

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 12, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## SPOTLIGHT

### IT'S A FREE COUNTRY?

The United States Navy has distributed a set of instructions to all its civilian workers in this country and abroad entitled "Counsel to Employees." Here are a couple of highlights from the instructions:

"Citizens unwittingly expose themselves to unfavorable or suspicious appraisal which they can and should avoid. This may take the form of an indiscreet remark, an unwise selection of friends or associates, or membership in an organization whose true objectives are concealed behind a popular or innocuous title. . . . You may be assured that the rights and liberties which devolve upon citizens of our country cannot be arbitrarily suspended or removed.

"But the existence of these same rights should encourage and inspire each one of us to so conduct ourselves that there cannot be the least concern on the part of our associates as to our adherence to the principles of this government, or as to our liability in furthering its defenses against enemies within or without."

Navy employees are, in addition, sternly warned to carefully check the "Attorney General's list of subversive organizations to make sure they are not associated with any of the organizations cited, and if they are, to discontinue such associations immediately."

Take heart! If you work for the Navy, your rights can't be "arbitrarily suspended or removed." Specially of you make sure you never use them to commit an unconventional act, speak a dissident word, or otherwise cause "the least concern among your associates" about your "adherence to the principles of this government. . . ."

But you have to go beyond that. The American Legion reports that a member was fired from his government job because his wife accused him of personal misconduct. Later the wife was fired from her government job because it was found that she had lied about her husband. But the government refused to reinstate the husband because being accused in public is sufficient grounds for dismissal in his particular department!

Even if you take every precaution against worrying your "associates," you are not really safe. All you need is one admittedly false accusation, and you are out.

As to the advice about immediately discontinuing any association you may have with an organization on the Attorney General's list, forget it. If any of your associates, or superiors, or the FBI find out that you ever had such an association, no matter how tenuous or innocent, you need a good lawyer.

Just to drop out quietly will not help a bit. Guilt of such association has been declared to be continuous, everlasting, retroactive, ex-postfacto, guaranteed annually and by decades, hereditary, consanguineous, conjugal, and extrasensory. It is considered inexcusable, indefensible and unpardonable. It is practically ineradicable, except by one method (and that it very unsure): informing on others.

It certainly is a relief to know that we live in a country where our rights and liberties cannot be arbitrarily suspended or removed!

## Adenauer's Trip to Moscow: No Prospect for German Unity

By MAX SHACHTMAN

German Chancellor Adenauer's visit to Moscow this week once again lifts the key question of the unification of Germany to prominence in the headlines. Yet, there is not more and probably less than one chance in a million that the conversations in Moscow will produce the reunification of Germany or result in even one positive step in that direction.

More than ever in the last decade, the Stalinists are adamant in their opposition to a united Germany, except, of course, a Germany united in subjugation to the Kremlin the way Poland and the Ukraine, among others, have been united. However, inasmuch as such a Germany is not a realistic prospect for the next period, the opposition of the Stalinists will remain what it has been, and without serious modification.

The Stalinists may indeed offer some minor concessions, both apparent and real, in exchange for the surrender of German sovereignty which has been at the basis of their demands from the first. But the offer would aim only at encouraging some elements in German bourgeois society who are playing with a policy of "Eastern orientation," some elements among the more softheaded neutralists and some of the more weakminded Social Democrats. It would not be presented with any expectation of acceptance.

Indeed, what self-respecting government, be it conservative or progressive, would of its own free will surrender its sovereign right to decide on its own military establishment and on its own foreign

policy for the sake of a dubious promise of a dubious unity made by a notoriously perfidious foreign regime which is, moreover, engaged in the military occupation of a large part of the other country and in the subjugation of a large part of its people? Such a government, more or less, was maintained during the war under the reign of Marshal Petain in the South of France, but it had no respect for itself and enjoyed no respect from anyone else. Adenauer is a good conservative bourgeois patriot and not a Petain (among other things, Germany needs no Petain today).

The Stalinists know that this fish is not for their tawdry flies and that they must do, for the time

being, with the one they have—the machinery that rules East Germany. Hence the bland announcement made by Bulganin at the famous and incredible Geneva conference two months ago that the time was "not ripe" for solving the German problem. Hence the further announcement made later in Moscow that while the Kremlin acceded to the request by Adenauer to add the question of German reunification to the subjects to be discussed during his reluctant visit, it had no intention of altering the position it indicated in Geneva.

### IRREPRESSIBLE FORCES

The forces behind the realization sooner or later of an independent united Germany are irrepressible. You have to be blinded by ignor-



ADENAUER

## This Was Labor Day 1955

Labor Day has come and gone, marked, in the East at least, only by the speechifying of labor leaders over the air. This holiday, instituted in the first place as a class-collaborationist counterweight to the militant trade unionist and socialist May Day celebrations, has tended to lose any vestiges of the participation of the workers themselves. "Old time Labor Day parades," one paper wrote, "were replaced by celebrations over the air waves."

The themes of the speeches by the various top leaders of the AFL and CIO were pretty much the same. Although they have "unlimited faith in the future of the American economy" (Reuther), they deplore the continued existence of three million unemployed, slums, inadequate schools, inflated corporation profits, the Taft Hartley Act, and the Republican administration. Reuther also warned that continuation of "the present Republican big business policy of neglecting the most needy and of favoring wealthy corporations and special interests" can "spell trouble down the road," nature not too clearly specified.

Meany concentrated on denying that the merger of the AFL and CIO would create a labor monopoly. "Nothing could be further from the truth," he said. "There

are also rumors to the effect that the merger will result in the formation of a labor party here in America. I do not know of a single responsible trade union leader who favors such a step."

James B. Carey of the IUE made the strongest attack on the Republicans, and specifically included Eisenhower in his indictment, thus following in the path of Harry Truman's recent speeches. Reuther, after attacking the administration ended his speech in typical fashion: "American labor calls upon the leaders of government and industry who currently occupy positions of authority and responsibility to abandon their policy of rewarding special interests at the expense of the people and to demonstrate the vision and the will to lead an effective crusade of action, not of words, against America's slums, against America's antiquated schools, against inadequate health facilities and against the many other problems which cry for solution."

In short: the American capitalist system is best for the workers and the people as a whole. Of course, the government in league with the great corporations, has shackled labor (Taft Hartley), assured vast profits to the favored

(Turn to last page)

ance, or even worse by chauvinism, not to see that whatever else our epoch may or may not be, one thing is certain: it is not the epoch of empire building. The old ones are either falling apart or being smashed to bits; and no new ones can take their place.

The most backward of peoples in the most backward of countries—at least by yesterday's standards—are rising, often against overwhelmingly unfavorable odds from the military standpoint, to emancipate themselves from alien and imperialist rule. It is the height of absurdity to think that in such a period the most advanced and cultured peoples of the modern world, who have known and enjoyed national independence, some of them for centuries, will docilely tolerate being deprived of it or even having it curtailed by the

(Turn to last page)

Auto Workers

Victory at Chrysler Once More Proves the Point

# Unionism: The Source of Workers' Gains

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Sept. 2—The successful conclusion of negotiations with Chrysler and the American Motors Corporation has placed the United Autoworkers Union (CIO) in a strategic position in the American labor movement in the coming period, able to devote itself to some of the problems of labor unity and political action.

In the year 1956, the autoworkers are going to get an automatic

six cents per hour raise, and also see the application in practice of the modified guaranteed annual wage program, while the escalator clauses will soften the impact of any further inflation in the economy.

**It is within the framework of this over-all picture, that the UAW leadership expects to operate, or more exactly, to concentrate in the field of political action. Even within the limitations of the contracts,**

**and the irritating resurgence of shop problems and moods of dissatisfaction in the ranks, the UAW still established a major point with the rank and file that needed emphasis badly: the source of any gains for the working people is unionism.**

More than in the case of any other of the major negotiations, those with Chrysler were an illustration. In Ford, there was not much understanding or approval

of the GAW by the ranks, who didn't get the feel of victory in establishing a principle. In General Motors a similar phenomenon was evident. But in Chrysler, there was little if any dispute over the economic package, nor was there any concern in the ranks about it. Chrysler wouldn't give more, and the union couldn't afford to get less. The big and crucial issue was: what would happen to bargaining and working conditions? Would Chrysler's plan to put a GM method of operations into effect succeed?

## UNTIL THE LAST MINUTE

Until the very last minute it was apparent that Chrysler thought the union would retreat at least somewhat. After all, in the former Briggs division, for example, there are 520 chief stewards for 30,000 workers! At Chrysler and Dodge plants, chief stewards also function full time, even though the language of the contract is not clear on this point at all.

**Neither Emil Mazey nor Norman Mathews had any intention of going backwards on this issue with the active leadership of all Michigan CIO labor watching closely for this one. Quite the contrary. As deadline time approached last week, the union became more adamant and the corporation more desperate. It had announced to its management personnel that a new bargaining structure would go into effect after a new contract was signed.**

For Michigan labor — and for the 139,000 Chrysler employees mainly situated in this state—the events of the last day served to enhance the reputation of the UAW. For the corporation folded up, not the union. All the important details, concessions, etc., were secondary to this decisive fact. Last year, in the year of recession, the union was wobbly on its feet in the plants, as lay-offs, speed-ups, and cutbacks kept a pattern of anxiety, uncertainty and fear as a dominant theme at Chrysler. (Of course, at GM and Ford plants, working five and six days a week last year, a different mood prevailed.)

