

# LABOR ACTION

Two Years of Labor Unity in the U.S.  
**PROMISE AND FULFILLMENT**

... page 7

**Wall Street Journal Sees a Ghost**

... page 6

December 2, 1957

TEN CENTS

on the **HOME FRONT**

## Recession Puts Heat On Trade Union Movement

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Mich.

As the economic recession deepens, the organized labor movement finds itself facing new internal strains, and an adverse socio-political climate that makes its much heralded objective of a shorter work week in 1958 a questionable prospect.

For the impact of increasing unemployment puts the union movement on the defensive to a degree unforeseen by its leaders who now realize that between 4 to 5 million workers may well be unemployed during 1958.

On the one hand, such a trend would serve to intensify the pressure for a shorter work week as a partial step to alleviate unemployment. On the other hand, a deep crisis would squeeze industry, and harden its opposition to any union gains of a substantial nature.

The whole series of defensive strikes, strike votes, and widespread unrest in the Chrysler corporation plants illustrates what could become a widespread pattern in such a situation. In one case, at the moment a local union was taking a strike vote a major lay-off took place. The effect increased the bitterness of the workers, but not their militancy.

Contrary to the publicity releases from the auto industry, the 1958 market gives every indication of a sharp reduction from the lower-than-expected 1957 market. This is an altogether different situation than the one Walter Reuther visualized when he planned the shorter work week fight.

By January new car inventories will climb to new peaks, and the industry may easily build up a huge stockpile of cars in anticipation of the contract deadlines in June 1958.

### MUST DIG IN

The coming hearings by the Kefauver committee on auto industry pricing practices will fall far short of their goal unless the committee digs into all aspects of the auto industry situation. Not the least of the untapped areas is the transportation cost which is part of Hoffa's domain.

While the UAW exhibits an understanding of the relationship between prices, profits and wages, as indicated in Reuther's recent car price cut proposals, the Teamsters and other unions simply proceed along the old policy of figuring out with management how much the traffic can bear and then charging it.

Decentralization and inter-plant competition within corporations, not to speak of competition between corporations, has turned the auto industry into a rat race where local unions are competing with each other to keep work. The hysteria and unrest in the Chrysler plants comes from this trend which is something new  
(Turn to last page)

# GOP, Dems Reaction to Sputnik: More Guns, Less Butter for U.S.

By SAM BOTTONE

The political effect of Sputniks 1 and 2 will continue long after both satellites re-enter the earth's atmosphere and disintegrate. If they would also lead to the disintegration of the present bipartisan foreign policy, then the price of the present Russian advantage would not have been too high.

If the Russian missile successes were to lead to a serious questioning of the assumptions of U. S. foreign policy and a re-assessment of whether this foreign policy leads toward democratic and non-cataclysmic solutions, then this period of political soul-searching would mark a turning point in the post-war period. But if instead as all indications seem to point, there is only going to be a rehashing and re-warming of all the stale ideas and formulas of the past decade, then the world may well be in for an arms race which will make everyone's hair curl.

At the very least the orbiting Sputniks have led to an acute awareness that a

change is indicated somewhere. After initial attempts to play down the political and military significance of the Russian satellites, the Eisenhower Administration has been making frantic efforts to re-shuffle its military program and bolster public confidence with a series of platitudinous pep-talks. But this is insignificant in face of the magnitude of the problem.

The basic fact is that the very foundations of the U.S. and Western foreign policy has been shattered. These policies were based on the assumption of permanent U.S. military and technological superiority as the bulwark against Russian conquests and expansions. The way to prevent the Stalinist drive for world hegemony, to contain and roll it back, was to

build a superior military establishment.

The adjunct to this was that only when the West is sufficiently strong could it negotiate with the Russians. That this policy of "negotiation through strength" has been an apparent failure has not destroyed its validity in the minds of many people. Little has been negotiated, nor has Stalinism been contained by the deterrent power of the Strategic Air Command. The present Russian incursion into the Middle East is only a case in point. Instead it has only led to a deadly arms race and the brink of push button warfare.

### POLITICAL POWER

From time to time there has been the recognition that the primary nature of Stalinist power is not military but political and economic, representing an anti-capitalist social system. It has also been proposed that the main emphasis of U.S. foreign policy be to meet it on these grounds. But these proposals were never consistently put forward in opposition to the military orientation of U.S. foreign policy. They have gradually evolved into a kind of liberalized rhetoric without force or content. The result has been the near conformity in thinking on foreign policy on the real important problem that the U.S. faces.

It is ironical that those liberals, who have been pointing to the trend toward conformity which reached its height under the hey-day of McCarthy as one of the contributing factors in restricting scientific achievements, do not see this same deadening conformity as producing even more disastrous consequence in foreign policy.

Part of the reason for what appears at times to be a near-monolithism is that liberals continue to think and act as if the main struggle in foreign policy is between internationalism and isolationism. Those lines of demarcation have long since vanished. Internationalism won with U.S. entry into the second World War and only mopping up took place in the post-war period. The real problem that exists is the basically conservative and undemocratic nature of U.S. foreign policy, reflecting as it does a narrow capitalist outlook in an age of change and revolution from the status quo.

### PANIC

The Sputnik and the partial awareness that the underpinning of our foreign policy has been shattered, that the U.S. can never again build a foreign policy around the idea of military supremacy has had sharp effect on the politicians. The typical reaction has been that of panic leading toward a strengthening of every reactionary and militaristic part of U.S. foreign policy.

A consensus of reaction from both Democratic and Republican spokesmen has been: redouble every effort to catch up to the Russians in the ICBM field; strengthen the NATO alliance; strengthen

(Turn to last page)

## WORLD POLITICS

### World Communists Adopt Tough Line at Moscow

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The "Declaration" issued by the representatives of the ruling parties of countries with Communist governments is, without a doubt, a document of the first importance. It reflects, on the one hand, a feeling of power and stability which these ruling parties, or many of them, did not have a year ago. And it seeks to set, on the other, the course for the period ahead for all Communist parties all over the world.

If this is so, why did they not all participate in the Moscow conference which drafted the document? Why did they not all sign it?

Although more light may be cast on the answer to these questions in the weeks and months ahead, there is a good reason which is inherent in the present crisis of the world Communist movement. Since the parties which signed it rule in their own countries already, no penalties can be imposed on them for this bold reassertion of Stalinist goals and dogmas. Further, many of the parties outside the Communist orbit were badly shaken up after the Hungarian events, and the cry which rose loudest and most persistently was for independence

of thought and action for the Communist Party in each country. If such a document had been signed by delegates from all these parties, without the "formality" of prior consultation with their own memberships, every charge of subservience to Moscow would have been once more proved to the hilt.

Now, the line has been laid down clearly and unambiguously by the most authoritative body possible: a conference of all the Communist Parties which have power, or at least which exercise power (in those cases where the real power lies exclusively in Moscow). The national parties will, in due course, adopt either their own, thinly veiled versions of this document, or make the original such a subject of study and "discussion" in their ranks that it assumes the position of highest revealed truth once held by such other "brilliant" documents as Stalin's imaginative "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

### TOUGHNESS

To seek to summarize this document would take more space than it warrants. Its chief purpose can be stated in a sentence: it is to mark down clearly for the world Communist movement that "de-Stalinization," "relaxation," "democratization," or call it what you will, have gone just as far as they are going to go, if not further, and that for the next period what is important is to re-establish the full authority, toughness and aggressiveness of the world hierarchy

(Continued on page 4)

# HOWARD FAST'S Picture of the American CP

By MAX MARTIN

Thousands of people have broken with and left the American Communist Party since the Twentieth Congress of the Russian CP. Other thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, had parted ways with Stalinism in the decade preceding February, 1956.

The question arises: what are these people thinking and feeling now? What is their attitude towards Communism and towards Moscow? What are their general political ideas?

No spokesman for the thousands of ex-Communists has come forward, no one can be regarded as the representative of those who have broken with Stalinism. For one thing, nobody has yet tried to rally the ex-Communists into a movement or to gather them around a political program. And for another, they undoubtedly are not homogeneous in their thinking; a number of different views and outlooks can be found among them.

Howard Fast is probably the best known of those who have broken with Moscow and left the CP during the recent period. A relatively popular writer, Fast had for years been the last remaining intellectual or writer of note in the Communist movement. His defection constituted a blow to the CP, in terms both of its individual and symbolic impact.

Since the announcement of his break

with the CP early this year Fast has expressed himself on a number of occasions on his thinking about his rupture with Stalinism. He has written a book on the matter which will be published shortly. In the meantime, a lengthy article of his, "The Writer and the Commissar," has appeared in the first issue of the new magazine, *Prospectus*. It can undoubtedly be regarded as a summing up of his outlook to date. His views are of interest not only because of their individual value, but because they may represent the ideas of many others.

Fast informs us that for years he had held doubts about various aspects of Communism and that he had been regarded by the party bureaucracy as an undependable and uncontrollable element. He details various struggles between himself and the CP cultural commissars over "deviations" and "heresies" the latter had found in his works. The catalyst

for his break with the CP, however, was the Khrushchev denunciation of Stalin. He writes, "Only with his contribution, out of the first and largest Communist Party on earth, did all the bits of the puzzle fall into place."

He describes the impact of Khrushchev's speech on the Gates group. "Within the party, and particularly on the *Daily Worker*, the reports of the Twentieth Congress had come as an explosive force of mental liberation . . . because there appeared the first trace of iconoclasm in any party congress in our memory. It was little, but it was enough for us on the *Worker* to seize sledges and begin to break the hateful images with the zest of a drowning man gulping air. Everyone on the staff joined in, to one extent or another. Myself, I struck out in every direction with a joy I had not known for years."

