

Do You Lie To Your Boss?

By Neva Kecsemeti

Here I am sitting with a large rubber covered coil around my chest and a stethoscope attached to my arm. I am being given a lie detector test. Why am I here? This is the true story. This morning the man came over and said: "We'll want to talk to you." An hour later he and a young girl came back and told me to follow them. Down two flights of dimly lit stairs into the basement through a long corridor with low pipes, into a brightly lit bare room.

"Sit down."

I sat in a straight wooden chair with curved arms that my hands fit into. The woman asked if I knew what a polygram test was. I answered: "I don't."

"It is a lie detector test. It will give us the facts in your case." She read out a few sample questions. "These are the questions you will be asked." She gave me a release to sign for any physical or mental harm that might come from the test. I signed it. She then strapped the large rubber-covered coil around my chest and the stethoscope around my arm. The man in the room didn't say anything but watched from behind the light. The light was turned on. It blinded me.

"Keep your feet on the floor, your hands flat and your eyes straight ahead."

The questions started. "Have you ever stolen? Is the information you gave us about yourself true? Is your name Neva? Do you object, in any way, to this test? Do you drink? Are you loyal? Do you live up to our rules? Do you live in Buffalo?"

I answered the questions that kept coming. "Do you feel that you are being taken advantage of in any way on your job?" I clenched my fist and yelled: "You didn't read that question to me before." She snapped back that I had ruined the first part of the test, and we'd have to start over.

"This time keep your hands flat."

What's This All About?

Questions came at me again.

I suppose the question about the job made you wonder what this was all about. You see, I'm not a criminal. I'm not even in jail. I work for the largest dry cleaners in western New York state as a silk presser for \$1.15 an hour. The plant is a two-story brick building. Inside, the paint is peeling, the plaster is falling, the second floor has been declared unsafe for more than twenty-four girls. There are at least thirty-six of us at work there now.

The union did organize the plant. Three years ago they were able to sign up all the employees and force an election. A contract providing for higher pay, better working conditions and fringe benefits was signed. Within a month all workers who favored the union were fired and the employer refused to live up to the contract. The case went to the State Labor Relations Board. After twenty-six months the Board ruled for the union, stating that the signed contract must be observed by the company.

The following day a notice was posted in the plant. It said that the plant would be closed before they would recognize the union, and that the union representatives are thugs and gangsters.

The man behind the light was my boss. The young woman had a conference with him. She then returned to the machine and asked me the same questions as before plus some new ones.

"Are you in favor of unions in large shops? Are you in favor of unions in small shops? Are you in favor of craft unions? Have you ever participated in any union activities? Have you been contacted by the AFL Dry Cleaners and Dyers Union?" Then she gave me some anti-union literature to read and told me that I'd be talking to her again in a short time.

Advise to all good unionists who might confront this latest union busting method — take two tranquilizers and beat the lie detector.

... High Court Shifts on Integration

(Continued from Page 1) have the Alabama law declared unconstitutional. He argued that it was designed to evade the Supreme Court integration decisions.

On May 9, a three-judge federal court, convened specially to rule on the suit, decided that the school placement law is not unconstitutional "on its face" although it might later be "declared unconstitutional in its application." In rejecting Rev. Shuttlesworth's contention that the law was designed to maintain school segregation, the court ruled, "In dealing with an act of the legislature of a sovereign state, we cannot lightly reach such a conclusion, nor, indeed, are we permitted to do so except upon the most weighty and compelling of reasons."

On Nov. 24, the Supreme Court, affirmed the three-judge lower court ruling, without giving reasons of its own. The high court thus upheld the lower court's reasoning. As late as last September, when the Supreme Court refused to allow a two-and-a-half year suspension of integration at Little Rock High School, the judges declared unanimously that their integration rulings "... can neither be nullified openly and directly by State legislators ... nor nullified indirectly by them through evasive schemes for segregation whether attempted 'ingeniously or ingenuously.'"

But "deliberate speed" and not delay were to be the norm of desegregation. The school placement ruling changes the time norm.

