than the proverbial cat. I am opposed to the suspension of the *Daily Worker* and intend to fight for its continued existence. In any case, the *Daily Worker* will cease to exist only when it alone says so."

GATES CENSURED

On December 29th, the *Sunday Worker* carried a statement by the National Administrative Committee (the body set up at its last convention to run the party) explaining that the final decision on the life of the *Daily Worker* was up to the full National Committee, and concluding: "In view of these facts the NAC declares that the press interview of John Gates on this matter was completely unauthorized, and that such public statements on the part of any individual constitute a violation of the most elementary organizational principles common to all working class organizations."

The following day, the *DW* carried a letter signed by seven of its top writers and editors (Abner Berry, Jesus Colon, Max Gordon, Ben Levine, Alan Max, David Platt, and Lester Rodney) taking exception to the NAC statement, and defending Gates. And the issue of December 31 finally carried a press release on the meeting of the Executive Committee which had decided to suspend the paper.

It appears that this meeting of the Executive Committee was pretty important, and if one can judge from the diplomatic communique, a heated one. First, there was the decision to suspend the *DW*. Then "The NEC received a report by Eugene Dennis on some aspects of the work of the CPUSA since its 16th national convention on the internal party situation, and the tasks

ahead. It also heard a conflicting report by Sid Stein on the same subject matter." Since no decision could be reached, the matter was referred to the next meeting.

Then there was a report by Robert Thompson on the Moscow Declaration. A statement to be published in the January issue of *Political Affairs* was voted 11 to 7, with 2 abstaining and 2 absent. Since Gates voted with the majority, the statement can be awaited with some real interest.

NAC CENSURED

By a similar vote the National Executive Committee voted to condemn a letter to the National Committee issued by the National Administrative Committee on the Moscow Declaration early in December. It seems that the letter was issued by a vote of four to three, with Dennis one of the four and Gates one of the three and the NEC told the NAC to "function within the limits of its clearly defined administrative role" in the future.

All this may become confusing, if not even tedious to the outsider. But the fact emerges crystal-clear that the fight inside the CP is raging again, and in the context of the world situation, it is not likely that it will end without a major blow-up in the party.

With the Moscow Declaration, what should really have been understood by every knowledgeable person, became impossible to misunderstand. The Russian leadership demands unconditional loyalty from the leadership of every Communist Party in the world, as it did for so many years. Any party which refuses to give it, and wholeheartedly at that, will be reorganized or destroyed, or both. That has happened to more than one Communist Party in the past.

A pro-Communist political movement which refuses to give such unconditional and uncritical loyalty and obedience may continue to exist for a while, but to do so it must find independent roots in its own country, and that is extremely difficult once its ties to Russia have been cut. That may be possible for a Stalinoid publication or two, even for an association of some breadth and durability. But a mass Communist Party independent or critical of Russia has never existed anywhere except in Yugoslavia where the party had state power before it broke loose.

Preventive War Drift — —

(Continued from page 1)

bombs and missiles, and deep holes in the ground? Gaither and Rockefeller reports say yes.

ARMAMENT RACE

Great stress is laid on the fact of Russian industrial and scientific achievement and that in a few years it will probably be on an equal level in over-all military capability. The conclusion drawn from this is that every muscle must be strained to keep the present American superiority. But there is serious question whether this can be done except through an armament race which will dwarf the present efforts, since no one expects the Russians to sit by and do nothing.

The consequences of this Canute-like effort are pointed to by Walter Lippmann as the basic cause of the decay of U. S. foreign policy.

"The decay of our foreign policy is due to the inability of those who make it to recognize or to accept the fundamental fact that the U. S. is not the paramount but only an equal power. Yet in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in Germany, the official aims of our policy are those of a paramount power. These aims can be achieved only by the unconditional surrender of China and of Russia.

"This underlying contradiction is the basic cause of the decay of our foreign policy, and, incidentally, it is the basic cause of the fabulous unpopularity of Secretary Dulles. We are struggling stubbornly for results that we cannot hope to achieve, and this impetus, especially when it is covered with moral preachments, is alienating the people we are trying to lead."

If the only answer to the growing in-

dustrial power of the Stalinist world is to build more missiles, to dig deep holes in the ground, more conventional armaments or to unify the armed services in the interest of greater efficiency, then all is lost. War then becomes an absolute necessity at some point since there is no absolute guarantee that at some point Russian military power will not equal, if not surpass that of capitalist America.

PREVENTIVE WAR?