How did the leadership of the CP react? "Throughout all this, because they had never coped with thought, ideas, change, or the excitement of shattering a worthless and senile idea, the national leaders of the party were silent. We had the feeling that they had crawled into holes to hide from the tempest that was blowing through the intellectual corridors of the communist world. . . . Finally, they spoke. Not ideas, not change, but a whining attempt to remove John Gates from the paper and expel him from the party."

## GATES GROUP DOOMED

The Gates faction, says Fast, was doomed to defeat. A substantial number of its adherents including himself, he explains, felt that the only logic of the situation was to liquidate the party. These presumably have since left it. In so doing, says Fast, they aided the defeat of Gates. Yet for them no other course was possible.

Others, equally appalled by what the Twentieth Congress had revealed about Stalinism, felt that they had to stay with the CP, despite its nature and leadership. With reference to a specific Detroit Communist worker who typifies this grouping, Fast writes: "With the party in existence, he could hope that it would change; but with the party liquidated, where could he go?"

Fast is excellent in describing the anti-democratic nature of the functioning of the CP, which prevailed until the Gates upsurge. "The membership discussion itself is guided by the paid section functionaries, whose major task is to kill an opposition to the resolution—even if steps towards expulsion are taken; and while the discussion may continue for weeks, it is all sound and fury. The result, finally, is *always* in the precise line of the original resolution, with only enough formal variations for the membership to reject the idea that they have been made fools of."

He depicts also the servility, the fawning, the stultifying intellectual atmosphere which has generally pervaded the party. He relates the information given him by Communists from the satellite countries of Eastern Europe on conditions there; the privileges enjoyed by the rulers and the crumbs received by the people. He discusses the special problems faced by the writers and artists of the CP.

Where is Fast going and what perspective does he have? It is clear from the article that Fast conceives the answers to these questions in general terms. "For me, the destination has remained unchanged—total brotherhood of man, a world-wide entity of love and creativity, in which life is neither wasted nor despised." He stands for a democratic and humanistic socialism. But he does not translate this aim into a concrete political outlook.

Fast remains true to the ideals which brought him into the Communist movement and is filled with outrage at the reality of Communism which he has at long last apprehended. The feelings and ideas of Fast and those like him who have broken with Stalinism represent a stage in the development of a democratic socialist perspective for the future. They constitute a good beginning.

## CROSSCURRENTS

### American Forum's "Questions for the Left"

By GORDON HASKELL

American Forum—For Socialist Education has published a pamphlet. *Questions for the Left* consists of some eleven pages of "questions" propounded by Sidney Lens, followed by brief "comments" (the longest runs to three pages) by John Dickinson, Tim Wohlforth, Stephen Grattan, Farrell Dobbs, Conrad Lynn, and A. E. Blumberg.

The character of Len's "questions" are hinted at by A. J. Muste in his introduction when he writes: ". . . I do not have any additional problems to suggest. It is hard to think of one which Sidney Lens has not stated or at least alluded to." And the character of the "comments" by the other participants in this literary venture is also adumbrated when Muste continues: "Nor is this the occasion to attempt to outline an answer for one of the questions which confronts us," and goes on to discuss the state of the world, labor movement and almost anything else except the questions which were considered important enough to constitute the bulk of the AF-FSE's first pamphlet.

Since, as Muste hints, Lens has asked everything about everything, it is little wonder that the other participants in the discussion appear to be at a loss just where to begin in the few words allotted them. The discussion being pretty much without focus to begin with, it is little wonder that each participant either tends to answer with a series of questions of his own which he considers better focused or "more fundamental," or to ride off on his own hobbyhorse with little more than a polite tip of the hat to Lens and his questions.

The most striking examples of this last form of "discussion" are, of course, Tim Wohlforth and Farrell Dobbs. Since Dobbs and the SWP have long ago made it clear that their contribution to the regroupment ferment has been and continues to be to throw open the doors to all who agree with their program, it is not surprising that his "discussion" of Lens' questions consists, believe it or not, by offering his own "programmatic statements" (eight of them) as a "basis for discussion." Tim just makes a strong pitch for the youth group he and the SWP are trying to build up, and lets it go at that.

## SIX QUESTIONS

John Dickinson has six questions of his own which he finds "more basic" than Len's, and he proceeds to list them, with answers. Their general character may be devined from one example: "Do we believe in god, and if so, how do we visualize his relationship to the world and man? I don't." Albert Blumberg (a Communist Party representative) treads warily around, tries to compress Len's questions into an approach or tendency which can be commented on intelligibly in a few words, and ends up with the, in the circumstances, inevitable Communist platitudes that Marxism should neither be treated as a dogma nor discarded out of hand, and that while Russia cannot be a model for American socialists, one must study their great achievements as well as their shortcomings, etc.

The AF-FSE's "Statement of Purpose" says that it "is organized in order to stimulate study and serious, untrammelled discussion of the problems of socialism in the United States." During the first six months of its existence this pamphlet and the symposium projected for December are the only public efforts it has made in this direction. In view of the known and proven personal talents and capabilities of its moving spirits, the meager product, and no kinder phrase for this pamphlet would be honest, can only bespeak a weakness in the very concept of the AF-FSE itself.

## CROSSCURRENTS

### Chicago Debate on "Free Enterprise or Socialism"

Chicago, November 13

"Free Enterprise or Socialism" was the topic of a debate held last night before an audience of around 500 in downtown Chicago, sponsored by the E. V. Debs Forum (organized by individuals of various views, including supporters of the *American Socialist* magazine). The contenders were J. Bracken Lee, president of For America, former governor of Utah and right wing "crackpot" pro-capitalist, and Harold Braverman, co-editor of the *American Socialist*.

The audience was predominantly composed of Lee-supporters and enthusiasts. They cheered, stood solemnly and clapped, laughed, and called out lustily from the audience throughout the meeting. On the whole they appeared upper middle-class, mostly older people, and wholly ignorant of politics. Socialism, they and Lee were convinced, was merely a clever conspiracy on the part of those who could not otherwise buy their own home and car to steal it away from those who already have them!

## ANARCHIST

Lee began with a 30 minute presentation in which he attacked all monopolies, ripped into Democratic and Republican parties for socialistic measures, argued for freedom of the individual and called to a return to the only perfect human document the Constitution. He gave in large measure the speech of an absolute anarchist—opposed to all government as inherently evil, for the individual free man unfettered by social restrictions. But he presented only half of the anarchist's program—the part aimed at cutting down the power of organized labor and ending government restriction on business practices.

Braverman's reply was, especially under the circumstances, restrained and well-mannered. He pointed out that free enterprise is a misnomer and hasn't existed in this world for many years. What we have today is monopoly capitalism, because our economy and technology have made ridiculous the older and freer forms of capitalism.

He went on to detail the problems of capitalist society—of depressions, wars, unemployment, taxation, etc. The trend toward greater government intervention described by Lee, has not abolished capitalism, said Braverman, but it is the trend of the future and will eventually lead to socialism. Today it is only creeping there, but Braverman placed himself in favor

of a galloping trend as preferable in many ways. Greater government ownership is essential for the future, he argued, because it alone is in keeping with contemporary economic and technological forms, and because it is juster than the government own what is produced by all than a few greedy individuals.

In the question and rebuttal period Braverman noted that he did not desire the type of socialism presently existing in East Germany, Eastern Europe, Russia or even China. However, just as capitalism has its different forms (some democratic and some totalitarian), and just as pro-capitalists can attempt to change certain aspects of their society, so he favored changes in these socialist societies and was sure that the working people in these countries would take greater democracy for themselves.

Though Braverman's presentation throughout this debate was by far the more competent and well organized, one important thing was missing. While Lee paraded his freedom-loving instincts, and shouted about individualism, Braverman made only passing reference to the relationship between socialism and individual liberty, self-expression and democratic rights. And just as liberal pro-capitalists were weakened in their effective appeal during the '30s by the common association of capitalism with fascist economics, so Braverman is hurt by the association of Russia with socialism. He never differentiated his type of socialism from any kind of "government" control, ownership or intervention.

In fact Braverman permitted himself to be identified with all those world trends which Lee attacked—the trends identified with increasing bureaucratization, governmentalism, statism, conformity and restrictiveness. That these trends also represent a major enemy to socialist development and an alternative to it was ignored or in effect denied.

Thus while Lee appeared a fool and a demagogue, and Braverman a reasonable and intelligent man, the duel was not one over socialist values or socialist objectives. Braverman sided himself with modern history and technology, which demands coordination, social harmony and planning; Lee sided with the past which demanded unrestricted competition and a laissez-faire government. Democracy? Freedom? Self-expression? Dignity? Lee argued about them, with tongue in cheek. Braverman, unfortunately, didn't even give them lip service.

## SCREEN the NEWS with Labor Action

A sub is \$2 a year—  
subscribe now!

# LABOR SCOPE

## Union Staffer's Union

It's mighty embarrassing, but the AFL-CIO has been fighting the attempts of its own organizing staff to form a union and win bargaining rights. On November 12, the Field Representatives Federation, which claims to represent 215 of about 325 AFL-CIO organizers, appeared before the NLRB at a hearing to determine whether a collective bargaining election should be held to determine whether they are entitled to bargain for the whole staff. Albert W. Bradt, temporary head of the union of union organizers, said that it wanted to bargain collectively with the AFL-CIO on wages, hours, and working conditions but its request had been turned down. J. Albert Woll, chief counsel for the AFL-CIO, argued that organizers were "managerial" in their function and could not properly seek relief from the Board. A union organizer, it appears, is a part of "union management" according to this argument.