## CONFIDENCE IN UNIONISM

In the context of this situation, the victory at Chrysler is all the greater, for the psychological mood of the ranks and the leaderships has changed. Confidence in unionism has been restored. New problems and old problems will be met with a different kind of outlook by the local union leaderships.

**This does not signify that all is peace and harmony. There are many hints that the separate agreement signed by Mazey for Automotive Body (formerly Briggs) is better in some respects than the rest of Chrysler, which if true is bound to be an irritant for the next three years. But it will also serve as a goal for the Chrysler locals to reach.**

In American Motors, Leonard Woodcock, the new UAW vice president, managed to retain the shop gains which the company was so anxious to chisel down, and the general economic package was won, with a concession on the part of the union on the GAW going into effect.

# LABOR SCOPE

## Era of Labor Peace Marked by "First Strike in 70 Years"

By BEN HALL

Chrysler and American Motors [Hudson-Nash] fell in line last week accepting the pattern of settlement with the United Auto Workers Union. Studebaker and Kaiser remain as the last holdouts in the auto industry while negotiations continue in the agricultural implement field. It is virtually certain that there will be no protracted strikes in auto—somewhat less certain in farm implement. The major contracts are successfully signed but in every case only after strike threats or short strikes.

### UNION STANDS FIRM

The Chrysler strike officially lasted only 6¼ hours; but this fact could be misleading: negotiations were not cut and dried. Even after the company had agreed to meet the full Ford-GM pattern, accord was not possible. Union bargainers refused to drop their own demands or to yield to company demands on a series of technical (to outsiders) questions of vital concern to local unions. Agreement on the big, broad public issues had to await decision on matters which directly affected the actual daily working conditions of union members. Not until the strike began at midnight, August 31, did the company finally give in. The union insisted on an end to pay-differentials for similar jobs; on better seniority and transfer rights; an improved steward system; and the right to strike over production standards.

**When the hour sounded for the brief strike to begin a group of top negotiators left the conference tables to join in "Solidarity Forever," the fighting union song, sung on every picket line and at every mass rally. They were not vociferous rank and filers; they had come as responsible representatives. But apparently they were sensitive to the mood of the ranks back in the shops—they knew that the members expected a contract victory to be felt right on the job. It was something impressed upon the leaders by the puzzling aftermath of the GM contract.**

To the amazement of UAW top leaders, a series of local strikes erupted just before and after the GM settlement. And, although the contract was a big victory, the top GM bargaining committee had a rough time at the GM Council

meeting called to ratify it.

The GM bargaining committee, headed by Livingstone, UAW vice-president, anticipated a quick routine session — everyone going through the motions smiling—to give a formal O.K. Instead, the Council, consisting of more than 200 representatives from GM locals, uncorked a barrage of none-too-delicate outbursts against the tactics of its top negotiators. The meeting, originally scheduled to adjourn in the early afternoon, dragged out until late at night.

**The critics were aroused by the committee's failure to back up the locals in the fight to settle local grievances. They were vexed by the same problems that held up the Chrysler settlement: pay differentials; seniority and transfers; speed-up; stewards rights. Such grievances seldom break out into dramatic news headlines; but they accumulate into an intolerable burden for men who work under them every hour and year. At Chrysler, the negotiators apparently were aware of the facts of life. But in GM they had been ignored.**

Traditionally, such local questions are negotiated between single plant managements and UAW locals. During the course of the five-year contracts, locals could bargain their heads off, but the final weapon was denied them: they could not strike. When the old agreement expired, locals were at last free to fight. While locals were in the actual process of negotiating with their plant bosses and getting ready to strike on purely local questions if necessary, they were undercut by their national negotiators. The top GM union bargainers, as part of the price for the national settlement, waived all unsettled union claims including local demands. At one stroke, the ground was cut from under the locals; with the signing of the national agreement, top union negotiators had signed away their right to strike on local issues. Their most effective weapon was gone.

### Studebaker

Studebaker still holds out against the union and as this is written the company plant in South Bend is shut down by a strike that began on September 1. Strikes are not a novelty, generally

speaking. *But this is the first strike at Studebaker, according to company reports, since the Knights of Labor shut down its wagon plant in the 1880's.*

Last year, Studebaker Local 5 agreed to shift from piece work to day work in order to save money for the company and keep it competitive. It meant a wage cut of 14 per cent to the workers and they submitted to a management ultimatum only after a serious internal union fight. Not long before, the local had conducted a big high pressure sales campaign to induce or force its members to buy Studebakers, and nothing else. There, writers on labor affairs rushed to say, is a picture of harmony that portends a new era of company-union peace and cooperation in the whole nation.

**It turned out to be an oddly inept example. In July, the company laid off 1700 workers, permanently. Not only had it profited from the voluntary wage cut; it had also embarked on an intensive speed-up campaign. Workers had to work faster; relief periods were cut out; the right to transfer to new jobs was curtailed. Soon, the company was able to cut its work force by 15 per cent and still maintain production at old levels. More work with fewer men at lower wage rates.**

But by this time, the local had a new president, Bill Ogden. He was the man who had led the opposition to accepting the wage cut, elected in an overwhelming vote of confidence. The old president, Louis Horvath, who had campaigned for accepting the cut, knew that he faced a stunning defeat and decided not to run.

And now, the first strike in 70 years reminds us of the class struggle in this strange era of labor peace.

Have you read . . .

### "NEXT— A LABOR PARTY!"

by

Jack Ranger

*A discussion for trade-unionists of American labor's greatest lack and greatest need.*

25 cents

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# Truman "Gives 'em Hell"—But Dems. and GOP Are United on One Investigation Which Will Not Come Off

By SAM TAYLOR

In recent years it has become one of the argumentative precepts of American politics to shout out "let's see deeds and not words." While it has been used primarily as a posture in foreign affairs when dealing with Russia and its allies, its applicability to the domestic scene should not be overlooked.

A close-to-home situation is brought to mind by the speeches ex-President Truman is making on a stumping tour of the mid-West. "Give 'em hell" Harry Truman is kicking off the 1956 presidential campaign for the Democratic Party, or at least for one wing of the party. By and large, it is an attempt to repeat the performance of the 1948 election. At that time, Truman was the undisputed underdog and the only question seemed to be the size of Dewey's victory.

"Injunction Harry," as he was also known in labor circles, changed horses in mid-stream, and went on to a vigorous attack on the Republican Party as the tool of Big Business, the party of the Great Depression and won a second term. The Democratic Party was portrayed as the party of the people, of prosperity, the enemy of Big Business and the only party to keep the lords of wealth from controlling the government. Needless to say, the words had no relationship to Truman's deeds.

While no one operated with the crassness of a Charles Wilson or a Harold Talbott, Big Business was not without influence in the government. Powerful bankers, corporation executives and their lawyers moved in and out of the administration with the familiarity known only to intimate members of the family.

## WILL NOT CONCEDE

The liberal and Fair Deal wing of the Democratic Party is not ready to concede the 1956 election to Eisenhower in advance, as seems to be the mood of the Congressional leaders. Truman is giving them the line: the Republican Party is the party of Big Business and it is destroying all the gains of the Fair and New Deal. While he is wrong on the second point, he has a case on the first. The Republicans are the out and out party of Big Business.

The record of the Democratic Party, especially in the past session of Con-

gress, is scarcely one to support any argument demonstrating the ability of the Democrats to carry on a real campaign against Big Business domination of the government. We will hear a great deal about the public vs. private power issue, especially Dixon-Yates, since cheap power rates have a widespread consumer appeal. But just as importantly because the Democrats have the backing of powerful industrial interests concerned about cheap power as a cost of running their business.

## ABSENT ISSUES

Far more important are the issues the Democrats will not raise. For example, the give-away of the atomic energy program. After the government spent billions on the development of atomic energy, it is now being turned over to industrial corporations and utilities. The same issues that are raised in a Dixon-Yates deal are present in the atomic energy situation. But the Fair Dealers will maintain a discreet silence—for this would really be an attack on Big Business.

And even in a case where the Democrats had a good issue, they pursued it with all the ferocity of a reluctant dragon. The case at point is the activities of the former Secretary of Air Harold Talbott who was caught soliciting business for a firm in which he was a partner from corporations holding important Air Force contracts. Talbott, it would seem, was forced to resign for committing the unpardonable sin—he got caught doing openly and flagrantly what thousands of other businessmen do more discreetly. They just can't help themselves. They have important connections with the largest corporations and it is with these corporations that the government does most of its business.

But the Senate Committee on Government Operations, headed by Democratic

Senator McClellan of Arkansas, treated Talbott ever so gently. Talbott had to go. This Democratic-controlled committee had to investigate "Big Business in government." But its heart wasn't in the job. It seems that Talbott had helped McClellan raise funds for his campaign to win the Democratic Senatorial nomination last year. And McClellan responded during the hearing by stating that while he had to carry on the investigation he was not going to lead the wolf pack against Talbott. And the rest of the Democrats on the committee were only scarcely less solicitous of Talbott than the Republicans who were his open defenders.