Second, under its 1955 decision, the burden of proof for holding up integration was placed on Southern officials. Of course, federal judges were lenient with the racists, but last September, in the Little Rock decision, the high court refused to sanction a delay on grounds now validated in Alabama's student placement law. Instead of Southern officials having to prove that a proposed delay is warranted, Negroes will have to prove that they are being discriminated against because of race, in contesting individual exclusions from white schools under the placement law. According to Krock, the same rule as in jury cases will obtain. "This was that the exclusion of Negroes from a jury did not in itself sustain a charge that racial discrimination was the real reason. What had to be proved was an enduring and deliberate pattern of exclusion."

Finally, the goal itself has been changed. The high court had ordered school boards and federal judges to proceed with all "deliberate speed" to integration — and led the Negro people to believe that this meant nothing short of total integration. As Krock says, the Alabama school placement decision "Amounted to notice by the Supreme Court that it will not strike down any state school law, which it is possible to apply so as to admit qualified Negroes to non-segregated schools..."

Anticipating the court's school placement decision Ralph Odum, Assistant Attorney General of Florida, wrote in the Nov. 23 U.S. News and World Report, "I think it is clear that the Florida pupil-placement act, which is similar [to the North Carolina act on which the Alabama law, in turn, was patterned], will be upheld if some integration takes place..." He says further, "This law was designed to permit some integration, but the various scholastic, psychological and sociological standards involved would tend to reduce the amount of integration which would take place in its operation to a bare minimum — at least for a foreseeable future."

But "deliberate speed" and not delay were to be the norm of desegregation. The school placement ruling changes the time norm.

Second, under its 1955 decision, the burden of proof for holding up integration was placed on Southern officials. Of course, federal judges were lenient with the racists, but last September, in the Little Rock decision, the high court refused to sanction a delay on grounds now validated in Alabama's student placement law. Instead of Southern officials having to prove that a proposed delay is warranted, Negroes will have to prove that they are being discriminated against because of race, in contesting individual exclusions from white schools under the placement law. According to Krock, the same rule as in jury cases will obtain. "This was that the exclusion of Negroes from a jury did not in itself sustain a charge that racial discrimination was the real reason. What had to be proved was an enduring and deliberate pattern of exclusion."

Finally, the goal itself has been changed. The high court had ordered school boards and federal judges to proceed with all "deliberate speed" to integration — and led the Negro people to believe that this meant nothing short of total integration. As Krock says, the Alabama school placement decision "Amounted to notice by the Supreme Court that it will not strike down any state school law, which it is possible to apply so as to admit qualified Negroes to non-segregated schools..."



Chief Justice Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court (top) and Arkansas Governor Faubus. Last fall Warren led court in unanimous ruling upholding school integration against Faubus-inspired move to put off continuation of Little Rock integration for 2 1/2 years. However, racists see in court's Nov. 24 decision upholding Alabama student-placement law a means whereby they can legally circumvent the court's 1954 decision.

McReynolds Challenges Militant On What It Says About SP-SDF

Editor, the Militant:

The story by Murry Weiss in the December 15th issue of the Militant — "Which Side in the Unions Are You On?" — is interesting for the misinformation it carries. Certainly the Socialist Party makes mistakes and these mistakes should be discussed and the Militant has the right to discuss them. But it is one thing to attack us for mistakes we have made, and quite another thing to attack us for mistakes we have not made but which the Militant has invented all on its own.

Murry Weiss states "And like the Communist Party, the Social Democrats advised the radical workers to vote for the candidates of the ruling class rather than the only socialist ticket on the ballot. We cite these known facts . . . to understand the terrible breach of elementary socialist and working class solidarity."

What "known facts"? Would Murry Weiss please give the official source in which the Socialist Party urged anybody to vote for Harriman or Rockefeller? And if he cannot give such a source, then why did he make such a charge? It is true that we did not support the I.S.P., because we have political disagreements with it. Nor do I recall the Militant giving any support to my own campaign

for Congress in the 19th District and I assume that is because of political disagreements and not because the Militant was supporting the Democrat or Republican in my district.