This point has not been lost to the authors of the Gaither Report, and it is even a strain in the Rockefeller Report in spite of a formal disclaimer of the idea. The conclusion that some members of the Gaither committee have come to or raised is preventative war. There is no definite evidence that the Gaither Report contains such a recommendation. But as the *N. Y. Post* has pointed out editorially, it is a grim state of affairs when many people in Washington are prepared to believe that such a recommendation is possible and could logically flow from the Report.

But whether or not it is informally in the Gaither Report, there have been a number of newspaper reports that leading members of the committee have been thinking along these lines.

Drew Pearson in his column on December 17 reported that Assistant Secretary of Defense Mansfield Sprague fought for the point of view that since the first attack in a nuclear war would be so massive "that if war appears inevitable some time in the future, it would be disastrous for us to wait until the Kremlin strikes the first blow."

But even more authoritative is the re-

port by Arthur Krock in the *N. Y. Times* of December 20 of a speech made to an Army committee by William C. Foster, of the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp., former head to the ECA under the Truman administration, and a leading member of the Gaither committee.

"MOST IMPORTANT"

Foster's statement that "we must attempt to get away from the strange dichotomy with which we have traditionally viewed force, refusing to consider it except as a last resort," was interpreted by Krock as implying a preventative war and "by deduction to have been the most important recommendation to the President and the National Security Council."

In addition William Shannon in the *N. Y. Post* of December 31 reports that "there have been other stories [of preventative war sentiment] to the effect that some of the members of the Gaither committee, at a private dinner on the evening of Dec. 9 which was attended by Vice President Nixon, put forward conjecturally the possibility of preventative war."

There have been public denials of any such conjectures, and the official public views of those involved do not embody these ideas. However, there can be little doubt, in view of the varied reports, that preventative war ideas have been discussed. It is the direct implication in much of the present thinking about foreign policy in Washington. Every step taken is the logical extension of the assumptions, but it is the logic of madness. The assumption that the only alternatives are continuation of the present policy or surrender and appeasement is false.

George Meany's Famous Speech to the Building Trades Dept. of the AFL-CIO

**A Look Into History
A Plea for Inter-Union Peace Today**

INDUSTRIAL UNIONS AND CRAFT UNIONS

Since the AFL-CIO merger, building trades unions have increasingly demanded that their jurisdiction over some skilled work performed by the industrial unions be recognized. Some of their complaints are of long-standing. Others are undoubtedly raised to throw a monkey-wrench into the unity machinery. In a speech to the convention of the Building and Construction Trades Department on December 3, 1957, George Meany considered the industrial vs craft dispute. These excerpts from his address illustrate how far his own thinking has developed and serve at the same time as a remarkable vindication of the aims and record of the CIO. The full text, by the way, was distributed by the Industrial Union Department.

I happen to be a building trades worker. I can't, of course, tell what was in the minds of those who ran the Building Trades unions years ago. I can tell you what was in my mind as an officer of a Building Trades union, the second largest plumber's union in our International. We talked about jurisdiction. Did we try to organize the skilled people in our trade who worked in industrial plants? Did we try to make these skilled people members of our union? We did not.

My union was a closed union, closed in the fact that it didn't take in new members. It had a closed shop agreement with a closed association of employers.

When we had industrial work crop up that we felt that we should do, we made an effort, if we had any weight, any pressure, to get that work for our contractors. We would not work directly. We wouldn't work for any one but our own contractors. We didn't want the people that were on the work. We merely wanted the work. So far as the people that were on the work were concerned, for our part they could drop dead. That was our attitude on this question at the time in my union.

CLOSED UNION

We even went so far that we wouldn't even take clearance cards. We shut the union to other union members of our own craft from other cities. The records of the United Association will show you that.

I am not bragging about it. I am not proud of it. I am telling you that is what we did 35 or 40 years ago.

Did the Building Trades organize in their organizing jurisdiction? They organized fairly well in new construction, but did they organize the skilled people who worked in factories back in those days? Did they organize the people in the so-called industrial plants? They may have, but the record doesn't show it.

Let me give you a sample of the membership figures of some of the Building Trades unions back in those days.

In 1915 the Brotherhood of Carpenters had 195,000 members. Twenty years later, in 1935, it had gone up to 200,000 members. In the interim during the boom days it went almost to 300,000 and back again.

The Brotherhood of Electrical Workers had 36,000 members in 1915. They went up quite a bit. They went to 130,000 in 1935.