The issue first arose at the May meeting of the Executive Council and at least one council member was reported to be in favor of simply firing the ringleaders. But George Meany was handed the hot potato. In October, according to another report, lawyers for the AFL-CIO were supposed to have suggested that the new union be recognized and Meany was ready to follow their advice but those who were opposed, notably Reuther and Dubinsky, carried the day; they argued that union organizers were not "employees" in a true sense but agents of the union.

We can understand what irritates some top officials when their own staff takes a notion to organize. Organizers are asked to go forth in the spirit of idealism, brotherhood, working class solidarity and carry on a noble crusade for justice and humanity; and here they are haggling over such things as pay and perquisites. But it casts both sides in a strange light. True, in the great days of union struggle the best organizers, those who helped build our labor movement, never thought of themselves as mere hired hands. But then they were playing a prominent part in the bursting forth of a new democracy among millions and they themselves had rights, the right to speak their mind and act as men and leaders. If now they have been turned into hired hands by their top bosses they must be expected to act as hired hands.

It reminds us, in a way, of the fate of foremen in the modern factories. At one time, they were truly mere agents of the owners with rights and with security and they felt it. But as the decades passed, foremen became nothing more than slightly elevated employees and they formed their own unions, demanding contracts and bargaining rights. With sadness, and with dismay the employers argued that foremen were part of management and could never be recognized as employees. Laws were passed wiping out their right to organize. But it changed nothing. If the foremen felt like employees then they were nothing more.

Perhaps an attempt to restore a little of the old spirit of democracy and dignity among the staff members would help. That is only one aspect of the need to revive the democratic spirit throughout the union movement, top to bottom.

## Union Democracy

Frank Grasso, general vice president of the United Papermakers and Paper Workers Union, turns to the question of "Trade Union Democracy in Crisis" in the Autumn issue of the union's *Journal*. He points out that the dissenting elements in the Teamsters Union who sought to overturn a corrupt officialdom face a purge by the mob. It reminds him of the need to defend the rights of minorities throughout the union movement. "Is it essential to purge opposition for a union to fulfill its responsibilities as an instrument of the membership?" he asks. "Here again we cannot equivocate.

The test for democracy in national government also applies to the test in union government. So long as the opposition is loyal to the principles of democracy and the preservation of the union, in the government of the trade union or the nation, that opposition must have its rights respected. . . . It is incumbent upon us to divorce ourselves from complacency and shape our own union institutions, be they local or, international, in the image of our democratic ideology."

## Make Up the Difference

Dave McDonald, United Steel Workers president, told the 450 delegates to a conference of the union's District 15 in Pittsburgh that he would like to see steel workers elected to posts in state government. He suggested, too, that locals subsidize any of their members who are elected to the state legislature by making up the difference between their pay as elected government officials and their pay as union workers.

## Whose Platitude Is Bored

The *Weekly People*, published by the Socialist Labor Party, begins a big series on "The Union Question" in its issue of November 16. It starts right off with this opening sentence. "As Daniel DeLeon, America's foremost Marxist, emphasized over 53 years ago, trade unionism is indeed a vital subject—particularly to the workers of America."

Even more profound original observations are promised in future installments.

## Curran "Unfit?"

We have just received the text of the Proceedings of the second convention of the International Brotherhood of Longshoremens held in Chicago last July. A resolution on Joe Curran was adopted unanimously. It reads:

"In view of the fact that Joseph Curran, president of the NMU did stab the IBL in the back when he supported the ILA during the last NLRB election in New York, we sitting in the second IBL convention this 22nd day of July 1957, do hereby condemn the unsavory action of Curran and class him as number ONE on our 'enemy list.' That the incoming officers be instructed to draw up the proper resolution to be presented to and asking the AFL-CIO to remove Joseph Curran as a member of the Ethical Practices Committee, as being 'UNFIT' to serve on such a committee."

## Dual Unionism?

The Masters, Mates and Pilots union is a case in point; here is a typical example of anti-democracy within a union and neglect by those outside.

In 1953, six members of the union were expelled. A decision of the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court in June ordered them reinstated. The tragedy is that they had to seek recourse in the courts instead of within the labor movement.

In the fall of 1952, those who were later expelled, decided to run a slate of candidates for office against the union administration headed by Atkins, its national president. To advance their candidates, they held caucus meetings and issued handbills—activities which are the normal by-products of any democratic election. But they were brought up on charges of dual unionism and disruption and expelled. . . . the typical refuge of any bureaucrat and dictator against opposition.

The opposition had announced that it intended to establish a permanent group within the union with the aim of creating a two-party system in the New York local. It was this that formed the main basis for the charges against them. But the court decided that they were completely within their rights.

We seek in vain for comment in the trade union press.

# Corrupt Employers, Politicians Help Make Labor Racketeers

In an interview for the *New York Post*, William J. Keating, who served as assistant district attorney in New York and as counsel for the city's Anti-Crime Commission, told some stark truths about racketeering in unions and who protects it.

"Corrupt leadership in the labor movement couldn't exist without management support," he said. "It's management's way of maintaining control over the workers, despite the unions."

But, it's not only management. Big politicians are behind it too. Keating pointed out that the labor racketeers are careful to make the right political connections. And so, "Two Congressional committee investigations of Hoffa alone were squashed within the last five years. . . . The second investigation barely got off the ground when Bill McKenna, chief counsel, resigned. He stated publicly that the pressure on the committee was so powerful and came from so high that he could not name the names. Sure, the racketeers have gotten political protection and they've protected the politicians in turn."

Keating was asked: do you mean that "the labor racketeers' trail . . . must lead . . . to management and eventually to highly placed men in government?" And he answered, "Yes, it must lead there. It can't help but lead there—if it gets that far."

Why don't the ranks revolt against

a crooked officialdom? he was asked. He pointed out that there have been rebellions in one case after another but the courageous men who fight the thugs get no help and their fight goes on without notice from the public. Why are these facts not known? "The public is getting misinformation on the labor movement by people who are paid to give them correct information. I'm referring specifically to labor reporters and labor editors. Your labor editors from one end of the country to the other—with very few exceptions, like Murray Kempton—all of their labor news in the form of handouts from union officialdom. . . . You never find a labor columnist or a labor reporter down at the piers talking to a rebel—or out interviewing the truck drivers as they stop to make change at the Holland Tunnel. No, they sit in their offices and they call the Waterfront Commission, the head of the shipping association and they take the 'news' down over the phone . . . if some of these labor reporters became working press—and got out of their chairs and off the telephone and out onto the sidewalks and down to the piers and the butcher shops and the factories—then you'd begin to get some honest reporting. Then the public would gain some understanding of the tragedy of the captives in the corrupt unions. Then the public would back up the rebels with all their heart—and they'd really be able to fight."

# Smith Act Cases Disintegrate In Govt. Informer Shambles

By GERRY MCDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Pa.

In no city across the nation were the Smith Act and the undercover informer used more sweepingly than in Pittsburgh during the McCarthy era. The total cost to the government at the federal, state, and local levels of trials of Communist Party leaders must have run into easily more than a million dollars. The cost in terms of fear, conformity and silence in western Pennsylvania through those years cannot be calculated.

Today every one of those trials has been undone; every person convicted is free; and every important government informer involved has been discredited.

The much publicized Matt (I was a Communist for the FBI) Cvetic turned out to be an alcoholic and psychopath. Although he made thousands of dollars from articles in the *Saturday Evening Post*, a radio series and a movie based on his experience, most of the money went to ghost writers, legal advisers and agents and today Cvetic is broke. In and out of mental hospitals, he ekes out an existence speaking to veterans and "patriotic" groups. The government no longer dares call on him to testify; the FBI has never acknowledged him. If he is more than a turncoat, there is no one's word but his own.

Another "undercover agent" who once made fat "expert witness" fees, Joseph Mazzei, was repudiated by the Justice Department last year. While an undercover agent, Mazzei was convicted of adultery and bastardy after admitting that he had fathered the child of a Pittsburgh waitress. The waitress testified Mazzei had put off her pleas of marriage by saying that he was too busy with his undercover work. Two years ago Mazzei perjured himself before a Senate committee on behalf of Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno, but has never been prosecuted for it. Could it be that Musmanno is able to protect him from the "vigilance" of the justice department?

The final star performer in the FBI's stable was Isaac Alexander Wright. This fall, attorneys for several Smith Act de-

fendants announced that they had evidence that Wright was a "moral degenerate" and predicted that the government would never dare produce him in court again. A few days later, then Attorney General Brownell corroborated the charge by asking that Wright's testimony be stricken from the record of a hearing before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In the meantime, the supreme court ordered a retrial of Steve Nelson and four other local Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act. The order for a retrial was based on the fact that Mazzei had been a principal witness in their earlier trial.

This presented the local United States district attorney with a problem; how could he retry the defendants when all of his principal witnesses were tainted? He couldn't. The government quietly dropped the case. It has also dropped all other proceedings against local Smith Act defendants. Not a single one is in prison. Not a single case is pending. The paid informer system is a shambles.

## MANKIND

international socialist monthly

for "all men who like a Thoreau would like to ask an Emerson why he was still out of prison"

contributors:  
Rammohanar Lohia, G. D. H. Cole, Milovan Djilas, Marceau Pivert, Max Shachtman, George Padmore . . . many others, from the U.S., Europe, South America, Asia and Africa

non-sectarian

speculative

timely

the only magazine of its kind in the world today

subscription rates:  
\$4.00 per year (by seamount from India). Sample copies on request. Write American Committee for Mankind, Box 55, Ansonia Station, New York 23.

## BOOKS ABOUT LABOR

### A Part of the Story

**THE COMMUNIST PARTY VS. THE CIO**, by Max M. Kampelman, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 299 pp. \$6.00.