And again Murry Weiss goes back to January 1957 — almost two years ago — to quote a statement from Louis P. Goldberg stating we would "never run candidates in opposition to those endorsed by the legitimate labor movement. And yet events prove that the Socialist Party has retained its right to choose who it will support and who it will not support. Certainly Congressman Farstein here in the 19th District was supported by labor and it is

We Cite Party's Official Policy in Reply

Militant Editor's Reply:

David McReynolds appears to have interpreted Murry Weiss as stating that ALL Social Democrats advised the radical workers to vote for the candidates of the ruling class. But Murry Weiss did not say that. Like the other members of our staff, he is aware that SOME Social Democrats are against voting for candidates of the ruling class.

equally clear that the Socialist Party ran a candidate against him. Murry Weiss should not quote sources two years' old which have been refuted by later events.

There is no time here to discuss the fundamental misconception the SWP has of a Labor Party and how to achieve it. But it is worth pointing out that any discussion among radicals is infinitely more difficult when some of those taking part in the discussion show a woeful lack of information or, worse, a complete disregard for facts when they do not fit a pre-determined line.

Sincerely,
David McReynolds

No great legal talent is required, it appears to us, to interpret this language. Out of deference to those who think it a betrayal of socialist principles to aid in the election of Democrats or Republicans, the SP-SDF Party "as such" will not support them. However, in accordance with the policy of supporting labor-endorsed or avowedly progressive candidates of the Democratic or Republican machines, "we" (Social Democrats) as individuals can aid in their election. "We" can also "consider" socialist or other independent candidates (such as McReynolds) and run socialists in the Democratic or Republican primaries.

Thus both the upholders of principles and the betrayers of principles can peacefully co-exist in the same party. Clever, isn't it?

PARALLELS CP LINE

This policy, as Murry Weiss pointed out in his article, parallels that of the Communist Party which has been supporting capitalist candidates since 1936 — even while running occasional token candidates of its own to appease those in its orbit who think it a betrayal of socialist principles to vote for Democrats or Republicans.

The SP-SDF National Convention resolution cited above declares that "for various reasons, we are in most cases unable to offer potential members an electoral alternative. . . . This might be taken as a justifiable plea of weakness and isolation; but the fact is that the policy of refusing to contest office against "labor-endorsed" candidates began in the thirties when the Social Democracy was relatively strong.

We found a two-inch advertisement among the Labor Day greetings in the September issue, two months before the election, where the name of David McReynolds appeared. There he was mistakenly listed as a candidate in the "10th C.D." Or was the Call right and McReynolds mistaken about running in the 19th C.D.?"

While we are at it, if McReynolds protested this oversight in the Call and the Call refused to publish his letter of protest, we would be pleased to print a copy in the columns of the Militant for the information of the radical public.

This does not complete the record of the electoral activity of the SP-SDF in 1958. The leadership did what it could to increase the difficulties of the United Independent - Socialist ticket in getting on the ballot. It threatened court action over the use of the word "United" in the name of the party.

And, as the paragraph quoted from the Call above indicates, it sought to smear the ticket as "Stalinoid."

Since the SP-SDF was not running its own statewide ticket, whom did these actions help if not the candidates of the ruling class?

If we interpret McReynolds' letter correctly, he sees eye-to-eye with the Reading Labor Advocate on this question. He holds that for Socialists to aid in the election of candidates of either the Republican or Democratic parties would be a betrayal of their Socialist principles.

WHAT IS OFFICIAL STAND?

The fact remains, however — and this is what Murry Weiss was talking about — that the actual policy of the SP-SDF is not to encourage Socialist electoral campaigns but to go along with the trade-union bureaucracy even if this means voting for candidates of the ruling class.

McReynolds appears to be of two opinions on whether this policy is a fact: (1) It has existed nowhere except in the columns of the Militant which invented it "all on its own" to fit a predetermined line. (2) It existed two years ago, as indicated by Goldberg's statement, but it has been dropped since then. Proof? McReynolds' campaign in the 19th District.

However, the policy was codified as follows at the May 1958 National Convention of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation:

"We must encourage a flexibility of electoral approach which, while not committing the Party as such to support for old-party candidates, can consider socialists or other independent candidates, entrance

into primary election, and action by individuals in support of labor or avowedly progressive candidates." (The Socialist Call, June 1958.)