The Bridge and Structural Iron Workers had 10,000 in 1915, and 16,000 in 1935.

The Painters had 75,000 in 1915, and 65,000 twenty years later in 1935.

My own organization in 1915, a combination of the United Association and

the old IA Steamfitters, which had been ordered to merge but which had not yet merged, the combination figures of the two unions, which afterwards became one, were 37,000 in 1915. In 1935 they had 34,000—3,000 less in 20 years.

In 1915, the Plasterers had 18,300. Twenty years later the Plasterers had 18,000—300 members less.

However, there was quite a different story from 1935 to 1955. The Carpenters went from 200,000 to 750,000 in that 20-year period.

The Electrical Workers went from 130,000 to 460,000 in that 20-year period.

The Bridge and Structural Iron Workers went from 16,000 to 133,000 in that period.

The Painters went from 65,000 to 182,000.

THE PAINTERS

The Plumbers went from 34,000 to 200,000 in 1955, in that 20-year period.

The Plasterers went from 18,000 to 60,000 in 1955.

So, what do these figures indicate? They indicate that something happened between 1935 and 1955, and that something was not just a war. The war might have had something to do with it, but there was a change in the organizing policies of the Building Trades Unions.

It came about through certain events that took place in 1934 and 1935.

No doubt some of you people remember the 1934 Convention of the AFL in the City of San Francisco. Then we were in the throes of a depression. The National Recovery Act was in operation and there was a tremendous urge on the part of workers in all classifications to organize. There were people in the AFL who felt that the AFL should change its policy so that these people could come into the trade union movement. There were those who felt they had no particularly direct interest in the workers but that all the workers should get the benefits of trade unionism so that the workers in the movement would be likewise benefited through increased purchasing power that would be developed by bringing the low-wage worker into a higher bracket.

14 RESOLUTIONS

In the 1934 Convention there were 14 resolutions on the subject of industrial unionism. All but two of these resolutions favored the application of the industrial union policy by the AFL in the so-called mass production industries. The Resolutions Committee met on this subject for six days and six nights. Let me read from that report that was unanimously adopted.

"The Executive Council was directed to issue charters for national or international unions in automotive, cement, aluminum and such other mass production as miscellaneous industries as, in the judgment of the Executive Council, may be necessary to meet the situation, and that the Executive Council shall at the earliest possible date inaugurate, manage, promote and conduct a campaign of organization in the iron and steel industry."

Then came 1935 at the Chelsea Hotel in Atlantic City, New Jersey, and the fight was on. There was no implementation of the 1934 directive and there was a complete disagreement between members of the Executive Council of the AFI as to what the 1934 directive meant. It was complete disagreement and the Council split almost down the middle. I am sure a good many of you recall that the 1935 Convention had nine specific resolutions which called for the immediate establishment of industrial unions

in certain fields. They were the chemical field, steel, the high-pressure pipe field, the rubber, radio, agricultural, canning, packing, white collar, gas and coke workers, and in addition, a resolution to change the form of organizational jurisdiction granted the Mine and Smelter Workers so they could operate as an industrial union without any craft restrictions.

CIO BORN

You know the result. The Committee came in with a split report with the majority turning down these resolutions and merely reaffirming the 1934 declaration of intent to organize industrial unions. The minority group, supported by John L. Lewis and others, went to a vote and were defeated by almost two-to-one.

Immediately thereafter, the Committee of Industrial Organizations was formed and after a year or two in which frantic efforts were made to have this matter adjusted, unions were suspended for joining the Committee of Industrial Organizations, including the unions that had representatives on the Executive Council of the AFL at the time.

I am not trying to tell you that this was the only cause of the split in the labor movement. I have always felt that there were other reasons. I have never changed my conviction but I do say that this was one of the reasons for the split. If you read the record you might come to the conclusion that this is the only reason for the split, but I don't believe that is so. However, it was one of the reasons.

In May of 1937, the AFL held an emergency general meeting of representatives of all of the national unions and state organizations in the City of Cincinnati, Ohio. It was the only conference of the AFL that I remember that was ever held within closed doors. It was a conference that was dedicated to the idea of defending the AFL from the onslaughts of the CIO, which by the early days of 1937 had started to roll. They had started to organize and they were organizing any place that they could organize. They were organizing the unorganized, without question. There were also indications that they were willing to reorganize the organized.