The latest case where the Democratic deeds come nowhere near matching their words has to do with an investigation that never came off. The issue is also "businessmen in government."

Representative Wright Patman, a maverick Texas Democrat, tried to get the House to pass a resolution calling for an investigation of the operation of the Federal Reserve Board's Open Market Committee. The OMC supervises the buying and selling of government securities in the open market by the Federal Reserve System, thereby encouraging or restraining the level of bank loans.

The Open Market Committee consists of 12 financiers who control the expansion and contraction of the \$25 billion holdings (or portfolios) of government securities owned by the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. This committee is virtually autonomous, answering to no one and not under Congressional direction to pursue one policy or another.

## WHY SO MUCH PROFIT?

Long a critic of the Federal Reserve policies, Rep. Patman wanted to find out why commercial bank profits from the sale of mainly government securities showed such a sharp increase last year. According to Patman, they rose 996.5 per cent over 1953, and there has been no denial of this figure from Federal Reserve officials.

The investigation was to look into the reason why there were such sharp fluctuations in the price of government securities last year, and the role that OMC had in these fluctuations.

After the Patman resolution passed the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Treasury Department and banker's lobbyists began to swarm all over the House seeking to line up votes against its approval. The opposition to the investigation was led by a group of Southern Democrats, in particular Representative Howard Smith of Virginia. (The same Smith who sired the infamous Smith Act.) To the pleas of "don't rock the boat," don't disturb the delicate balance of the bond market or the economy as a whole, the House defeated the Patman resolution 214 to 178.

This was a clear-cut victory for the banking and financial interests whose profits in the present boom have been among the best of any sector in the economy. The banks have been making handsome profits as the economy spirals up in the boom phase and as the demand for bank loans increases. Then, as the Federal Reserve System moves in to tame the boom by raising interest rates, thereby making credit more expensive, the large commercial banks profit even more. As well as they did last year, *The Journal of Commerce* estimates that just because of the rising interest rates the larger banks are going to increase their operating earnings by at least 15 per cent in the second half of this year as against a year ago. And the expectation right now is that interest rates will inch up again in the fall.

## GOVERNMENT BOND BONANZA

The significance of the House vote is not that it prevented an investigation of the operations of the Open Market Committee where it would have had to justify one policy as against another. If that were all, the investigation might have gone through, even over Treasury and Federal Reserve opposition. Patman was interested in why the larger banks did so well in their buying and selling of government securities.

Last December a subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report on which Patman holds a seat, held a hearing on "United States Monetary Policy: Recent Thinking and Experience." At the hearing, Patman questioned William McChesney Martin Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on the operation of the OMC. He pointed out that High Treasury Department officials are legally enjoined from owning government bonds and securities because they are in a position to determine policy affecting their value. And since the Treasury has this rule, Patman wanted to know whether the Federal Reserve System and the OMC had a similar one in effect. Martin replied that they did not, but they relied on the ethics and morality of individuals not to do anything wrong and that he did not think that any rules would work which could not be easily circumvented. This is a fine testimonial to the ethics and morality of these bankers.

Therefore when Patman wanted to investigate the Federal Reserve and high bank profits, he was indicating that he wanted to inquire whether any of these officials or their banks stood to profit from the decisions they formulated as OMC policy.

## ALL THE SAME FAMILY

If a thorough investigation were made, not merely whether OMC officials have personally gained because of their actions, as in the Talbott affair, but into their banking connections which stood to profit, then this had the potential of a really meaningful "businessmen in government" investigation. That's because it is impossible to make the separation between the OMC's policies and the profits made by the banks since they are tied by interlocking personnel.

However, this investigation will not come off. There will be no real investigation of the influence, and a profitable influence, wielded by big corporation and financial interests in the government. At best, any individual, who steps too far out of line or tries to be a hog, will be forced to resign. Always the individual will be to blame, never the system which makes corruption, though not always as it is legally defined, inevitable. But the sorry record of the Democratic Party will, of course, not restrain Truman and many liberals from going about speechifying that the issue in the '56 election will be "businessmen in government;" and that the election of a Democratic president will put an end to their predominant influence and control.

## BOOKS AND IDEAS

Peter Abrahams' MINE BOY

# Integrity, Courage and Hope

By PRISCILLA CADY

MINE BOY, by Peter Abrahams.—Alfred A. Knopf, 252 pages, \$1.25.

Peter Abrahams is a South African Colored writer whose work is consistently fresh and interesting. His latest book, *Mine Boy*, is the story of Xuma, who comes from a farm in the North to work in the mines of Johannesburg. He falls in with a highly interesting group of people, all of whom bear the scars of battle for a life of decency and integrity in a ghetto slum.

Leah, who sells illegal liquor, who is the prop of many dependents, whose warmth and integrity battle with the harsh needs of reality, eventually goes to jail. "Daddy," the drunken slob, the neighborhood clown, is cared for tenderly until his death by the women who remember when he was respected for his wisdom and courage, when it was an honor to be his friend—"such a man as I have never seen." Johannes, "boss boy" at the mines, who when sober is mild-mannered and sad, and when drunk proclaims, "I am J. P. Williamson, and I'll kill the sonofabitch." Eliza, the school teacher, whom Xuma loves, torn between her people and their debased condition and her intense longing for the intellectual and material riches that she realizes the world contains, finally goes away alone to seek a personal solution to the problem.

Xuma, who comes to understand some of what Eliza has felt, learns a vital lesson in the mines where, befriended by an intelligent, radical white worker he comes to understand that the line between exploiter and exploited is not drawn only by the color bar and that the ties of hu-

manity must transcend the divisions of color. "People were people. Not white and black people. Just people. Ordinary people. And one could understand a white person as well as a black person. And be sorry for white as well as black. . . ." The book ends as Xuma and his friend precipitate a strike over unsafe working conditions in the mine.

Peter Abrahams, whose work heretofore has such varied types as an historical novel of the Great Boer Trek and an autobiography (*Tell Freedom*), has an artist's sense of the relation of form to content, and in telling this story of a young countryman's growth toward maturity and understanding he uses a succinct, unsophisticated style that is highly effective.

In his work we find that the novel of "social significance" is by no means dead, that it lives where artists have not turned in upon themselves but seek to evoke people grappling with real, immediate problems, and growing in the process. At the end of *Mine Boy* we are left with the feeling that the strike will be a tremendous experience for Xuma, and although jail is his inevitable lot he will have burst the bonds of his former unaware condition and become a man struggling

for the development of man. (We cannot refrain, at this point, from mentioning an egregious error in the publisher's blurb of this book—"Xuma came from the tribal past, from the Stone Age, into the big city of the technological present." [Italics mine, P. C.] The tribal past from which Xuma came is a brilliant one, although now debased, and many, many, centuries beyond the Stone Age.)

Peter Abrahams possesses an almost unique gift in these days of disillusionment and apathy—in the midst of sordid surroundings he presents us with integrity, in the presence of tremendous odds he shows us courage, and in the face of despair he draws forth hope, not the hope of easy panaceas, but the hope inherent in man's dogged determination not to give in.

## SOUTH AFRICAN NOTES

East London newspapers reported some time ago the case of Mlonge Tembeni, who was found guilty of stealing a sheep from his employer and sentenced to nine months' imprisonment and a fine of £20, 15s 6d or a further two months' imprisonment.

What are politely known as the "extenuating" circumstances are these: Tembeni has a wife and six children, two of them new-born twins. His salary is one pound a month, but of this he received only ten shillings because Ivan Oswald Bursey, his employer, deducted ten shillings for having taken his wife to the hospital. His food ration was a four-gallon tin of mealies a week.

"If your wife and children starve you would do anything," Tembeni said.

## WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

## DISCUSSION ON ARGENTINA

# All Political Currents Join Fight "To the Bitter End"

The following article was written by Juan Rey on August 20, over a week before the latest offer of Peron to resign, the staged demonstration on his behalf, and his announcement that all opposition to his regime is to be "exterminated."

We print Comrade Rey's article, despite the fact that it is no longer altogether timely, because it is a further elaboration of his views of the nature of the Peron regime, the forces now ranged against it, and of the attitude and policy of revolutionary socialists in the struggle which has reached a new peak of intensity in Argentina.

In this connection, we would like to refer our readers to the discussion on this subject between Comrades S. R. and Hal Draper in the August 22 issue of LABOR ACTION. It does not appear that Comrade Rey had received this issue at the time he wrote his article. Nevertheless, it is part of the same discussion.—ED.

By JUAN REY

Even if the anti-Peron revolution did not overthrow him it shook his bonapartist dictatorship so that he was forced to resign the presidency of the Peronist party; to declare himself an impartial "president of all Argentines"; and to decree "the end of the Peronist revolution," "after profound reflection."

The brand-new "president of all Argentines" was also obliged to beg the opposition for an "armistice," and to guarantee opposition parties the right to public expression. But the opposition, one party after the other, have rejected the Peronists' magnanimity and have declared that no peace will be possible in Argentina as long as Peron is president of the republic, and that if he wants to get a political armistice, he will have to go.