No great legal talent is required, it appears to us, to interpret this language. Out of deference to those who think it a betrayal of socialist principles to aid in the election of Democrats or Republicans, the SP-SDF Party "as such" will not support them. However, in accordance with the policy of supporting labor-endorsed or avowedly progressive candidates of the Democratic or Republican machines, "we" (Social Democrats) as individuals can aid in their election. "We" can also "consider" socialist or other independent candidates (such as McReynolds) and run socialists in the Democratic or Republican primaries.

Thus both the upholders of principles and the betrayers of principles can peacefully co-exist in the same party. Clever, isn't it?

PARALLELS CP LINE

This policy, as Murry Weiss pointed out in his article, parallels that of the Communist Party which has been supporting capitalist candidates since 1936 — even while running occasional token candidates of its own to appease those in its orbit who think it a betrayal of socialist principles to vote for Democrats or Republicans.

The SP-SDF National Convention resolution cited above declares that "for various reasons, we are in most cases unable to offer potential members an electoral alternative. . . . This might be taken as a justifiable plea of weakness and isolation; but the fact is that the policy of refusing to contest office against "labor-endorsed" candidates began in the thirties when the Social Democracy was relatively strong.

How the policy operated in the 1958 elections can be judged from the role played by the Socialist Call, official publication of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation. The October issue devoted a three-paragraph editorial to the New York contest. That's right — the Call participated in the election to the extent of just three paragraphs in one issue!

The first paragraph took up the two millionaires running on the Democratic and Republican tickets. The second paragraph reads as follows:

"For those voters who want a millionaire who is also a staunch advocate of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union there is Corliss Lamont, candidate for Senator on the so-called Independent-Socialist ticket, a coalition of former Communists, fellow-travelers, former members of the American Labor Party, and the Socialist Workers Party, a Trotskyite group."

HOW IT'S ANGLED

Paragraph three follows the formula of no endorsement from the SP-SDF "as such" but of

Calendar of Events

SEATTLE
Reconvened Convention of United Liberals and Socialists. Sat., Jan. 10, 2:30 P.M. Banquet at 6 P.M. At 7:30 P.M., Discussion of Cleveland Conference and Socialist Political Action. Reporter, Dr. Holland Roberts of San Francisco. Chairman, Terry Pettus. Dinner \$1.25. Washington Hall, 14th and East Fir. Ausp.: United Liberals and Socialists.

NEW YORK
Debate! Fri., Jan. 9 — 8:30

CHICAGO
Fri., Jan. 16, 8:15 P.M. — James Nash Sr. reviews "Black Reconstruction" by W. E. B. DuBois. Also a report by Clifton DeBerry on the Carolina Cases of Racial Injustice.

Two Timely Books About the Soviet Union
By Leon Trotsky
The Revolution Betrayed
The economic roots of Stalinism and why worker's democracy has become an overriding necessity for the USSR.
Cloth \$3.00 Paper \$2.00

Stalin's Frame-Up System And the Moscow Trials
With Foreword by Joseph Hansen \$1.00
Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

The South's Dilemma
Education is more important than segregation, say increasing numbers of white parents and students in the South. As doubts begin to assail racists over the tactic of "massive resistance," a favorable turn is registered in the struggle for integration in the schools. But the bigots are not willing to give up yet. They intend to defy the Supreme Court as long as they can get away with it. What can be done to speed final victory?

This timely study offers the latest facts necessary for a realistic answer. In the winter issue of International Socialist Review. Send 35 cents for a copy.

International Socialist Review
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

The Class-Struggle Road to Negro Equality
Resolution adopted by the Socialist Workers Party at its National Convention, June 1957.
23 pages 25c
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Laura Gray Cartoon Calendar

A quarterly calendar, with four cartoons by Laura Gray, two of which are pictured here. Each cartoon is 7" x 8 1/2" and is printed on a vellum suitable for framing. Get them as gifts for your friends. Be sure to get a Laura Gray calendar for yourself before they run out. Each \$1 paid for a calendar will go into the fund for publication of the Laura Gray Memorial Cartoon Book. Order calendars from

Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