A COUNCIL OF WAR

I attended the May 1937 meeting and I am quite sure many in this room attended it. It was a council of war on the part of the AFL. At that meeting it was decided to go and beat the CIO at their own game. From then on we had 20 years of division in the American trade union movement. We had 20 years in which the CIO organized not only on industrial lines but on craft lines wherever they could. They drew no line in organizing crafts. In fact, they have a good many crafts in their unions and right at the moment some of the crafts are giving

them some headaches. But they went out and they organized.

What did the AFL unions do, including a number of the AFL Building Trades? They went out and they organized along craft lines and along industrial lines. So we had 20 years of dog fighting, with both groups organizing in any way they could organize.

In 1955 we decided that we would try to end this division, that we would try to bring the groups together, and that we would bring them together with conflicting jurisdictions; jurisdictions granted to one group by the AFL and jurisdictions granted to the other group by the CIO. We would attempt to work out within the framework of a unified organization all of the problems that existed. So for two years now the Building Trades and the industrial unions have been trying to unscramble this particular omelet, trying to bring some order out of the chaos which has developed after 20 years.

When we say industrial unions, do we mean the former CIO unions that are organized industrially or the former AFL unions that are organized industrially? Do we mean the Building Trades unions that are organized industrially, that they must concede? To whom do they concede? Do they concede to themselves? Let's look this thing straight in the face. Let's be realistic about this situation.

Is anyone here going to turn over members they have organized for 20 years at the point of a gun? Are they going to be compelled to turn them over? You fellows know that isn't going to happen. So how are we going to solve this problem? By a trade union war, by fighting until the last drop of blood is gone? I have had enough experience to know that we can't gain anything by that sort of practice. The only ones who gain are the enemies of labor. The way to settle this is to settle it in an intelligent fashion on a man-to-man basis, and I think a settlement can be worked out.

PLENTY OF CHANCE

However, if we want to fight we will have plenty of chance to fight. The right-to-work people are still pretty much alive. They are working to destroy the things that you and I have built up over the years.

There will be an opportunity to fight on the legislative field. I very respectfully suggest that there is an opportunity for the Building Trades to fight on the approaching non-union field, with the non-union contractors in the building and construction business. There are some estimates that say non-union construction, private industrial and public utility construction, will run as high as a billion dollars this year.

I am not trying to assess the blame. I am not trying to say what should have been done 30 years ago. I told you what my local union did. We wouldn't have any part of an industrial worker. We wouldn't take them in. We wouldn't work for the man he worked for. We wanted to work for our own boss. In fact, we had a contract that prevented us from working for anyone other than a master plumber. I don't know what the policies were, but the record indicates that the Building Trades organized and put on a terrific drive to organize after 1935 at the same time as the industrial unions of the CIO were likewise pushing their drive.

The problem can be solved by intelligence and by faith and determination and devotion to the ideals of the trade union movement. I know it cannot be solved by labor fighting labor. Let's try to solve it. Let's turn our faces to meet the real enemies of this trade union movement, of whom there are legions.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In six special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?
- No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class
- No. 7—Labor Politics in America
- No. 8—Revolt Behind the Iron Curtain

Russian Political Offensive — —

(Continued from page 1)

what will happen to the satellite regimes in East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia if Russian troops are removed from the area, and bledged to remain out of it by international agreement?

Since the American government was forced at the Paris NATO conference to agree to negotiations with the Russians at the foreign minister's level, and the latter have at least initially turned down this proposal on the ground that they want a "heads of government" meeting or nothing, the two sides appear to be hung up in a ludicrous tangle over just who is to talk to whom. From the point of view of the Russian campaign, however, the tangle is not ludicrous at all. It is quite advantageous. For while the argument takes place about the "level" at which talks are to be conducted, their proposals continue to dangle before the eyes of the world issuing their reasonable and appealing message as clearly as the beep-beep of their spatniks.

HIDDEN TRICK?

Is there a hidden trick in the Russian proposals, as is implied by the American government's demand that they "show good faith by deeds" before any real negotiations can be entered into profitably? Yes, there is. It is a perfectly simple and even transparent one, yet they feel safe in using it. The trick is simply their conviction that the American government will refuse to accept their proposals as a basis for negotiations or to put forward others, equally reasonable and appealing to world opinion.

One reason why they are justified in this conviction is highlighted by an article in the New York Times for January 5 from Washington. James Reston, obviously expressing the views of the highest American circles puts the matter succinctly in one paragraph: "Problem No. 1 (for the Eisenhower administration) is how to keep their promise to negotiate, made at the recent NATO meeting in Paris, without risking the possibility of stopping the arms race at a point highly favorable to the Soviet Union." No one should need blunter words than that.