In substance, this is the story of the expulsion of the Communist Party-dominated unions from the CIO, told matter-of-factly in great detail. The author is an attorney who served as legislative counsel to Senator Hubert M. Humphrey 1949-1955. He draws heavily from official CIO sources, especially the transcript of the hearings that preceded the expulsions, and on occasion from testimony before various governmental investigative committees.

Essentially accurate is his description of the rise of CP power within the CIO and his detailed documentation recording the abrupt shifts in policy of unions controlled by it in strict accord with party line. Less complete is his account of the rise of inner-union oppositions to the CP. Dozens of prominent CP unionists pass through his pages in biographical detail but we get only a brief, occasional hint of how some became party followers. Most revealing is the testimony of former party members and fellow travellers at the CIO hearings; for example, Mike Quill of the Transport Workers Union and M. Hedley Stone of the National Maritime Union.

But the author can only describe what he can find in sources at his command. And these are almost exclusively official records. The faction fights, the polemical handbills, the caucus publications, the inner union battles come to him only second hand and this is his big shortcoming. He accepts without question, only because it is "official", a complete whitewash of Joe Curran's ruthlessly dictatorial role in smashing the Lawrenson group in the NMU, a group which helped to destroy CP control over the union before it in turn was destroyed by Curran. He seems totally unaware that a big fight began against the CP and that the party suffered severe losses at the hands of rank and file oppositionists while Phil Murray and top CIO officials were still collaborating with its followers. Thus, the UAW rank and file caucus receives not one mention—it has no place in official accounts. The fight of Reuther against the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist bloc gets only a passing reference (4 pages!).

Even when the author stumbles upon some of the facts, he is not prepared to notice them. Despite the strength of anti-CP sentiments in party dominated unions, Phil Murray and his associates refused to give moral encouragement to the formation of caucuses and groups to fight inside these unions for a new leadership. If the reader had only this book at his disposal, he would never imagine that Murray had supported Thomas against Reuther in the UAW or that the opposition to the CP in the UE had to fight on without Murray's help.

He presents, then, in well-documented fashion the official case of the CIO leadership against the CP. That he does thoroughly; but it is only part of the story.

### Miners in the Old West

**DEEP ENOUGH**, by Frank A. Crampton. Sage Books. 275 pp. \$4.00.

This is a personalized autobiographical account of how a 16 year old boy left his wealthy society home in New York to go West in 1904. He worked for a little while digging in the hard rock mines and then became a mining engineer travelling all over the West. He has good stories to tell of life in the mining camps during the last stages of frontier existence. But only a few pages tell of mine unionism.

He was there, and almost killed, in Ludlow, Colorado when coal strikers and their wives and children were massacred by National Guardsmen recruited for the purpose among scabs and company agents; and he was horrified and sickened by injustices and atrocities he witnessed with his own eyes.

But soon after, he was called to Bisbee, Arizona when radical unionists were herded into cattle cars and deported. The governor of the state told him that the victims were all Bolsheviks and German agents and he believed it. Apparently he still does! (Although a commission appointed by President Wilson at the time, which he does not mention, condemned the deportations and declared them illegal.) Yet, he expresses sympathy for the IWW and the old Western Federation of Miners.

This is a dandy book for those who want to read fascinating yarns about mining out West in a rugged era.

### Teamsters Union

**THE TEAMSTERS UNION**, by Robert D. Leiter. Bookman Associates. 304 pp. \$5.00.

You can learn a lot about the economy and technology of the trucking industry from this book and something of the history of teamster unionism, too. And if you need a handy source of reference to recent news clippings you will find it here. But the author, Associate Professor of History at the City College of New York, has not been able to shed much light on what interests us most.

He set out to write a scholarly work; and in no sense is this one of those canned "official" union accounts. But as he writes, "... most of the research was completed before the sudden upsurge of popular interest in corrupt union behavior." Apparently, he was caught unawares by the sudden sensational disclosures and couldn't quite adjust his book to them.

On the one hand he writes, "Those men running the International Brotherhood of Teamsters have apparently been fully aware of their responsibility and have publicly opposed racketeering in all its forms." This must have been written some time before the page which tells us, "In 1957, however, revelations disclosed financial and political corruption among leaders of the IBT during the past decades to a degree beyond the pale of condonation."

On the big questions, then,—union democracy, the fight inside the union against rackets, what it all means to the labor movement today — there is little. In chapter 2, by the way, there is a brief but frank account of the sordid deal between Roosevelt and Tobin which led to the prosecution of the SWP Minneapolis teamster leaders under the Smith Act.

### ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

in  
**LABOR ACTION**

are obtainable from

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14th St., New York

### New Perspectives for American Socialism

#### The Case for Unity

Introduction by  
Max Shachtman  
ten cents

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

## New York Liberal Party Campaign Raises Issue: What Is a "Loyal Opposition"?

By P. LOOMS

In the course of the recent mayoralty contest in New York City, the Liberal Party proudly referred to itself in a widely-circulated piece of campaign literature as "His Honor's Loyal Opposition."

The Party leadership evidently felt that this phrase accurately summed up the role played by the Party in this past election: supporting the major Democratic candidates, opposing some of the minor ones with independent Liberals, and putting forth a program of broad civic and social reform.

Even though "their" major Democratic candidates were victorious, the election results cannot have brought much satisfaction either to the party's leadership or to the ranks; and a partial key to the problem of building the Liberal Party as an effective political force in New York lies in an understanding of the term "loyal opposition."

The leadership's concept of "loyal opposition" minimized one thing, the most crucial single aspect of the phrase: "opposition." Instead of stressing "loyalty" to the Democratic Mayor (and to the Tammany machine, whose candidate he was) an opposition must oppose; not to do so calls the very need for its existence into question.

The Liberal Party's method of opposition consisted largely of support to its local candidates running for city council posts (and even a borough presidency, in one instance). These local candidates

could, and did, oppose the Democratic ward heelers in their own districts, but were crippled by the support they had to give to the major Democratic candidates. How could they fight corruption in the City Council and support, at the same time, the chief candidates of the Tammany machine, the source of the corruption?

The political schizophrenia induced by this kind of thinking had another effect: it led the leadership to minimize their own program. Thus they called on the electorate to vote for Liberal Party candidates pledged to: end discrimination in private housing; coordinate the transit system under broader municipal control and ownership; obtain better salaries for teachers; improvements in the health services; and better working and living conditions for Puerto Rican immigrants, etc.

And on the other hand, they stated (in the very same leaflet): "As a matter of fact the only live issue of the campaign is whether to vote for Wagner on Row B or Row C."

To have political effectiveness, a "loyal opposition" must be a genuine opposition. In Britain the slogan of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is not "Vote For Us But Support Macmillan," rather it is: "Throw the Tories Out!" It's time politicians who pride themselves on being "practical," appreciated the impracticality and utter futility of supporting the leadership—no matter how "friendly"—of the party they are attempting to replace.

## CP Declaration — —

(Continued from page 1)

of Communism led from Moscow and established over every single Communist movement, wherever it may be.

From now on, if some innocent, well intentioned, or even cynical member or friend of the Communist movement or apologist for the "Socialist world" suggests that they are marching toward greater freedom and democracy, (just give them time) such a "revisionist" is answered in the Declaration: "In the Socialist states the broad masses of the working people enjoy genuine freedom and democratic rights."

If someone suggests that each Communist Party should decide for itself when it can or cannot support Russian foreign policy, the Declaration replies: "Today the vital interests of the working peoples of all countries call for their support of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries who, pursuing a policy of preserving peace throughout the world, are the mainstay of peace and social progress."

To those who have been murmuring, in recent months, that although the banning of rival political parties in the Communist countries may be an understandable result of their specific histories and circumstances, the time has now come when they must begin to permit some airing of differing opinions at least in the ruling party itself the Declaration replies:

### NO FACTIONS

"The experience of the international Communist movement shows that resolute defense by the Communist and Workers parties of the Marxist-Leninist unity of their ranks and the banning of factions and groups sapping unity guarantee the successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the establishment of socialism and communism."

It is true that at a later stage the Declaration also speaks approvingly of the "measures taken in recent years by the Socialist countries to expand Socialist democracy and encourage criticism and self-criticism." But since, for the past six months at least the tendency has been toward a re-tightening the screws in every country where they were loosened up by the mass pressures which built up into the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, this section has no real significance for the document as a whole.

Finally, the Declaration closes in a series of repeated assertions on the unity,

solidarity, cooperation and the like of the parties involved. In this section there is so much breast-beating about this unity and unanimity and "closing ranks" that one begins to wonder whether it was not really written to cover up some big split among the signatories.

Since nothing else seems to bear up such an hypothesis, it may be discarded. The Yugoslavs refused to sign up, but that is an old split not a new one. Everywhere else the appearance is, for the moment, of calm and unity, of a renewal of the self-confidence and aggressiveness which were so badly shaken up by the revelations about Stalin and the Polish and Hungarian revolutions of last fall.

But this renewal of self-confidence and aggressiveness is not based on new foundations, on, say some new level of freedom and rights granted to the common people by the rulers which can win the former's loyalty to the regime, or on a rising standard of living and economic well being for all. Not at all. It is based rather on the feeling of self-confidence a bureaucrat gets when the old, familiar machine methods work to keep things running quietly. They are based on the defeat of the Polish and Hungarian revolutions, and on the feeling that the old, tried and true methods of Stalinism are the safest and surest after all.

So, the world Communist movement, in the countries where its bureaucracy constitutes a new ruling class, as well as in those where it is a persecuted movement which only aspires to such rule, seeks to return to its classical forms: totalitarian one-man rule in Russia and the other "socialist" countries; monolithic, totalitarian parties in the rest of the world.