## COURAGE OF OPPOSITION

The courage of the Argentine opposition is to be admired; that of the Radicals as well as of the Socialists who, in spite of terror and persecution, are fighting for their programs. Anyone who knows Argentina can understand how difficult and dangerous this fight of the opposition is for leaders and rank-and-filers, such as Alfredo Palacios of the Socialist Party, and many others who were imprisoned for years by Peron's police.

Of course, Juan Domingo Peron's little game is that of a crooked gambler. He hopes to gain time, and to cheat the opposition. Meanwhile, he "reorganized" the Army and Navy, and purged opponents from the state and military apparatus. After he had consolidated anew his strength in the Navy and Air Force, and strengthened the police force, he began to talk tough again. The Peronist party, now

formally without the presidency of the "beloved leader," declared that it will once again take up the fight against the people's enemies, and that it will win. Of course, the Peronist party does not intend to pay for a political armistice with the head of Juan Domingo, because he counts on the support of the people, etc., etc., they said.

On the other hand, the Peronist police have discovered a new "conspiracy" against the life of the "beloved leader" prepared by the "Catholics, Nationalists, Radicals, Socialists, and Communists." The police have arrested many people in Buenos Aires and the provinces. This is the dictator's answer to the opposition's courageous declarations which demanded his resignation from the presidency as the condition of a political armistice.

There will be no peace in Argentina as long as Juan Domingo remains in power. The political struggle is assuming a more and more popular character, and is spreading from the government and armed forces to the streets. If the army rebellion against Peron was a military conspiracy without coordination with the political fight of the masses, now the anti-Peronist struggle is entering into a new period. This is an open political fight against the dictatorship by all political currents, as the Peronist police admit.

Only the Stalinist organs are appraising the Argentine revolution as a mobilization of reactionary forces against the social conquests of "Justicialismo." [Peron's term for the goal of his movement.—Ed.] But revolutionary socialism cannot accept this point of view, because every revolution in countries where no democracy exists begins with the decomposition of the government and armed forces as the condition for the revolutionary struggle of the masses in the streets. That was true not only for France and Russia; it is even truer in a revolution against a totalitarian dictatorship.

## TO THE "BITTER END"

If the decomposition of the governing State and its armed forces is the precondition to the armed, revolutionary insurrection of the people against every autocracy and specially against totalitarian tyranny, then the armed uprising of the opposition circles in the Army, Navy and Air Force, even if it was defeated, signifies the beginning of the Argentine revolution against Peronism. This fight will have its ups and downs, but it will continue to the "bitter end." The decisive credentials in this fight will belong to the Argentine workers.

It is quite erroneous to think that the Argentine workers will back the Peronist dictatorship. In the recent rebellion, the Peronist unions did not back the dictator, not only because of the pressure of the armed forces, but because of the indifference of the working class to the destiny of "Justicialismo."

It is not so much that the Argentine workers back Peron's dictatorship, but that they fear the right opposition. The vanguard of the Argentine proletariat belongs to the Socialist and Communist parties, and is anti-Peronist. The Peronist-forced unions represent the true feelings of the Argentine workers as little as the bureaucratized unions in Russia express the political emotions of the Russians proletariat today. If the opposition could win over the Argentine workers to its fight, that is, if it could elaborate a modern workers' policy, the defeat of the Peronist dictatorship would be inevitable. The solution of this problem belongs to the Argentine Socialist Party, to the independent Communist workers, to the anti-Stalinist left, and to the old union militants.

## LABOR ACTION EXCLUSIVE

# SWP Proclaims New Turn to Mass Work

We reprint below some excerpts from a recent (June 1955) bulletin of the Socialist Workers Party.

## LETTER FROM JAMES P. CANNON

"I am inclined to believe that the most fertile field for preliminary recruiting will be found among the unemployed, the discriminated minorities, and the student who are beginning to graduate into the labor force without finding any jobs open." And elsewhere: "... my own conclusion, from all the experiences up to date, is that all the old movements in this country are exhausted—not only in their own revolutionary potential, but also as primary sources of recruiting for a new revolutionary party. Except for isolated individuals, the new troops for a radical revival in this country will come from fresh elements who have not gone through the experience of Stalinist and social reformist organizations; who will be pushed onto the road of radicalism by the conditions of their lives; and who will get the first introduction to revolutionary theory and practice from us."

## LETTER FROM M. WEISS TO JPC:

"The most important point you raise is the prospect of a revolutionary tendency emerging among the youth and what importance this has for the future of our movement. It is entirely correct to envision that a contest will take place for the allegiance of these youth. Our task in this process is to connect these youth with the rich traditions and ideology of international and American Marxism and to defeat the counterfeits. This task is a current one. It must take place today in the form of ideological preparation of our own ranks and in struggle with other tendencies in the radical movement.

"In this respect I think we should combat all inclinations to regard our struggles with the revisionists of all forms as a finished chapter belonging to the dead past. We will be badly mistaken if we think we can 'by-pass' even the Shachtmanites, as well as the Cochranites, in ideological battles. The awakening youth will examine all programs and tendencies. They will not take our word for anything. We will have to review and bring up to date all the great faction fights. These fights, after all, were not factional brawls. Nor were they concerned over obscure doctrinal fine points of interest only to a sect. They were over the great programmatic issues of our epoch and they have burning meaning in the world today.

"Take our work on the college campus. In my opinion both the Shachtmanites and the Cochranites are important opponents to our movement in this arena. Any attitude that we can turn our backs on them and work in unploughed territory is a dangerous half truth.

"This does not mean that we are interested in any fusion or entry maneuvers with these people. Our only interest is how to smash them. But this must be done at every stage anew. And it must be done with ideological weapons."

"I am worried that our student work will not get to first base until we've taken off our coats and done a job on the Shachtmanites. The brutal fact is that they have more on the campus than we do. And much more important, they stand in a position to disorient and demoralize awakening elements that are looking for a radical solution."

"We ought to sail into this treacherous gang where they are in our way and show them up for what they are—would-be 'left' advisors of the State Department. Instead, I must say that I detect

a certain inadequacy and defensiveness among our people when they are confronted by some verbose Shachtmanite social patriot.

"The same thing is true in a more important sense about the Sweezy-Cochranite bloc. We have to subject it to a merciless scrutiny. They are getting away with murder, because of our silence. The Cochranites are walking on air because the *Monthly Review* editors have paid them a left handed compliment. In return the Cochranites praise these Moscow Trial Stalinists as 'Marxists' with a 'grasp of world realities.'

"The high road to the mass movement of the American workers will not be reached by some political helicopter which will land us right in the middle of a leftward moving mass of workers. We are compelled to take tortuous side paths and engage in many a skirmish before we can reach the high road.

"The fact is that the general ideological backwash in the U. S. has affected our movement. The whole anti-theoretical, apolitical reactionary atmosphere causes even our own ranks to manifest indifference toward our past ideological struggles. The base of the party does not stand fully on the assimilated lessons of these struggles, ready to do battle with any and all comers. Notwithstanding the fight with Cochranism and Pabloism our people are politically apathetic. Such is the enormous weight of the alien pressure on the movement.

"Perhaps I exaggerate, but I prefer to look at the situation cold bloodedly. You may remember that during the interim period in the fight with the Cochranites I told you that my impression was that you couldn't state a single proposition of American Trotskyism without being challenged on all sides within our own movement. This was the mood that formed the basis of a split. Today the situation has altered considerably. Every proposition of American Trotskyism can be stated unchallenged within the SWP but there aren't very many comrades who actively concern themselves with theoretical, historical and programmatic questions.

"I'm in favor of opening a sustained, polemical attack against all our opponents. I think the Cochranite-Sweezyite combination should be high on the list. The Shachtmanites a close second, particularly in the student field."

## FARRELL DOBBS IN A TOUR REPORT:

"We should also watch for a peg to make an attack on the Shachtmanites on two points. One, advocacy of slowing down the class struggle to aid imperialism, which is social patriotism. Two, participation in the Democratic Party primaries, which is class collaboration. Their line traces to their Russian position as does their theory of abandoning the concept of a vanguard party to function as a loyal left wing of the social democracy. The dissident Shachtmanites (sic) lean toward a new version of the Debsian SP. We should debate with the Shachtmanites only on carefully chosen occasions where they have somebody we want. It should not be made a general practice. That would divert from and obstruct our main work."

"Our main source of recruits will not be among Shachtmanites, dissident Shachtmanites, Cochranites or dissident Stalinists. The central function of our polemics against these elements is to educate and harden our own cadres, and prevent these opponents from confusing our prospective recruits. Our main arena will be among the awakening elements in the general mass movement, especially the unemployed, the minority peoples, women workers and the youth generally ... etc."

## 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. 2—Independent Socialism and the Third World War
- No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?
- No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class

## THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A basic primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

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



**LABOR ACTION**

September 12, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 37

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## French Socialist Calls for Firm Third Camp Program

By EDWARD HILL

In the July-August issue of *Correspondance Socialiste Internationale*, there is a discussion of the Big Power Conference and the detente by Marceau Pivert, the well known leader of the left-wing tendency within the SFIO. This article is part of a continuing analysis which has included a reprint of Max Shachtman's *New Internationalist* piece on co-existence. A summary of Pivert's point of view should be of considerable interest to Third Camp socialists.