But if neither side is willing to negotiate except when they are ahead, how will the arms race ever stop? The American government is trying to dig up an argument to answer its allies' worried questions about this. The answer is, be-

Belgian Socialist Youth—

(Continued from page 5)

lonial people in their struggle for independence; there must be a special resolution for Algerian independence and the withdrawal of French troops.

• We must begin a struggle in every country for the reduction of military service and arms budgets as a first step in halting the insane arms race.

• We must demand the immediate cessation of nuclear explosions and outlaw the A and H Bombs; organize an international demonstration which will take place on the same day in all countries, bringing together all youth organizations; organize an educational campaign.

• We must demand from our various Governments that they interdict the atomic stockpiles, and suppress the bases which have been built up for them.

• We must unequivocally condemn the English and French intervention in Suez.

• We must condemn the Soviet intervention in Hungary.

to all these questions which are posed by the youth of the world. But we accept this responsibility because we are socialists, because we are conscious that only socialism can solve the problems which confront humanity.

Today, the world has reached a level of scientific development which makes it possible to begin to satisfy the needs of man. In a phrase, the time has come when socialism is no longer a utopian dream, but has become realizable. Yet, at

lieve it or not, that the United States, which does not yet have an ICBM, is only a few years away from a "missile-killer" weapon. No agreements should be reached which could inhibit the development of this weapon which would, presumably, afford a real defense against the ICBMs.

Even if this missile-killer story were based on solid facts, it would serve more to underline the sterility and even bankruptcy of American foreign policy than as an argument against negotiations with the Russians. Does Washington really expect the peoples of the world to close their eyes, put their shoulders to the wheel, pull in their belts, and persevere in the arms race till American scientists, whose world reputation is not exactly at its apex at the moment, come up with the answer?

FRIGHTENING NOTION

The very fact that such a notion can be put forward seriously by the highest circles of the American government is really frightening. But equally disturbing is the sterility of political thought on this vital area of foreign policy throughout the width and breadth of American society. It is not that the Eisenhower administration perseveres in a suicidal course, in the face of an opposition armed with a coherent program. What is really going on in this country is a "great debate" both sides of which operate on the basis of the same assumptions, reach pretty much the same conclusions, but seek partisan advantage from the emphasis of minor details or from the relative position of responsibility for the execution of the agreed policy by the other side.

As good an example as any of the failure of the Democrats, or any wing of them, to come up with a real alternative to the Dulles-Eisenhower "policy" was presented in a recent article by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey entitled "What Hope for Disarmament?" (New York Times Magazine, January 5) Humphrey, who is often a spokesman for the liberal-labor wing of the Democrats, starts out by detailing at length the record on the disarmament negotiations between Russia and the United States. He makes out a good case for the American proposals with regard to nuclear disarmament and controls on it.

But in discussing the whole range of American foreign policy, Humphrey stuns us with a sentence such as "It is difficult to see how we could have pre-

sented a strong negotiating front to the Soviet Union when we were so busily engaged in unilateral disarmament." He is talking about the last few years. Later in the article he writes: "Before we can expect to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union on control or limitation of arms we and our allies must possess sufficient military strength and political solidarity to give compelling weight to our diplomacy. The rulers in Moscow revere and live by power and force, and reject the moral standards of good faith and respect for the pledged word which are our guiding principles. . . ."

WHAT DIPLOMACY?

But what is the diplomacy to which military strength should give weight? We search the article in vain. There is talk about a changing world, about a "steady, non-emotional outlook," about "outstanding political problems." But the closest we get to even finding out just where these problems are (let alone what our proposed solution should be) is the following: "In my opinion these problems include specially the division of Germany, the current crisis in the Middle East,

and the issue of Communist China. United States policy on these problems must undergo the most careful re-examination."

Perhaps we can take heart from the fact that more and more often we hear from the liberals about the need to re-examine some of these problems. The danger, of course, is that this admission can become a ritualistic substitute for the re-examination itself, while the actual support for the present "policy" continues by backing up phrases about needing more strength from which to negotiate.

The year 1958 can mark the beginning of the most dangerous armament race the world has ever seen. On the other hand, it could also be the political turning point of the cold war. Which way it will go will certainly not be determined by the progress made on the development of American ICBMs, or missile-killers, but rather by the progress made in the re-examination to which Humphrey so vaguely refers.