But history has proved over and over again that once broken or outlived, the classic forms of a society or a movement can only be parodied, they can never be restored. We are, it appears, about to receive another demonstration of this axiom.

### THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious  
students of social issues

50 cents

\$2 a year

### LABOR ACTION • 18" YEAR

December 2, 1957 Vol. 21, No. 38

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: GORDON HASKELL  
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON  
Business Manager: Mel Stack  
Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL  
HERMAN BENSON  
MAX MARTIN  
SAM BOTTONE

## Russian Young Communist Leaders Turn Down YSL Debate Challenge

On Sept. 25th the Young Socialist League's National Student Committee sent a letter to the Young Communist League of Russia, proposing that simultaneous debates be arranged in Russia and the United States between members of the two organizations. (See Challenge for October 7.)

It was felt by the YSL that these debates would serve two functions: giving American students the opportunity to hear this confrontation of views between democratic socialists and representatives of the Russian Young Communist League; and allowing the Russian students to hear the ideas of democratic socialism for the first time in many decades.

There was only one condition put forth in the YSL's original letter, that no restrictions be placed on the debates, that no subject be banned from discussion.

On Nov. 12th, a reply was received from Mr. Y. Balanenko, of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR. (This is a central body, one of whose functions it is to represent all Russian youth organizations in their dealing with foreign youth groups.) The text of his letter is reprinted below.

The following week the YSL answered Mr. Balanenko's letter. The YSL reply is also reprinted on this page.

### Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR

Moscow, November 12

Messrs. Peter Novick, Nancy Ahern, Arlon Tussing New York, U.S.A.

Sirs:

We have received your letter of September 25th. From the letter it is unfortunately difficult to see what kind of organization is yours. You call yourselves socialists, but the contents of your letter refute the notion entirely. There is nothing in it which even remotely would be socialist in spirit. But after all this is your own affair.

In reply to your question we would like to tell you that it is a generally known and irrefutable fact that our young people and their organizations, including the Lenin Young Communist League of the Soviet Union, stand for peace and friendship, for fruitful co-operation between the peoples and youth of different countries, for exchange of views between people of different outlook.

Let us take the example to which you refer in your letter: the Sixth World Festival of Youth and Students for Peace and Friendship. Thirty four thousand young people, representing some fifteen hundred youth, students, cultural, trade union, religious, sports, child and other organizations from 131 countries, participated in it. As far as we know some American newspapers commented rather objectively on the content, character, and results of the Festival, including also the fact that the aim of the Festival was not to oppose one section of the youth against the other, but to bring them closer together in order to ensure peace throughout the world, to strengthen friendly contacts between young people of various political views, re-

ligious beliefs, races and nationalities.

And we would like to inform you that in the course of open debates and discussions, held in an atmosphere of complete freedom of opinion, no small contribution to the achievement of the above aim was made, a long with young communists, conservatives, radicals, Catholics, Moslems, etc. also by young socialists from Austria, Belgium, Britain, Federal Republic of Germany, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Finland, France, Sweden, Japan and other countries. The general outcome of these discussions in spite of differences on many questions was the same—people living in countries with diverse political and social systems can and must live in peace and friendship.

We hope that the young people of the USA who took part in the Festival will tell you about it in greater detail.

Such is our stand on the question raised by you. We have always been in favour of meetings and exchange of views among young people. But we hold that the questions for discussion should be such as would promote friendship and cooperation and not lead to mutual alienation.

We are willing to discuss and look for ways of peaceful existence, of friendship and concord. But judging from your letter that is of little concern to you. You want the reverse. As is seen from your letter, you would like to talk to us from a clearly hostile position. You hold the view that "the road to peace lies through opposition to Russian Communism." We believe that this position of yours will lead to no good.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) Y. BALANENKO,  
Secretary of the Committee

### REPLY

#### Young Socialist League

##### National Student Committee

New York, November 22

Mr. Y. Balanenko  
The Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR  
Moscow, Russia  
Dear Sir:

We received your answer to our letter to the Young Communist League.

We are sorry that you do not see fit to agree to our proposal regarding having simultaneous debates in Russia and the United States on the momentous social issues of our time. We would like to reopen this suggestion. But first, allow us to comment on several points in your letter.

In your letter, you state that we "would like to talk . . . from a clearly hostile position." That, as we stated in our letter, is true. The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization and, as such, is opposed to Communism. We would point out to you that this view is shared by all our democratic socialist parties recently addressed by Khrushchev.

We would like to point out to you that the Young Socialist League has consistently stood for peace, demanded the banning of the H-bomb, and defended the Civil Liberties of all Americans, including Communists. Further, our opposition to the Russian Government and social system does not extend to any kind of opposition to the Russian people, and the youth in particular. On the contrary, it is precisely because of our attitude toward the Russian people, our friendship for them, that we wish to raise these political questions in free and open debate.

As to the Festival. We are in favor of the youth of the world meeting together, unhampered by any restrictions as to passports, visas, etc. We, for example, opposed the American government's attitude toward those American students who went to Moscow and to China.

But we do not believe that the cause of peace is served by assuming that there are no basic differences among world youth. On the contrary, what we propose is an orderly, open airing of the differences. The very fact that a large section of the world youth movement is opposed to Communism, and that another section operates under Communist governments, is the reason why we are for debates.

Specifically, we propose debates between American democratic socialists and Russian Communist youth. In the long run, we believe that a frank confrontation of this type is absolutely necessary to the cause of peace. For our part, we do not believe that peace will come through the policies of the present Russian Government or through those of the American Government. But that is what we wish to debate.

We, therefore, renew our proposal: that representatives of Russian Communist students come to the United States and we will arrange a tour in which they can present their views, in debate with American young socialists, throughout this country; and that a similar tour be arranged by you in Russia for debaters from the YSL; with the one condition, that no subject be ruled out of the discussion.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,  
Pete Novick, Columbia U  
Nancy Ahearn, U. of Chicago  
Arlon Tussing, U. of Washington

### Wisconsin Victory For Academic Freedom

The Wisconsin Senate has defeated a bill which would prohibit Communists or "subversives" from meeting or speaking in tax-supported public buildings in the state. The vote was 19-12. A small group of Republicans joined a solid bloc of Democrats to defeat the measure.

State Sen. Gerald Lorge, a Republican disciple of the late Sen. McCarthy, and a candidate for nomination to his vacant seat, led the battle in favor of the bill. The legislation was sponsored by the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion.

State Sen. William Trinke, a Republican, headed the opposition to the measure. Trinke's support was valuable because he is a former commander of the state American Legion organization. He said the bill foisted "the ugly head of intolerance, ignorance, and thought control on a great university."

The legislation was proposed by the Legion after the University of Wisconsin's board of regents allowed the now-defunct Labor Youth League, an alleged Communist youth group, to meet in university buildings and to invite out-of-state speakers to address them.

From: American Civil Liberties Union's Feature Press Service.

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

### YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

December 6

Morris Williams

(Young English Trade Unionist)

BRITISH LABOR PARTY  
TODAY

social refreshments

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

### GET ACQUAINTED!

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

- I want more information about the Young Socialist League and its ideas.
- I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

SCHOOL (IF ANY).....TEL.....

### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

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

# The Wall Street Journal Is Haunted By the Specter of A New Third Party in America

By GORDON HASKELL

The lead editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* for November 25 is entitled "The Greater Specter." What, one might wonder, aside from the falling stock market, could be haunting the *Journal*? Sputniks, perhaps? Or the fear that the growing recession may turn into a full-scale depression? Or the prospect of a smashing Democratic victory in some future election?

No, though such thoughts may haunt the *Journal's* editorial rooms, it is not to them that this editorial is devoted. It deals rather with another matter entirely: the specter of a third party.

"The specter of a third party . . . has appeared again to disturb the calculations of the country's politicians. None of them—Republican, Northern or Southern Democrats alike—is pleased about any such prospect."

## LABOR MOVEMENT

And neither, one might add, is the *Wall Street Journal*. As a matter of fact, this organ of smart businessmen's Republicanism appears to be so disturbed about the matter that in a lengthy editorial it succeeds in pointing the finger at all the dangers and their sources (the *Journal* concentrates on the Electoral College system of electing the president as one of the chief ones) without daring to even get close to what haunts its clients most: the possibility of a third party whose base and soul is the labor movement.

Here is the way the *Journal* continues: "The reasons are clear. A third party could easily become a resting place for dissident Republicans, fed up with the present modernism, and thus injure GOP hopes. A third party could draw from the strength of the Democrats, and perhaps deny them a victory. And a third party, built around a South dissatisfied with both Republicans and Democrats, could end up unsuccessful and thus deny Southern Democrats their highly valued committee chairmanships in Congress. These are chances no politician likes to hazard."

Let us take up the alternatives mentioned by the *Journal* one by one. The prospect of a branch of the Republicans breaking away from the GOP in order to march firmly and with determination

into the past may dismay the *Journal*, but it can be of little concern to the great mass of Americans. In fact, it is so apparent that such a group would be doomed to the life of a small minority movement composed of a few businessmen, bankers, coupon-clippers plus perhaps a sprinkling of back-country farmers, existing with little influence and less power, that even the hard-shelled Old Guard of the GOP has rejected such a prospect. There is nothing in it for them. They can do better for their principles and programs in the GOP as it is.

## DIXIECRATS

And the Dixiecrats are faced with very much the same kind of problem. Some fanatical groups among them may be so frenzied by the march of civil and political rights for Negroes that they may be determined to flee back to the Confederacy, or an imaginary facsimile thereof, regardless of the practical political consequences. But they are a real crackpot minority and don't count much in the professional political circles, even in the South.