### ROLL OF MASSES

Pivert begins by placing great emphasis on the role which the masses, and particularly the working class in various countries, has played in bringing about the detente. He also feels that the impossible direction of the armaments race—a catastrophic nuclear war—penetrated into the thinking of even the imperialist leaders and was another factor in their decision to negotiate. This negotiation, however, will of course not put the basic question on the agenda: the nature of the exploitive social systems of the two camps.

Yet given this extremely limited scope of negotiations—that it takes place within the framework of imperialist politics—Pivert still feels that the coming period opens up the possibility of a significant change in socialist thought and action. In Germany, for example, the action of the working class with regard to re-armament has proved the worth of independent socialist politics. In other countries, the detente will allow for a change in those social democratic parties which have made support of the Western camp their sole excuse for politics in recent years. Pivert finds an example of this in his own party where the attitude on German re-armament is already changing.

The basis for this change in socialist politics is listed programmatically by Pivert: the right of the German people to rule themselves; the affirmation of an international socialist solidarity in the struggle against rearmament; the right of the workers to go beyond the period of imperialist military competition and to demand collective security through general disarmament. To these points, Pivert emphatically adds, the struggle for socialism, the refusal of the workers to obey the ruling classes of the various exploitive systems.

### GENEVA CHANGED LITTLE

Geneva, Pivert feels, changed little. "Only the affirmation of the class line, the international solidarity of the working class, only the march of the people toward their common goals can give a positive content to the detente." In particular, Pivert feels that the slogans of German unity and disarmament provide a rallying point for a vast popular movement. At the same time, this socialist action must be coupled with a relentless exposure of the imperialists, from Yalta

through Vietnam to the case of Germany.

The way in which Pivert advocates that this be done is initially through a mobilization of workingclass action confronting the negotiators with a solid, mass front, and forcing them to take various progressive steps. In all of this, Pivert emphasizes the need for international workingclass organization. Only if class solidarity goes beyond national boundaries, he feels, can it actually make itself an effective force in international politics.

### THIRD CAMP POLICY

Pivert concludes this general discussion with an appeal to the supporters of the "New Left" in France. The major point which he raises is that of the Third Camp, of the necessity for freedom from ties to either of the two imperialist camps. It is impossible, notes Pivert, to raise any kind of a program calling for socialist solidarity and then to subordinate that program to the exigencies of one or the other war camps. This point in turn leads to a consideration of the New Left's penchant for talking in terms of another united front of socialists and Communists.

Pivert writes: "With regard to the popular front, we must speak plainly: the key to the victory of the struggle against militarism and against tyranny is in the international solidarity and action of the working class." A movement which has in it a tendency of support for one of the two camps—in this case, the Stalinist—cannot possibly raise such a slogan. Pivert points out that the Stalinist-oriented militants of the New Left are actually afraid to make any criticisms of Stalinism. To this, he counterposes the need for a class program based upon the international needs of the working class and therefore hostile to both camps. In certain cases, of course, Pivert sees unity of action between socialists and Stalinists—in strikes, in defense against fascists, etc.—but this is something other than a popular front.

### FOR GERMAN UNITY

Finally, Pivert insists that the issue which provides the basis for the organization of international socialist action is that of Germany. He feels that it is absolutely essential that Third Camp socialists should struggle for German unity and a revision of the Paris and Warsaw agreements. Here again, the method of the fight is that of mobilizing sentiment in all countries, of attempting to create an international labor point of view on this subject. It is interesting to note that Pivert concludes his article with a strong statement on the necessity of struggling against Stalinism in France:

"If the Russian people, by one means or another, show themselves to be capable of liquidating the heritage of crimes and cynical monstrosities by which Stalin has dishonored a great revolution, then the emancipation of the working class will have taken a giant step. But those who favor this liquidation, they are the socialists who are faithful to the revolution—not those who follow its degeneration."

### CHINA

## Idealism, Critical Spirit of Youth Seen as Peril to Stalinist Rule

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The Stalinization of the Chinese Revolution is a process which has developed gradually. When Mao's government took power in 1949, the evidence indicates vast popular support. But within two years, it was necessary to begin a "Year of Terror," and throughout the six years of the Peking regime there have been growing indications that the Chinese Stalinists are creating a totalitarian political apparatus on the Russian model. The July 23 issue of the *London Economist* has an interesting comment on one of these cases which effect the youth of China.

When the first inter-party purges were announced by the Chinese Stalinists this year, one of them concerned Hu Feng and his "clique" of students, young writers, poets and critics. The crime for which this group was denounced was a failure to follow the party line on "socialist realism." And crime it was, for a symposium of chief justices declared that "to safeguard socialist construction, judicial personnel should . . . use their right to impose sentences as weapons to smash the Hu Feng clique."

What were the acts which justified this attitude? First, that in 1947 Hu Feng had disparaged Kuo Mo-jo as a "silly fool" who pretended to be "sitting on the throne of literature." Needless to say, Kuo Mo-jo is now president of the Academy of Sciences, a chief propagandist for the regime, and has denounced Hu Feng as "anti-socialist." Another member of the clique complained that the Chinese novel lacked real characters; another of the conviction that the socialist hero must be perfect; a third wrote a realistic novel about the countryside which did not conform to state "realism."

As a general trend, the Hu Feng clique reacted to the state-imposed line in art by moving toward a kind of romanticism. In a sort of Wordsworthian theory, they urge people to write in everyday language about everyday things, "the wind, flowers, snow and moon." Hu-Feng himself appears to have been a Young Communist in the early

1920's, but to have broken with the party at that time. He apparently rejoined in recent years. This fact would seem to indicate that the regime is not dealing with an unsophisticated group which lacks familiarity with the party line.

It was probably this disturbing fact which formed the basis of the violent Stalinist reaction to the "Hu Feng clique." When the attack against Hu Feng was first announced in the *Peking People's Daily* early last May, the group was described as "anti-party." It then became, by the dreary and predictable pattern of totalitarian semantics, "counter-revolutionary," "anti-people," and of course Hu Feng and his youth followers were charged with being "connected with the imperialists and Chiang Kai-shek's secret agents." Just in case these accusations did not sink in, Hu Feng was denounced for protecting his family's property against the land reform program, and one of his associates was brought up on charges of murder and rape.

All of this is evidence of the fact that the Chinese Stalinists have learned in six years what it took Stalin himself two decades to put into practice: the mechanics of totalitarianism. The Hu Feng incident makes clear that Peking is no ordinary "dictatorship," for dictatorships usually content themselves with the murder of actual political oppositionists. It is only totalitarianism which has put forward the principle that all areas of life—literature, art, science, etc.—are potential rallying points for enemies of the state and therefore must be under strict control. And among the areas which totalitarianism finds of greatest danger is that of the youth.

Here there is a dangerous idealism, a critical spirit, a refusal to accept literary lines from above. The Chinese Stalinists have learned their tactics well. "New China" will not be required to go through a long agony in which freedom is gradually amputated, as in the case of Russia. "New China," as the Hu Feng incident with its campaign against the youth indicates, begins with the sophistication of almost four decades of Russian Stalinism.

**CHALLENGE** Salutes the Second National Convention  
of the  
**YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE**  
A Full Report of the Convention Proceedings Will Follow Soon

BOOKS AND IDEAS Daniel Guérin's Book

## Twilight of French Empire

AU SERVICE DES COLONISES by Daniel Guérin—Editions de Minuit, 319 pages, Paris, 1954.

By A. GIACOMETTI

The French colonial empire is collapsing under our eyes; its agony is spread all over the headlines of the world press. It has lasted longer than its British and Dutch counterparts, based as it was on less developed regions; but it has lasted only to disintegrate more violently and brutally. In 1945 Syria and Lebanon won their independence; then Algeria, Indochina and Madagascar revolted, soon to be followed by Morocco and Tunisia. Today Indochina has fallen, North Africa has risen in revolt, and revolt is spreading to Tropical Africa. Africa, the last stronghold and refuge of Western imperialism, is being drawn into the struggle. New forms of national and social consciousness arise, and are immediately translated into action. German, French, Italian and British capitalists who were preparing to practice European unity by jointly exploiting African labor are outflanked by events—too late for enlightened colonialism. Investors from the United States are finding out that the national revolutions cannot be bought—too late for dollar diplomacy. American air bases are no longer safe—too late for the strategists of imperialism.

### EMANCIPATION MOVEMENT

This movement of emancipation is carried out by organizations: parties, leagues, trade-unions. The circumstances of the birth and growth of these organizations, their struggles and defeats, their influence and the personalities of their spokesmen and leaders are an integral and decisive part of the history of their countries. Without a knowledge of their political development, the significance of current events in Africa and Asia is lost.

In his book, Daniel Guérin has assembled some indispensable elements toward an understanding of the national-revolutionary movement in the French colonies. No one is better qualified to tell its history. In the "Gauche révolutionnaire" tendency of the French Socialist Party, then in Marceau Pivert's Parti Socialiste Ouvrier et Paysan, Daniel Guérin devoted the major part of his activity to mobilizing support for the colonial independence movements and to coordinating the social and political struggles of the French labor movement with those of the colonial peoples.