We propose, in the next issue of LABOR ACTION, to indicate what we consider a fruitful approach to this re-examination.

What Next for Labor?

(Continued from page 1)

friends, allies and imitators. The Federation still must look into unions with a total membership about as large as those already ousted, if not larger.

There are unions, too, which won a reprieve. The Distillery Workers Union still holds its affiliation. But while the convention was in session, Negro and Puerto Rican workers demonstrated on the Atlantic City boardwalk outside Convention Hall appealing for aid against victimization by locals of this union and others: the Jewelry Workers Union, the United Textile Workers Union. The UTW also won a stay of execution, but can anyone imagine that a slight alteration of the top leadership of these two unions has transformed their whole inner life and structure?

PROBLEMS TO COME

So far, the Federation leadership has acted only against those unions publicly exposed by the McClellan Committee and even that was a tall order. But there are other terrible problems to come. Two months ago, Meany demanded an accounting from the Jewelry Workers. It is only a small union of 28,000. But the Carpenters? The labor movement still awaits an explanation from its President Maurice Huteson on his role in an Indiana land swindle. Did he manipulate union office and prestige to further his own private profit? The Carpenter's records have been subpoenaed by the McClellan Committee; will the Federation wait for a new public scandal and act later?

There is still the International Union of Operating Engineers. For years, groups of rank and files have been trying to get help from the AFL against union dictators. In 1956 a committee from local 138 in Long Island appealed to the Ethical Practices Committee. They got nowhere although Reuther, whom they got to see, told them: "I'm 1,000 per cent behind what you people are trying to do! I don't approve of any corrupt union official who puts his hands into the union funds and denies union men the right to work. Whatever you do, don't stop fighting." This is Joe Fay's old union; he was once a vice-president. The former president of local 138, William DeKoning who was sent to jail for grafting, died recently and left \$300,000 to his estate. Not bad for just a local officer. Wonder where he got it?

HOD CARRIERS

What is the real situation in the Hod Carriers Union? Here is a union which held its 7th convention in 1911 and never got around to another for 30 years; its 8th convention was called in 1941 and all incumbent officers were re-elected without opposition; in that period of lapse, in 1926 to be exact, the present union president was put in office by this "long parliament" of Hod Carriers without anything nonsensical like a membership vote or convention.

This is the union which spawned James Bove, vice-president and close collaborator of Joe Fay who lived, cooperated and went to prison with him. The official history of this union published in 1954 makes no reference to anything so sordid as racketeering in its ranks, to the role of its vice-president Bove. Is it possible that more has been overlooked? Speaking of James Cross and his rule over the Bakers, George Meany said, "I imagine if we let this fellow go until the 15th of March he will be elected unanimously by the convention!" That was only 3 months. Imagine this: the officers of the Hod Carriers had 30 years! Surely, this situation will have to get attention at the proper time.

NO EASY JOB

But, obviously, it is not an easy job and the disease is so widespread that it cannot be handled all at once or cut out at one thrust. It is not enough, either, to expell offenders. International by International; their hold over millions of decent trade unionists must be broken somehow. For that, the action of a top committee is not enough. The actions of hundreds of thousands of members must be stimulated, aroused and supported and not by resolutions alone.

We hear a lot of speeches these days advising the members of unions ousted from the Federation to rise against their rotten leaders. It is fine sentiment; but the speechmakers overlook one sordid fact: for a long time, the emphasis in our union movement has been the other way. Members were told to be silent, to support the leaders everywhere, never to revolt; never to oppose, never to protest. If James Cross' administration is now excoriated, there have been and there are officialdoms far more tyrannical and dictatorial that have pursued their merry way undisturbed by colleagues in other unions. There has never been encouragement or support to democratic rank and file movements in any union however authoritarian its leadership. Who has the right now to expect some sudden upsurge from below upon command from above?

Besides, while there is plenty of advice to Teamster ranks to rise up, there is little advice to the memberships of unions still in the Federation. In fact, there is virtual silence.

Racketeering is on the way out but there is a long fight still ahead. Out of that fight must come a union movement which is not merely honest but genuinely democratic. It is time now to change the whole milieu inside our labor movement, to make it clear that the rights of members will be defended, that the labor movement will create and preserve the democratic spirit and by turning away from bureaucracy and toward democracy create that atmosphere which makes a revival of racketeering unthinkable and impossible. In the long haul, that is the best defense of good unionism.

New Perspectives for American Socialism

The Case for Unity

Introduction by

Max Shachtman

ten cents

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.