The real steam behind a third party movement in the South revolves around different calculations, though it seeks to exploit the feelings of racial prejudice for all they are worth. The leaders of the third party sentiment among Southern politicians point to the possibility of playing a balance-of-power role between the Democrats and Republicans. Relying on their disproportionate representation in Congress (especially though not exclusively in the Senate), they could hope to wring concessions for their reactionary program by throwing a deadlocked presidential election into the House, and by generally throwing their weight back and forth between the two parties in their own interests.

But even the advocates of this course for the South recognize that it could, at best, be a delaying action. They know

that they and the point of view they represent is a minority in the nation, and can have decisive impact only by exceptionally lucky circumstances and exceptionally tricky political footwork. And for all but the most embittered, the risks look bigger than the possible advantages. In the present set-up, right now, they have been able to keep labor down and prevent the passage of most social legislation (or cut its teeth out) by the informal Dixie-GOP alliance. By their membership in the Democratic Party, plus their one-party rule in the South, they are able to keep most important committee chairmanships in both houses, with the great advantage this gives them as individuals and as representatives of a social policy. And even on the third party business, they have proved that they can, in a way, have their cake and eat it too. They can bolt the party in occasional elections, and still get their seniority assignments in Congress. Why should they leave such a first-rate set-up for the unknown role of a minority balance wheel between the parties?

## TRUMAN WANTS MODERATE

Recent experience has not led them to change their minds on these questions. Some of them bolted the Democratic Party in 1948, but nothing serious was done to them. In 1952 and 1956 again they sat on their hands or flirted with the Ike forces, but they got their committee seats and other perquisites just the same. Last year they demonstrated that despite some big talk, Eastland could stay in the party and, with his friends, wield more power in its effective program-making than the whole labor movement put together. And just the other day, Harry Truman, not the most conservative of Democratic leaders by far, expressed the opinion that in 1960 the presidential nominee of the Democratic Party should be a man who, though he stands for enforcement of the Supreme Court's school integration opinion, has said or done nothing about it which would infuriate the Southern racists!

The bulk of the Southern conservatives stay in the Democratic Party, just as the bulk of the business conservatives stay in the Republican Party for the same reason: they realize they, as minorities, can get more out of this set up for themselves from the majority of the people than they could get by going it alone politically. In reality what this means, also, is that the majorities in these parties get less for their interests by the arrangement than they would otherwise.

The *Wall Street Journal* editorial quoted above claims that the "greater specter" even than a third party is "minority rule." But that is exactly what the present political set-up promotes in three different ways: (1) the money power which gives the business Republicans their virtual monopoly of the communications industry; (2) the apportionment swindle which magnifies the rural vote against that of the urban areas on the one hand, and the Southern vote (with Negroes largely still disfranchised) against the North as a whole; (3) and the party system which reflects these other disproportions into the working machinery of political control in the country, and magnifies them further in the process.

Of course, the *Wall Street Journal* being what it is, it is not precisely this kind of "minority rule" it has in mind. Though its editorialist is vague enough about the "minorities" he fears, he talks about "pressure groups" and the "farm and labor problem" which seem to be linked up, in some unspecified way, with these "pressure groups."

## LABOR MAJORITY

But even if the *Journal* finds it expedient to beat about the bush on these matters, there is no reason for the labor movement to do so. For the simple fact is that in politics the labor movement is no longer a narrow "pressure group" interested only or primarily in laws to protect its own most immediate and direct concerns. The union movement, in

## 'Lesser Evil' Policy Seen Bad For Labor

From: *Voice of 212*, UAW Local 212 paper, for August-Sept.

When it comes to basic problems affecting the welfare of the working people, there is not much difference between the Republican and the Democratic parties. This is the opinion of Charles C. Lookwood, Consumers Council. In the President, Greater Detroit Eastside Shopper (Sept. 12), Lookwood writes:

\* \* \*

A short time ago I listened to a tirade by Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.). It was directed mainly at Walter Reuther. As I listened, I couldn't help but think that it is characters such as Goldwater who are alienating fairminded and independent voters and causing the GOP to become more and more a minority party.

Goldwater was particularly bitter at organized labor for its interest in political campaigns and for spending money in behalf of friendly candidates. And yet he admitted that he hoped and expected to receive for his own campaign, substantial contributions from business groups both in and outside Arizona.

The tragic and deplorable part of it all is, however, that while the Republican Party is openly and completely pro-big business, the Democratic Party isn't much better or different. The average voter doesn't have a choice. The best he can do is support the lesser of two evils.

Just how long fair-minded voters, including the members of organized labor, will go along with this intolerable and extremely dangerous situation remains to be seen. But few can deny that a very real crisis is developing.

the broad avenues of politics; is the most concentrated and effective representative of the interests of a majority of the American people! That is its social nature. It is no one's fault but its own that this nature has been warped and concealed by the stubborn adherence of the leadership of the movement to the political straight jacket of the two-party system.

Every active unionist knows intimately the proportion of the burden, financial and manpower-wise, of the Democratic Party's work which has been taken over directly or indirectly by the unions in recent years. Who has really gotten out the vote in city after city where the old Democratic machines have collapsed from their own rottenness? Who has supplied the manpower and the money for the sound trucks and leaflets, for the car-pools and poll-watchers? And way and beyond that: who has given the Democratic Party its program and appearance of a party dedicated to the interests of the majority?

Of course, all that has not come solely from the ranks of trade unionists. In many cases the most prominent spokesmen for the liberal ideas and progressive programs have been men from other walks of life. But the backbone, and sinews of war, the heart and soul of the movement came from the working class, from the labor movement.

## WHAT FRUITS?

Yet, what have been the fruits for labor and all the "little people" of America of the growing political role of the labor movement? Few and far between, and watered down into unrecognizable shapes and forms at that.

Labor gets out the vote, and reactionary or conservative Southerners sit in the driver's seat in Congress. Labor rallies all liberal and progressive elements behind the Democratic Party, but the Taft Hartley law remains on the books year after year. Labor does the hard, driving work during the campaigns, but the excellent resolutions it adopts in its conventions on civil rights, housing, education, old-age benefits, unemployment insurance and a host of other pressing problems and issues either lie unnoticed in the legislative pigeonholes of their fellow-Democrats in Congress, or come out shrunked,

(Turn to last page)

## Philadelphia ADA Sees Need For New Party As Dems Fail People

By G. HOTSPUR

Philadelphia has been the city in the country where the Americans for Democratic Action have had their most outstanding successes in the past. Co-operating with the Democratic Party, the ADA provided much of the leadership in ousting a corrupt and long entrenched Republican machine from control of the city and county. Richardson Dilworth and Joseph Clark, two ADA leaders, rose to positions of mayor of Philadelphia and U. S. senator, respectively.

What was the key to the success of the ADA in Philadelphia? Many observers thought that the ADA became a powerful organization because it was "blessed" with a Republican administration in the city, which it could really attack. This is an advantage that the ADA in New York City, Chicago, Cleveland, or Pittsburgh, for example, does not enjoy. Although Mayor Wagner of New York, Mayor Celebrezze of Cleveland, or Mayor Lawrence of Pittsburgh are certainly vulnerable to attacks from a liberal, progressive, or reform movement, the ADA has never taken off the gloves with the men in question because of the ADA's alliance with the Democratic Party. And as a result, the ADA has never gotten anywhere in these and similarly situated cities.

Now the Philadelphia ADA is up against the same quandary. The Democratic politicians whom the ADA did so

much to put in office have turned out to be essentially no different from the Republican hacks they ousted. The Democratic slate in Philadelphia this fall was so foul that Mayor Dilworth could not bring himself to support the nominees of his own party. Abandoning high-sounding rhetoric and political double-talk, Dilworth said of the ticket, with absolute accuracy, by the way, "It stinks!"

Where does this leave the ADA in Philadelphia? In the recent election, the ADA rejected both the old party slates and went on to raise the question of an independent third slate backed by liberals and the labor movement. Their statement is worth quoting: "There comes now the inescapable conclusion that, if both the Republican and Democratic parties continue their irresponsible nominations of men and women who do not represent the will to continue civic reform in Philadelphia, then it will be necessary for a coalition of organized independents and the labor movement to create their own political instruments for the purpose of achieving the continuance of good government."

If this statement is only a threat to put a little pressure on the Democratic machine hacks, it won't fool anyone for very long. If it is a serious perspective—and we hope it is—then the Philadelphia ADA and its allies in the labor movement are in a position to give even more spectacular leadership than they have in the past.

# Two Years of Labor Unity in the U.S.

# PROMISE AND FULFILLMENT

By BEN HALL

When the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations joined together at their unity convention in New York, it was a moment of high anticipation. Labor unionism was never stronger; yet, somehow, it had become bogged down. The Taft-Hartley law, a Republican administration, state "right-to-work" laws were a token that labor, despite its power, was stalemated. Now, it was time to recapture the old crusading spirit that built the labor movement and raised it from a small minority to the authentic representative of the industrial working class. Now, it was time for a new stage of social progress for the whole nation. In all the unions, the ranks waited for a new surge forward.

Two years have passed and now the united AFL-CIO opens its second convention in Atlantic City, December 5. Its task is to prepare itself to carry out the promises and hopes of unity, promises based not upon illusion but reality.