### COLLECTION OF ARTICLES

"Au Service des Colonisés" is a collection of articles written between 1930 and 1953, and published in various socialist, liberal and libertarian papers, mostly in the press of the P.S.O.P. These articles were written under pressure, in the midst of battles; they keep their freshness to this day, and reflect the urgency of struggles now past. But they also contain detailed and thorough information, on the colonial regime, its victims and its enemies in Indochina, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and Madagascar.

For lack of space, it is not possible to describe the contents of this book in as much detail as would be useful and necessary. However, Guérin's documentation on the early phases of colonial conquest should be mentioned: it is a useful reminder of the criminal origins of "French presence" in the colonies. The discussion, in several articles, of the Popular Front's colonial policy is also important, as it provides the background for the understanding of present SP and CP policy. It is followed by the resolution of the P.S.O.P. on the national and colonial question, which was written by Guérin. In this resolution, and in other parts of the book, Guérin defines a socialist attitude toward the nationalist groups. They should be supported, he argues, in spite of their bourgeois and even feudal leadership, while preparing and aiding their transformation, in the course of the struggle, into proletarian parties. This position, which recent events have amply confirmed, was then held only by the revolutionary Marxist groups, since both SP and CP had given up all opposition to colonialism in the interest of their alliance with the "liberal" bourgeoisie. In this respect, the situation has unfortunately remained the same.

### A FEW PORTRAITS

Guérin has also drawn a few portraits, which convey the personality of the pioneers of socialism in the colonies: Ta-thu-Thau, the leader of the Trotskyist group "La Lutte" of Saigon, one of the earliest and most fearless fighters for Indochinese independence; Paul Dussac, a French colonist who changed sides and devoted his whole life and fortune to the people of Madagascar, editing successively the papers *Le Réveil*, *L'Aurore*, *La Nation*, *Le Proletariat*; Ferhat Hached, the founder of the Tunisian labor movement; Messali Hadj, as a young man and leader of the "Etoile nord-africaine." With this book, as with others, Daniel Guérin has rendered a great service to the labor movement. The deeper meaning of these articles can be best expressed in his own words: "The wheel of history does not always turn as fast as one predicts or wishes, but it turns...."

"In spite of certain appearances, French colonialism is wounded unto death. Its insane repressions, its angry manipulations, are only its last convulsions. It only survives with the complicity and the support of the United States, without which there would have been neither war in Indochina nor terror in North Africa. But these are frail crutches. On the ruins of the Empire, disguised as "French Union," slowly but surely the dawn of freedom is rising. The sacrifices and sufferings which our friends, the colonized, had to endure for the last quarter of a century, will not have been lost. Soon nothing will tarnish in their eyes the light of French civilization, since it will no longer be imposed by a foreign occupation, so they will be free to value it. And soon we, who belong to a colonizing nation and therefore participate, in spite of ourselves, in a collective crime, can finally cease to be ashamed of being Frenchmen."

POLAND Resistance Takes on Traditional Forms

## Bierut Seeks Scapegoats

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The signs of the "thaw" in Poland are not confined to the softer policy toward the peasants, and the suspension of forced collectivization. There are also other signs. On the cultural and literary fronts there has been a liberalization of the censorship in the literary press, and a discussion is being conducted on the future of Polish literature.

Of course, the peasant question is the more important one in its effect on the relations between the government and the people. But the liberalization of controls on literature is a sign of the intention to establish better relations between the regime and the "intelligentsia." It may be that the occidental tradition of the Polish "intelligentsia," specially its ties to French culture, could serve the Kremlin's new course as a gangway to Europe.

### ONE GOT AWAY

The policy has become somewhat softer toward the Catholic Church also. Thus, Cardinal Wyszynski has been released from prison. There are rumors that he accepted "collaboration" between the government and the church. Possibly he was broken by the UB (Polish NKVD), but he is now at liberty, and without having to perform at a spectacular trial. Trips by Polish cultural representatives, as well as youth excursions, are now more frequent to Paris. The government has also decreed an amnesty for exiled Poles, and is seeking to get them to return to the country. Finally, "Comrade" Wieslaw Gomulka has been released from prison after six years, and he will probably be the first Stalinist scapegoat to save his life.

Of course, the "new look" is a reflection of the new policy in Russia, but it also has Polish national foundations. After ten years of domination, the regime has not been able to win the support of the people, despite successes on the economic front and the reconstruction of the country since the war. This is true not only because the "revolution" was imported by the hated Russian bayonets after the Warsaw uprising and the Polish resistance had been massacred; not only because of the lack of prestige of the Polish Stalinist party which was created after the old Communist Party of Poland had been destroyed, and its leaders, disciples and friends of Rosa Luxemburg had been murdered as "spies of the Polish Fascist government; but because the Polish political opposition could not be destroyed by the UB or the NKVD. It is still living as an organized force in exile and as the spirit of political opposition in the emotions of the country.

The resistance of the peasants to collectivization is not only an expression of the spontaneous opposition of the petty bourgeoisie against bureaucratic state monopoly. It draws inspiration also from the past and from political opposition to Stalinism. The Catholic Church is not only the "stronghold of Polish reaction." It has been transformed into a concrete "united front of the Poles" in defense of the occidental tradition of Polish culture, against the imported Russification, against Russian Byzantinism and the new Russian mystique of Stalinism.

### TRADITIONAL FORMS

The struggle between the post-revolutionary reaction imported from Russia to Poland and the western tradition of Polish culture, mixed with the religious struggle, is taking on very interesting forms. This is no longer the victorious offensive of the Bolshevik revolution against culturally retarded forms. This is a social and national rebellion of an oppressed people against Russification which takes on traditional forms.

The situation in Poland is changing from day to day, even if in secondary details. But Boleslaw Bierut remains as an absolute anachronism as general secretary of the Polish CP. He is a creature of the NKVD, Stalin's and Beria's man, the murderer of the Polish Communist leaders and

the hangman of the Polish underground. He had to release Gomulka, after he had accused him as a "Polish Titoist," as an "agent of American imperialism," and even though Gomulka did not confess his "crimes."

Bierut is no longer president of the republic, or prime minister. But he remains the secretary of the governing party, in spite of his police past and his lack of prestige or of any theoretical capacity. He not only remains, but tries to save his position of leadership and to justify his policy against Gomulka by a new spectacular political trial involving ex-minister Lechowicz and another high government bureaucrat, Alfred Jaraszewicz, both of whom were considered adherents of Spychalski and Gomulka.

### STALINIST AGENTS?

Both Jaraszewicz and Lechowicz have been accused of their pre-war political past as collaborators of the old Polish police, then as collaborators with the Gestapo in the time of the resistance, and finally as agents of the government in exile and also of foreign espionage. They did not confess to these crimes. They affirmed that before the war they had executed the orders of the Communist Party of Poland, and later of the Russian intelligence service and its chief, Fogelson, in Poland. Jaraszewicz was sentenced to 13 years in prison (considered a "light" sentence for Polish circumstances). We don't as yet have information on Lechowicz' fate.

During the trial, Mirian Spychalski, ex-vice minister of war, was attacked many times, but not Gomulka. Perhaps Spychalski is regarded as the scapegoat in the liquidation of the Gomulka affair. It appears that Bierut and his group are searching for some way in which to justify their "mistakes" in the Gomulka purge, and in this way hope to save their positions in power by demonstrating their political responsibility to the country and to the new lords in the Kremlin.

These scapegoats are set-ups because they are men whose pasts are bound to the Pilsudsky camp, and after that to the intelligence apparatus of the Polish underground. They are not political figures of the Polish left, of the Polish Socialist Party or the Peasant Party. They are not backed by the Polish opposition. Possibly they were agents of the Russian spy service, but now they are obstacles to the "new look" and scapegoats destined to whitewash the actual political past of "Comrade Bierut."

But it is very doubtful that this new maneuver of Bierut's as the executor of the new course will succeed in convincing public opinion in the country which is indispensable for the "pieredyschka" (rest), or will persuade the Kremlin bosses. The new look in Poland requires new men, and the Kremlin knows this very well. It is waiting only for the right man and the right situation.

## Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

The first eight pamphlets listed are by Trotsky, and are editions published in Ceylon by Lanka Samasamaja Publishers.

Revolution in Spain (January 1931)	\$25
The Lesson of Spain: the Last Warning (Dec. 1937)	.25
Marxism and Science (Speech, 1925)	.15
Against Social-Patriotism (1916)	.10
Europe and America (Speeches in 1924 & 1926)	.30
Whither Europe? (Speech of 1926, included in the above)	.15
I Stake My Life! (Speech on Moscow Trials)	.15
In Defense of October (Speech, 1932)	.15
The Zimmerwald Manifesto (The famous anti-war declaration of 1915)	.10
The Last Words of Adolf Joffe	.10

Package price for all 10 pamphlets—\$1.50

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.  
(Remittance must accompany all orders)

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

### Thursdays 8:45 PM

Sept. 15 "REPORT ON YSL CONVENTION"

Sept. 22 "WORKERS' CONTROL IN ISRAEL"

Al Findley

114 West Fourteenth Street

### 'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

Is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 50¢ FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE

OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

## Air Secretary Quarles Explodes Disarmament Illusions

# "A PEACE OF MUTUAL TERROR"

By L. G. SMITH

If anyone has been getting the idea, in the midst of the cold war "thaw," that when representatives of the United States government bring forth plans for "disarmament" they are really talking about *disarmament*, he need live with this illusion no longer. This was made amply clear in a speech delivered by Secretary of the Air Force Donald A. Quarles at Philadelphia recently which got little attention in the press.

**Quarles' speech was a statement of administration policy. Further, it was delivered to the air attachés of the foreign missions in this country. Thus it was a direct message to the governments both of America's allies and opponents in the cold war.**

Among other things, Quarles said:

"Neither the United States nor the free world is interested in an arms race with anyone. The balance we seek is not between free world air power and that of any potential opponent. We seek, instead, a balance between our air power and any opponent's temptation to aggression.

"We believe that, so long as we retain the capability to react to aggression with crushing force—regardless of how the aggressor could initiate war—we will have a convincing deterrent to war.

"The free world must be sure that this deterrent capability is of such strength and flexibility that, even if it suffers a sudden atomic attack, it can still react with devastating power. Such capability does exist today in the free world. We intend that it shall exist in every foreseeable tomorrow, in fact, until some other reliable basis for peace has been achieved."

### INSTANT RETALIATION

The administration is thus making it clear that nothing which has happened in the last few months in world relations has changed its basic military policy of "instant retaliation." James Reston, head of the New York *Times*' Washington bureau, who reported this speech (*Times*, September 6) does not say that Quarles went on to indicate what "other reliable basis for peace" the government may have in mind as an alternative to its military police. The reason for this is obvious. It has none.

**Reston's comment on Quarles' speech makes this clear enough: "So when the Russians ask," he writes, "as they have been asking in the United Nations 'disarmament' talks, whether, if they accept our alarm-system of inspection, we will adopt their system of banning and destroying all weapons of mass destruction, the answer is 'no.'"**

Reston traces the history of United States policy with regard to atomic weapons. First there was the proposal that an international agency be given the monopoly of atomic energy production, with national production of atomic weapons banned. Then came the period of advocacy and search for a sure-fire method of inspection and detection of atomic weapons production and storage. Now all that has been abandoned, and replaced by the "instant retaliation" doctrine as the basis for America's military policy in the world.

"The United States hopes that once the Russians realize we are determined to counter major aggression with atomic retaliation," Reston continues, "they will be in a mood to reach a 'limitation of

armaments' agreement. The root assumption of United States official thinking is that both sides will retain atomic weapons and that this will compel peace.

"Secretary Quarles made this unmistakably clear. We are no longer assuming the perfectibility of man, or relying on treaties or agreements, or talking like Wilson or Roosevelt of the 'outmoded' balance-of-power system.

"We are assuming the essential wickedness and acquisitiveness of man in general and the Communists in particular. Secretary Quarles called it 'peace through effective deterrence.' Churchill, who is better and briefer at these things, called it 'a peace of mutual terror.'"

**That should make a lot of things clear to anyone who assumes, that since there have been many headlines and apparently much talk about disarmament in high places, there is reason to be hopeful that some fire lies behind the smoke. Nevertheless, it leaves some things not quite so clear.**

(1) Though the mutual terror of atomic war may prevent "major aggression," what about the "minor" aggressions like Korea, and the kind of thing which the American government calls "aggression" like Indochina? The doctrine of mutual terror contains no answer to them.

(2) Since this is so, it is clear that in addition to these weapons of mass destruction, conventional armies on a large scale are needed to cope with "minor aggressions." Hence the American coldness to the Stalinist proposals about the mutual reduction of armed forces which they link to a withdrawal of American troops and bases from all non-American territory. Just what kind of a "limitation of armaments" agreement the American government is really for, even within its over-all policy as described, neither Reston, nor apparently Quarles, can say.

(3) The Stalinists, like the American government, proceed on the basis of "the essential wickedness and acquisitiveness of man" in general, and the "capitalists in particular," they would add. Socialists can buy that description as it applies equally to men as they are shaped by both the capitalist and Stalinist systems, and of their ruling circles in particular. Why, then, should the control of this humanity-destroying power be left in the hands of these circles?

**A "peace of mutual terror" can last a long time, it is true, but no one will predict that it can be permanent. Even while it lasts, it is hardly the optimum condition for the human race. The two world systems breed not only "wickedness and acquisitiveness" in general, but more specifically produce the political, social and economic antagonisms and contradictions between them which propel them toward war. Hence it would appear that the objective of reasonable people should be to work for the abolition of both of them, and for the reconstruction of the world on the foundations of new and different principles.**

That is the objective of revolutionary socialists. Insofar as Secretary Quarles' speech serves to dispel illusions about the desire or capability of the American government, at least, to proceed toward anything which can really be called "disarmament," it should help more people to grasp the reasonableness of the socialists' objective.

## Sub-committee Probes "Loyalty-Security" Program

# Senate Investigation Is Farce

By SAM ADAMS

Still another investigation is taking place on the government's security-risk-loyalty program. This one is under the aegis of the Senate Civil Service Sub-committee whose chairman is Democratic Senator Johnston of South Carolina. Like previous "examinations" of administration policies in this field, it seeks out the most "shocking" examples of the harm done to individuals, cases which have already been highly publicized.

The leisurely sessions of the sub-committee which meets periodically, has already heard testimony from Joseph Rauh, chairman of the ADA and counsel for the ISL in its case against the attorney general, Will Maslow of the American Jewish Committee, as well as representatives of the International Association of Machinists and the Scientist's Committee on Loyalty and Security.

In addition to these, the sub-committee has heard several individuals who had themselves been victims of the government program.

Among these, Mr. Abraham Chasoff, once fired by the Navy and reinstated months later, testified and recommended that important changes take place in the program, chief among these being that the government which creates the hardships for individuals ought to pay the expenses of the accused who try to get themselves cleared.

The sub-committee, among other things, reviewed the case of First Lieut. Walter K. Novack, discharged as a security risk from the Army because his mother had put his name on an insurance policy with the International Workers Order when he was under age. It heard the case involving Dr. Alfred H. Kelly of Wayne University, Detroit, charged with being a contributor to the American Youth for Democracy. This was, of course, "ludicrous" as the New York

*Times* describes these cases, because Dr. Kelly is a well-known liberal who had investigated the AYD on behalf of the University and recommended its banning from the campus. This was one aspect of the sub-committee's investigation.

**The testimony it heard from Rauh was of another character since it concerned the political fight between the Republican and Democratic Parties in which the ADA appears as an advocate for the Truman administration. Rauh asked the committee what it was doing about the "numbers" game, referring to Vice-President Nixon's statement that the Eisenhower administration had dismissed thousands of loyalty and security risks who had invaded the government during Truman's administration.**

Rauh accused the committee of "failure to do its duty by steering clear of an overall inquiry into the Nixon 'numbers' game." This isn't all the sub-committee has failed in. We doubt that it can do very much more than say that Nixon, as usual, has been misrepresenting the situation for political purposes. And it may well be that the sub-committee will yet go on to "blow-up" the Nixon game, as it can easily do, but also for Democratic partisan purposes.

So far there is no indication that the Civil Service Sub-committee has gone or will go into the nature and effect of the attorney general's "subversive list" itself, and of the way in which the Department of Justice, including the FBI, proceeded under it.

**The fact is that the decisions made in relation to individuals are in the hands of department heads, individual officers and committees which are politically illiterate and totally incompetent to hear such cases, let alone render decisions affecting the future of any individual who has the misfortune to appear before them. The Watts and Yarmolinsky reports have shown exactly what so many cases amount to. They are compounded of lies, of half-truths, and disorienting security reports emanating from secret FBI files.**

Obviously, if those accused cannot face their accusers, cannot examine evidence against them, and cannot cross examine

witnesses on the evidence in their files, they can hardly cope with their cases. Individuals with resources which put them in a position to do so, have fought back and have fought back successfully. But in every one of these cases, the government did not take the initiative to clear these people, but fought vigorously against such clearance in defense of their pile of rotten informations.

Were it not for the insidious presence of the attorney general's list, nine-tenths of these cases would not even exist. There is no doubt, as the argument may and has been made, that the list is being misused. To be sure, the list is used in ways not "intended" for it. But even here, the responsibility for this lies in Washington and the cheap political uses made of the list by the attorney general himself, as well as the administration of which he is a part.

**The list itself was drawn up in secrecy as a national index. It was drawn up on the basis of materials gathered by the FBI and the advice of paid and unpaid "experts" and paid and unpaid "informers." Organizations were never notified of the actions of the successive attorneys general beginning with the Truman administration, nor did they know of the listings until they appeared in the public press.**

To repeat, there is hardly an individual case, which does not stem from the existence of this list. And yet, in this sub-committee hearing, not a single press report recorded that a witness even mentioned the existence of an attorney general's list, let alone made any proposal respecting it.

Yet the tide of re-examination and investigation into the government's loyalty and security-risk program goes on. The New York Bar Association, for example, has been given a grant by the Fund for the Republic to make its own investigation of the program. There will be many others in and out of Washington. But unless these touch upon the evil character and influence of the attorney general's list, they will do little to restore the basic right of political association to the place in the civil liberties of the American people which it should and must occupy.