As the first convention assembled the immediate prospects seemed bright. Labor would speak with a united political voice; it would intensify its political action program and thus strengthen American democracy. In 17 years, not a single piece of important social legislation had been passed in Congress; perhaps, it was time to break the power of the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition and renew the story of social progress. In the South, the fight for democracy had at last begun in full force and it seemed possible to cut down one pillar of national conservatism. In the unions, racism was to be obliterated; equal rights for all to be installed in all unions; and unionism to appear as the champion of the equal rights of all. Organize the unorganized! Again the call was heard to bring new millions in new industries into the family of organized labor and to organized, above all, in the South. Hope rose, too, for democracy inside unions where it had been suppressed. The rank and file of one Teamster local, campaigning for democracy and decency in their union passed out handbills to this first convention, appealing for support against a tyrannical officialdom. In every way, it was a time of great expectation.

### Slow in Coming

But what every unionist wanted, what they looked for, has been disappointingly slow in coming. In 1956, the Eisenhower administration was reelected. Although labor demanded that liberal Democrats dissociate themselves from reactionaries in their own party, although Walter Reuther, and others, proclaimed "you cannot have Eastland and us," the Democratic Party remained the party of Southern slave dealers united with Northern New Dealers. In the South, Negroes continued to press for democratic rights but labor was not conspicuous in the struggle; after unity, it was announced that a big fund would be established to help the victims of Southern reaction in their crusade for equality but dissension among the leaders killed this project. The unorganized remained unorganized. Although slow, steady and modest progress was made in increasing the membership of

unions that were already powerful, there was no breakthrough into new fields, no spectacular expansion of areas of organization. The unorganized South remained the unorganized South.

Yet, unity has already justified itself.

There are many reasons why the enthusiasm of unity has been bottled up and ineffectual. One is labor's out-lived political policy discussed elsewhere in this issue of LABOR ACTION. But most important is this: the united federation has been compelled to preoccupy itself with cleaning house. Before labor can move on, it has got to get rid of the grafters and racketeers that infest the unions. The fight against racketeering is more than a crusade for ethics and honesty. It is the fight to carry out the promise of unity.

Racketeering is nothing new, inside unions and out. Man for man, in proportion to membership, there is probably less corruption in the labor movement today than there was twenty-five years ago. But it has become intolerable. For decades, union progressives demanded that the labor movement take steps to rid itself of grafters, long before any politicians or public investigators were willing to take a continuing interest in it. But the crooks found refuge in the cry of "autonomy." The CIO was largely able to free itself from corrupt elements but in the old AFL a big section of the Executive Council, for one reason or another, was not willing to take decisive action.

### Power Balance Shifted

But unity changed all this. When the CIO and AFL merged, the balance of power inside the labor movement shifted and a decisive majority was now eager to act against grafters. For the first time, the united labor movement worked out constitutional clauses, with teeth in them, for acting to eliminate racketeers from the ranks of the labor movement. If for no other reason, unity was a great thing. Labor's determination to do something did not wait upon any Senate committee; in fact, the CIO would never have agreed to unite unless machinery for dealing with rackets was written into the new constitution. But, it is now clear, that the extent of racketeering surprised even those, like Meany, who had decided to act against it.

Teamsters, Bakers, Textile Workers, Distillery Workers, Laundry Workers, Allied Industrial Workers, Jewelry Workers . . . here is just the beginning of the list of those accused of unethical practices from within the labor movement. And, unfortunately, others are to come. When rackets are uncovered in New York City garbage collecting, union officials are incriminated; when gangsters confer in national assembly in New York State, a union official is picked up. And everyone is aware of the fact that one or two new national exposures are to come.

The racketeers are many, they are powerful, but they are a minority. The labor movement has reached the point where it will no longer tolerate this crooked minority and that is what this second AFL-CIO convention will make clear to all.

There are some who will still say: "We admit, of course, that grafting is a reprehensible thing; but there are far more crooks in business than in labor. Why split up the unions over a trifle like this. Take it easy; don't go to extremes." It was this spirit that helped the rackets find cover in legitimate unionism. But those days are gone.

Once, unions could go about their own private business and only a few were concerned. A little wage increase here; a larger one there; and who cared too much whether some official concocted a personal racket on the side.

### For Social Progress

But not now. The labor movement affects every facet of national life; it strives for social progress everywhere; and at the same time, its enemies want laws to cut away its power. Labor is in politics; it appeals to all the people. Unions call upon all citizens to vote for justice, to sympathize with the underdog, to support democracy, decency and liberalism in national government.

But it has a hollow sound when inside the union movement itself the people learn that there is graft; that critics are expelled, even murdered; that officials practice exactly the kind of deception, conniving and thievery that labor denounces so justifiably in industry and politics. Labor must come forward with clean hands, democratic and decent. That is what faces the second convention; the united federation will deal with it before it can devote the energies of a united movement to carry out its own program of politics, organizing and building.

For the first time, a serious effort has been made to crush corrupt practices in powerful unions. The Executive Council has suspended several unions and now the convention must decide whether or not to expel the powerful Teamsters Union which has refused to carry

out the AFL-CIO mandate to clean house. It will not be an easy decision but the outcome seems certain: the Council will be upheld.

It would not be surprising if a number of high officials from unions which have resisted the clean-up drive opposed the expulsion in public or behind the scenes.

That would be in order, for the racketeers find allies and apologists in the labor movement. Quite different, however, is the appeal of some anti-Hoffa elements within the Teamsters Union against expulsion of their union; not because they want to compromise with grafting but because they want to be able to fight it more effectively. Seven Teamster locals from New York City have appealed to George Meany against expulsion and at the same time ask for all possible aid from the AFL-CIO "to those of us in the Teamsters who are determined to bring our union back to the high place it occupied in former years." New York Teamsters voted 89-70 against Hoffa at their union's national convention and have chosen a slate against Hoffa's men now in control of the local Teamsters Joint Council.

It is indeed a hard decision to make and a terrible dilemma. If the Teamsters Union is expelled, the fight of progressive unionists within it will become more difficult; some will perhaps find their way back into the AFL-CIO; others will have to remain where they are; the authority of the Federation may be strong enough to win away whole sections of the union. But in the big section which stays with Hoffa, the life of a AFL-CIO loyalist will be a hard one.

### Decisive Action

But—and this is the other side—if the Teamsters are not expelled or disciplined in some other drastic manner the fight against racketeering in the whole Federation will have suffered a terrible moral blow. This convention must act decisively. If it does not, it will be taken as a sign that the AFL-CIO intends to compromise with corruption; in every local and international where corruption exists and the ranks are waiting for some sign of what to expect from the labor movement they will lose heart and feel deserted. The loss of the Teamsters will be a blow but there seems no alternative.

Is it possible that the machine which runs the Teamsters Union can take a million and a quarter unionists out of the united labor movement . . . and for what? To defend the right of top officials to practice rackets at will! This is not like the Miners Union which quit after arguing over policy. It is not like the Machinists who left for a while over jurisdiction. If the Teamsters leave, it will be over nothing more than graft.

How is that possible? The answer seems to be that the labor movement waited too long; it was too slow; it delayed until the disease must be cut out by hasty surgery. Years, years, years passed; there was no encouragement to decent elements in the unions to rise against their officials; no hint that they would receive the moral aid and encouragement of the labor movement if they did so; quite the contrary. The mood in the American labor movement was one of obedience below to the officials above whoever they were. And that has yet to change in any deep-going fashion.

### New Spirit Must Rise

Even today there is no full-scale recognition of the fact that a new spirit of democracy must rise. Now that it is clear that the Teamsters officialdom is riddled with corruption the ranks are asked somehow, somewhere to effect an overnight change. But the job of refurbishing a union and changing its whole leadership takes years. Even in the Auto Workers Union, Reuther had a long fight even after he had won the presidency of his union. Can the rank and file, without warning or encouragement be asked to do in a moment what took him years?

As the convention assembles, the moment of crisis has already struck in the Teamsters Union. But what of other powerful officialdoms. For example, take the Operating Engineers. Some of its locals were rotten to the core; the International does nothing. Or the Carpenters. Its president was never called upon to explain why he resorted to the Fifth Amendment in Indiana when questioned about land swindles. Are these unions next? If so, where is the slightest hint of a suspicion that the memberships of these unions and others have the duty of calling their officials to account, a pledge that all unionists will get the moral support of all labor if they exert their democratic rights to the full; that they will be defended if they are expelled; that they will be supported if they are victimized; and, yes, that they will be remembered if they are killed.

The second convention of the AFL-CIO will endorse the fight to drive crooks out of the united labor movement; union militants will be gratified to see what they demanded for years finally come to pass. But it can be looked upon only as a first step toward the reestablishment of union democracy where it has been crushed and toward the realization of the promise of a united labor movement.

### YOU ARE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of LABOR ACTION, "Readers Take the Floor." Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words. Letters must be signed; names withheld on request.

## LABOR ACTION

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST NEWSPAPER  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year at \$2.	<input type="checkbox"/> New
<input type="checkbox"/> 6 months at \$1.	<input type="checkbox"/> Renewal
<input type="checkbox"/> Payment enclosed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Bill me.

NAME (please print) \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

ZONE \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_

# More Guns, Less Butter — —

(Continued from page 1)

the SAC retaliatory power; greater co-operative effort with the Western allies in scientific developments and balancing the military forces; more emphasis on scientific training to produce the scientists to turn out even more advanced weapons.

With rare exception there have been those, like George Kennan and the N. Y. Post who have been looking around for some kind of political alternative to the missile madness. They have been raising the question of U.S. "disengagement" from Germany.

But the dominant note has been sounded by those who have firmly entrenched themselves in the old way of thinking and then issued a call for greater sacrifices from the American people.

The more stringent notes have been sounded by those like David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America who unabashedly announced to a meeting late in October that the "time for an adequate cold war offensive is running out." Joining in have been Dr. Edward Teller who compared our present position to that of a Pearl Harbor; and Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat from Washington, who warned that the defense philosophy of the U.S. and its sense of urgency "must be the same as if we were at war."