# Prospect for German Unity — —

(Continued from page 1)

brute force of an alien power. Whoever does not understand this thoroughly, and act accordingly in the political life of the world today, is lost. And no matter how powerful he may appear at the moment, that power is as surely doomed as was Hitler's in Europe, England's in Asia, France's in Indochina yesterday and in North Africa tomorrow, and Russia's in the days to come. So far as Germany is concerned, Russia can only hope to postpone the inevitable.

There is no denying that the rulers of the Stalinist empire have very good cause to fear an independent united Germany. It will be realized either under conservative, even reactionary, rule—or under working-class socialist rule. It is not easy to say which regime the Stalinists would dread more. Under reactionary rule, Germany would represent no less a threat to Russia and its present regime than Hitler represented in his time.

## DISGRACEFUL CAMARILLA

Leaving aside for the moment the question of when and under what circumstances such a threat might materialize, the magnitude of the danger is not lost upon the Kremlin (nor, it would be well to add, is it lost upon those peoples whose apprehensions the Kremlin so shrewdly exploits for its own ends). The new camarilla of slaveholders in Russia have not forgotten how few were the inches that separated their regime from collapse and destruction when their turncoat ally, Hitler, attacked their country in 1941; or how, after making the most disgraceful political and military showing of any country in the war, they were saved by their own slaves only when the Hitlerites made themselves even more hateful than their own rulers.

With the disappearance of the Hitlerite menace and the reconstruction of the country's economy, including the country's working class, there is a growth of popular discontent and demands against the "new" Stalinist regime which differs from the "old" one like an unshelled rotten egg from a shelled one. The precariously-perched regime has ground for fearing that it would not survive the threat of a war danger—which a new reactionary Germany would unquestionably enhance—added to the threat growing out of the midst of its own people. (It is, by the way, only from this standpoint that the Stalinist regime is genuinely "for" peace.)

On the other hand, while a working-class Germany would not represent a military threat to the Russian Stalinist regime, at least not in the sense or in the way indicated above, it would decidedly represent a surer and more irresistible political threat. A working-class government, in a country of the importance and remarkable capacities of Germany, which proceeded to solve its problems at home and abroad in a more or less consistently socialist way, would very soon leave the Russian Stalinist regime with hardly a bayonet to sit on. All the monstrous power of the G. P. U. would vanish faster under the rebellion of a Russian people inspired and encouraged by the German example than did the

power of the Hohenzollern regime when the German people rose out of encouragement by the example set by the Russian Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.

## STALINISM'S FATE PREFIGURED

It is more than likely that the first attempt of the German workers at taking control of their country would bring to office the present pitiable leadership of the Social Democratic Party. But there is good reason to believe that the first attempt would early be followed by much more serious and fruitful ones. The German working class has added much to its rich traditions, understandings and political arts in the last twenty years. Of that we got a most purposeful and encouraging inkling, only an inkling, in the historic June 1953, uprising of a socialist proletariat against the Stalinist despotism. Multiply the dimensions and significance of that uprising in length, width and depth, and the coming fate of Stalinism is completely prefigured. There are few who grasp this better, even if in their own unique and limited way, than Khrushchev & Co. in Moscow and Ulbricht & Co. in East Germany.

## OFFENSE TO DIGNITY

For his part, if the truth were known, Adenauer is not eagerly enthusiastic about coming to an agreement over unification of his country with the Stalinists. He was not panting to go to Moscow, and the first official reaction of Bonn to the Russian invitation for a visit was as negative as it could be without saying "No" in one word. It is possible to believe that a statesman would regard it as an offense to the dignity of the country he represents and respects to scurry off promptly upon invitation to the capital of the gendarmes who occupy his land to discuss with them the terms under which it is to be humiliated as a united nation. It is even possible to believe that this is what prompted Adenauer's initial reaction to the Moscow invitation. Possible to believe—but not necessary. For the same Adenauer did not consider it an offense to the dignity of his person, office or country to discuss ever so patiently and humbly bartering part of his fatherland, the Saar, to the pirates of the French government in return for the highly circumscribed right to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (whose French divisions and American helicopters are at the moment engaged in the crusade for democracy if not in the North Atlantic at least in North Africa).

Whatever may be the case, considerations of dignity are not the mainspring of Adenauer's policy. The German ruling class owes a great debt to its faithful statesman under whose post-war guidance it has been brought back to such power, wealth and position. One could not wish for much more than that the German Social Democracy would serve its class as well as Adenauer has been serving his.

Under Adenauer's regime, German capital has regained an economic and political position in the world that is completely without precedent for a defeated and conquered nation in so short a space of time. This position cannot be secured, however, to say nothing

of making it pre-eminent, until it is capped by military strength; at least not so long as capital rules and, of necessity, develops into imperialist capital. What better argument, above all in "respectable" world circles today, can a bourgeois Statesman like Adenauer find for the at first limited rearmament of Germany than the fact that not only is heavily-armed Stalinism a threat to freedom everywhere but, what is more to the point, that it represents a knife cutting right through the heart of Germany? So long as Russia maintains armed domination over one half of Germany, and therewith denies the nation its elementary right to union and sovereignty, the rearmament of German capitalism is given the cover of a national legitimacy that could not even be argued in the absence of such alien military occupation. In this way, the Stalinists, for all their desire for peace, as indicated before, pursue a course which guarantees the rearmament and remilitarization of Germany much more swiftly and surely than did the infamous Versailles Treaty imposed upon Germany in 1919.

## SOCIALISM ANATHEMA

Undoubtedly there is another consideration in Adenauer's lukewarmness toward reunification, at least presently. As it is now, in West Germany alone, the Social Democratic Party continues to make its gains almost everywhere. In spite of the ambiguous and vacillating character of its policies, not only on domestic but above all on

foreign political questions (the two are more closely tied in Germany than in most other countries), it represents almost the entire working class, imbued with a democratic and socialist opposition both to capitalism and Stalinism. The socialist working class is anathema to Adenauer in every important respect—to the Adenauer who is staunchly for capitalism, to the Adenauer who is openly for an authoritarian political system, to the Adenauer who is a devout servant of the Vatican.

To repeat, that is how it is in West Germany alone. And in a reunified Germany, in which at least East Germany, of all the alienated territories, would be incorporated? In such a Germany, not only would the national percentage of the non-Catholic population be considerably increased, but what is more important, the percentage of socialist workers would be sharply raised and so would the quality of their militancy! The political scales would be strongly tipped in the direction of the Social Democratic Party and, within its ranks and around it, in the direction of the more aggressive and more class-conscious policies.

Altogether, then, the prospect of an early reunification of Germany is not the most attractive one Adenauer has ever faced. It is not an unmixed blessing. He will have no difficulty in coming to a disagreement with the Stalinists over this question during his visit to Moscow.

# Labor Day 1955 — —

(Continued from page 1)

few, does little or nothing about slums, schools, health and the rest. Even though a united labor movement will give the working class a weapon more powerful than it has ever had before in this country, no one should fear that the unions (which, with the families of members will represent about 50,000,000 Americans) will actually use this strength to do anything drastic to rectify the situation.

An inspiring message, if there ever was one.

## Comic Relief

Old John L. Lewis provided a bit of comic relief to the dreary Labor Day speeches when he predicted, in a TV program, that the new united labor movement would "part like the rope of sand it is" under the pressure of union rivalries. He denounced the proposed constitution of the new federation as giving the Executive Council "too much power." When asked whether he didn't enjoy a bit of power himself in the United Mine Workers, Lewis replied that he functions in "an advisory capacity" in his union.

## Bureaucrat's Logis

Julius Hochman, manager of the Dress Joint Board of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union got a big write-up in the special Labor Day supplement of the New York Post.

Hochman used to be a socialist. According to the Post, "Hochman shed his socialism gradually and it was not until the New Deal, when the union for the first time felt itself on firm ground, that he began to feel an 'understanding' for the employer. With the elimination of management's refusal to recognize the union, he said, the 'great cause of antagonism was wiped out.'"

"We realized," Hochman told the Post, "that trade unions were one of the basic institutions of capitalism, an essential element of the sought-after balance of power. Remove capitalism and the reason for existence of unions is abolished."

"When you get to this point in your

thinking, then cooperation with the employers becomes possible—and desirable."

That is logic for you! Hochman was a socialist, it can be assumed, because he thought socialism would end the exploitation of the workers by the employers; would make it possible for the workers to administer their own economic and social affairs; would end economic contradictions and antagonisms in general. From this he deduced that under socialism unions would have no further reason to exist. Conclusion: cooperate with the employers.

It may not be logic in general, but it is certainly logic for the union bureaucrat. It is as if a hospital administrator were to say, "If you go too far with preventive medicine, the reason for the existence of hospitals is abolished. When you get to this point in your thinking, then cooperation with those who oppose preventive medicine and profit from its non-existence becomes possible—and desirable."

As we see it, unions will probably be necessary long after capitalism has been abolished. But the "reason for the existence" of union bureaucrats, divorced from the workers and forming a special privileged group will be abolished.

**A New Collection!**

## MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

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

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