## MARGINAL FREEDOMS

From official Administration sources have come a series of statements showing how they are thinking about the cost of the stepped-up missile programs.

Speaking before a meeting of businessmen secretary of State Dulles said that the urgency of the cold war means that Americans might have to make sacrifices and "give up small marginal freedoms" to retain their basic, individual freedoms.

When questioned at his news conference on Nov. 19th, Dulles further explained that "it may prove desirable to give up or stretch out some of the domestic programs (which ones, he failed to specify) we have which are desirable but not vital, so that we can carry out programs which are vital." This was being proposed as the

## Recession — —

(Continued from page 1)

and different for the UAW to face, and for which old answers simply do not suffice.

The huge expansion of American industry in the past decade provides management with the opportunity in a recession to close down marginal plants, and place its work in the newer, more efficient factories. This process in steel, textile, and elsewhere, will give other unions the same problems which now plague the UAW.

In each case, the corporations demand increasing work loads per man, or else threaten to move the work to another plant. Local unions are placed in the terrible dilemma of either going along with management or watching the whole plant close down.

The first reaction of the workers in this kind of atmosphere is to go after union leaders on a plant and local union level in pressure moves to get some answers that are answers. In turn, pressures build up on international union leaders. The unemployed provide more fuel in the fires, as they come to local union meetings and demand answers when the local union leaders are simply swamped by the size of the problems.

Unless, the union leadership does re-establish contact with the ranks and takes more carefully into account the new mood going on in basic industries, more internal storms and strife are bound to take place.

Blind as usual, the corporations keep driving away at costs and reducing manpower, as they must to survive under capitalism, and thus keep intensifying class hatreds which union leaders find more and more difficult to ignore.

Any failure to achieve a short work week without a loss of pay to help alleviate the unemployment situation will, for example, create new factional situations in the unions and shake more than one hierarchy in the year 1958.

alternative to unbalancing the budget and raising taxes.

At the same meeting at which Dulles spoke, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks urged business and industry to support a federal budget calling for "less butter and more guns."

As ominous as these warnings are as portents of future administration policy, they at least do not have the draconic overtones of some of the statements made by leading Democrats. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson delivered the Clayton Lectures at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy which the story in the *Christian Science Monitor* of Oct. 24th described as proposing "that the U.S. enter a Spartan era in the coming decades."

## "SPARTAN HEAD"

The views expressed by Dean Acheson, former secretary of state, late in October are an expression of the reactionary potential of those who think through the implications of the present bipartisan foreign policy. It is quite accurate to characterize these views as "Spartan belt-tightening" as the *Christian Science Monitor* did.

Starting from the fact of the rapid Russian economic development in the past 25 years based on a tremendous reinvestment program at the expense of the Russian people, Acheson concludes that the U.S., too, must have a heavy industry orientation rather than service and consumer industry. He complains that "as we proceed with automation, we turn the results to leisure, then to reinvestment." And then Acheson points out that a decade ago America took 35 million weeks in vacations, while now they take 70 million weeks. The conclusion: less butter, more guns.

In line with this, Acheson proposes that the federal government take a larger role in planning. Otherwise "parochial interests [is he referring to labor unions here?] will always overpower the general interest. . . . If the government will interfere more with what we produce and consume it might interfere less with what we think, what we do, and where we go."

The governmental power Acheson describes will tend toward authoritarianism. If it is going to "overpower" parochial interests and decide how much is to be consumed, then what basis is there for believing that it will lead to greater freedom? Since the only significant reduction in consumption can come out of the great mass of the American people, obviously it will run into strong union opposition to this cut in the workers' real standard of living.

The alternatives facing America, Acheson summarized, are "using our vast productivity to fashion a system that will keep us strong and free" or of expending this power "on an increase in consumption and leisure." [See box for fuller summary of Acheson's views. Ed.]

## PACTOMANIA

If anything is clear at this late date of this revolving crisis it is that the way out cannot be through redoubling everything the U.S. was doing up until Washington became aware of the new relationship of forces in the world. The pactomania approach of building military alliances throughout the world has been

held up for increasing criticism in the past few years by liberals. Now, however it is pulled out, polished up, and presented as the solution to Sputnik, and scarcely a dissenting voice is heard.

Before President Eisenhower's latest illness, the December meeting of the NATO council in Paris was being built up as one of monumental importance. The *Times* editorially referred to it as "potentially [the] most important such gathering since the Versailles conference of 1919" (Oct. 31). And everything which has appeared thus far about the proposals to be presented by the Eisenhower administration, with the assistance of Adlai Stevenson, indicates that it may very well turn out to be about as successful as the original Versailles conference, one of the most notorious busts in world history.

Thus far the main proposals have to do with a series of military and technical considerations like stockpiling nuclear weapons on the Continent, and sharing military assignments among the NATO allies. All of these are important chiefly for those who have almost exclusively a military orientation toward the problems raised by the new Sputnik diplomacy started by the Russians.

The conference has been charged with meeting the "crisis of confidence" and the gradual disintegration of the NATO alliance. For almost two years there has been talk in NATO circles of increasing the political and economic functions of this military alliance. But it has come to no more than talk.

## INTERDEPENDENCE

Now the emphasis is on "interdependence" of the Allies, and calling for greater political consultation. But it turns out that each ally has a different idea of what are the common interests of the alliance. For the French it means one thing in North Africa, but for the U.S. and Britain who look at the possibility of Russian intervention, it is another. Similarly, Britain and Greece can not get together on what is the correct joint policy in respect to Cyprus.

Viewed from this point of view the situation looks hopeless. Hence the openly stated pessimism about what can really be accomplished at the NATO meeting aside from soothing talk.

The need is for a thorough re-evaluation of what America's foreign policy should be. Even if all the proposals at the NATO meeting were carried out, the question

# Third Party — —

(Continued from page 6)

misshapen and devitalized from the legislative meat-grinder.

There was a time when the organized labor movement in this country represented a small, skilled minority of the workers in industry and transportation, and an even smaller minority of the population as a whole. In those days labor's legislative program confined itself pretty much to the "narrow issues" befitting a "special pressure group." Further, labor was organizationally divided, and often pulling in opposite directions on political questions.

But today, all that holds no longer. Even though the union movement still embraces a numerical minority of the working people of the country, no one can honestly say that it does not represent the interests of all. It is precisely because it has become such a broad movement representing such a broad section of the American people, that the conservatives and reactionaries seek to restrict and cripple it as much as possible in the field of politics as well as in that of collective bargaining.

## NEW PARTY

And now the labor movement is united, and is in the process of cleaning out the crooks and fast-buck boys who brought it into disrepute both among some workers and in the eyes of the "general public." What real argument can be made against the proposition that from the point of view of a majority of the American people the labor movement should lead its allies the Negroes, small farmers

remains: toward what goal? Is it toward negotiations with Russia based on more or less equally strong military blocs? Or is it to generate so much strength that the Stalinists will be forced to their knees before the superior military power of the U.S. and its allies?

There is the need for a political opposition in this country to develop an alternate foreign policy which will be able to distinguish between a position of strength and a situation where rigor mortis has set in.

## CONGENITAL RIGIDITY

The fact that in the past year the Russians have been able to recoup a great deal of the prestige lost as a result of the Khrushchev revelations of Stalin and the bloodbath of the Hungarian Revolution is less a testimony to the viability of the Stalinist policies than to the congenital rigidity of the Western alliance.

On no front has the U.S. or anyone else been able to mount a political offensive to undermine Stalinist influence and prestige, even at a time of great crisis inside the Russian empire. The break has to be made somewhere in this vicious pattern. First the idea that the aim must be negotiations with the Russians must be replaced by the aim of building a democratic foreign policy based on positions of political strength, not military strength. Once such positions have been built, it will not be the Stalinists who will be able to win great support in the Asian-African world by their demagogic appeals for peace, national independence and ending of bomb tests.

Such a policy of political strength has to start with the willingness to end testing of nuclear weapons, unconditional support for national independence movements, as in Algeria, and ending the arms race in the Middle East. There also has to be a move toward disengagement from Germany, that is, the withdrawal of American troops from Germany, even without an agreement with Russia. This means, of course, a reconsideration of the entire NATO alliance. The idea that if U.S. troops pulled out of Central Europe the Russians would automatically move in is scarcely held in any serious way any longer.

It is along these lines that a democratic foreign policy has to be developed. The need is for a partisanship not concerned with a narrow fixing of the blame for a lagging missile program, but with the broad outlines of a new approach to world problems.

and "little people" in general into the formation of a political party which can really represent their interests?

The working people and those whose interests are identical with theirs are not a minority in the country. Thus the arguments which keep the Old Guard in the GOP and the Southern reactionaries in the Democratic Party do not apply to them. Even though a new party, organized by the labor movement and its allies might fall to win initially, their strength and potential invincibility would be so apparent that the political tables would be turned from the very beginning. Instead of the working people, through the union movement, begging with hat in hand for some crumbs of favors in the councils of the Democratic Party and in the national and State legislatures, the more conservative elements would have to decide whether they could not defend their interests better by such a role rather than by "going it alone."

The American labor movement has already performed yeoman service for the workers of this country, both organized and unorganized. There is much, much more that it can and will do, now that it is united and has begun to move against some of the businessmen and racketeers who have been masquerading as labor leaders in its midst. But the biggest single step it could take in its own interest and in that of the whole nation would be to prepare and begin to work on a serious program designed to bring about the formation of a new political party in America at the earliest possible time.

## NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

Thursday, December 5

## INTEGRATION AND THE N. Y. CITY SCHOOLS

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