

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 13, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Excerpts from His
Forthcoming Book:

**ANDRE MARTY'S
OWN STORY**

... page 6

Right-Wing Pressure on the BLP

... page 3

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

UAW Victory at Ford Gives A New Drive to Labor's Fight

The Court Dodges

It must be ruefully admitted that the Supreme Court decision which slapped the government on the wrist in the case of Dr. John P. Peters is not very much of a victory, though no doubt better than nothing. The court majority sidestepped a decision on the important aspect of the case: Did the government have the right to dismiss Peters from a job as a health consultant on the basis of unknown testimony by unknown informers as to his loyalty?

The court majority found a technicality on which to disagree with the government. (This won't help Peters any because he can't get his job back in any case, the appointment having expired.)

The two right-wing dissenters, Reed and Burton, disagreed with this technicality, and so did Justice William O. Douglas who concurred in the decision. Douglas concurred on the basis of the real constitutional issue.

The court majority explained that since they could settle the individual case without broaching the constitutional issue (they thought), they had decided to pass it by. Douglas disagreed with this approach. It is not necessarily a technical question for lawyers and jurists only. We laymen have a legitimate right to opinion on this score too.

While it is usual practice for a court to avoid a constitutional question if the given case can be adjudicated in any other way, this is not always responsible behavior. In this case it was irresponsible and a dodge. It was the court majority's means of declining to stop a government practice which neither the government nor the court can justify legally or morally.

Getting an issue before the Supreme Court is a long and costly process. Meanwhile the government witchhunters are at work in their own way. The way things look from the Peters case, pushing a case of principle up to the Supreme Court is a gamble: will or won't the justices (and their research clerks) be able to think up a technical means of dodging the necessity of a blow at the government?

Justice Douglas' concurring opinion was really a vigorous dissent from the majority's evasion. Its eloquent attack on the informer system is worth preserving:

"Dr. Peters was condemned by faceless informers, some of whom were not known even to the board that condemned him. Some of these informers were not even under oath. None of them had to submit to cross-examination. None had to face Dr. Peters. So far as we or the board know, they may be psychopaths or venal people, like Titus Oates, who revel in being informers. They may bear old grudges. Under cross-examination their stories might disappear like bubbles. Their whispered confidences might turn out to be yarns conceived by twisted minds or by people who, though sincere, have poor faculties of observation and memory.

"Confrontation and cross-examination under oath are essential, if the American ideal of due process is to remain a vital force in our public life. We deal here
(Continued on page 3)

On Monday the UAW finally broke through in its fight for a Guaranteed Annual Wage. In the agreement signed that day with Ford, the company conceded its responsibility to pay laid-off workers during periods of unemployment. While the contract falls far short of the union's original demand for a GAW plan, the basic principle has been established.

A powerful pressure weapon can now be brought to bear against General Motors, whose contract with the UAW has already expired, to follow suit. GM can now hold out only if it is prepared to face a long determined strike.

The union accepted the main outlines of a second company offer after Ford's first effort to evade the main issues had collapsed completely; its effort to sidetrack the union by an employee stock-purchase plan, supplemented by temporary cash loans to unemployed workers, failed.

Although the union's committee had repeatedly postponed a scheduled strike in the quest for agreement, Ford workers began walking off their jobs in city after city. As the agreement was signed, 37 of Ford's 68 plants were idle and 114,000 of its 140,000 workers had quit work. It was this openly demonstrated solidarity that won important contract concessions for the union. Ford knew that a certain, unified strike impended and it was not willing to face such a strike.

According to estimates made by UAW President Walter Reuther, the union has won the equivalent of 20 cents per hour. The chief provisions of the new contract, according to first reports are:

- The duration of the contract is three years.
- The Guaranteed Annual Wage is accepted in principle by the establishment of a \$55,000,000 fund to be set up by company contributions of 5 cents per man-hour, over a period of years.
- Increased pension payments and better all-around terms.
- An increase in the annual-improvement factor. Every year wages will be automatically increased by 6 cents per hour or 2½ per cent, whichever is higher. Previously, the annual increment was 5 cents.
- Improved benefits covering hospitalization, medical, disability benefits.
- The cost-of-living allowance under the escalator clause is increased. This clause provides for wage adjustments with the price index.
- Triple time for holidays; vacation concessions.
- Dozens of other contract changes were negotiated dealing with matters that do not hit the newspaper columns but which are vital in the day-to-day functioning of the union. Details are not yet available but Carl Stellato, president of Rouge Local 600, said: "With the exception of two or three items, we changed every item we wanted changed."

With the background of this newly won contract, the UAW will now deal with General Motors and Chrysler. It is inevitable that every sector of mass production will soon be under union pressure to grant what the UAW won at Ford. Steel wage negotiations begin soon although contracts do not expire till next year. In September, the IUE-CIO's contract with General Electric expires.

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, June 5—The extraordinary impact of the current negotiations between the powerful United Auto Workers and the Ford Motor Company was highlighted this weekend by two unusual events: (1) The National Association of Manufacturers announced it was holding an emergency meeting on June 15 to appraise the Guaranteed Annual Wage demand, and (2) the Detroit *Free Press*, under the signature of John Knight, its publisher, threw in the towel with an editorial "All Present Signs Point to Victory for Reuther."

These developments followed Ford's concession on a modified Guaranteed Annual Wage plan along the lines proposed by Walter F. Reuther, CIO and UAW president, thereby breaking the major log-jam in negotiations, though there still are many important but not decisive issues to iron out.

The richest profit-making industry in America is about to share some—if not enough—of its fabulous wealth with its workers, represented by the most radical and powerful union in America, the UAW-CIO, led by a shrewd set of leaders determined to retain their place as the vanguard sector of the labor movement. In the day-to-day developments in and around negotiations, and in the auto shops, this over-all strategic picture became abundantly clear.

Although the so-called public and the press was kept in the dark about it, the first important fact in the current wage crisis in the auto industry is that both General Motors and Ford did offer the UAW a package that amounted to a

(Continued on page 2)

POLITICAL WARFARE IN BELGRADE: A Retreat Is Turned into a Weapon

By HAL DRAPER

Moscow's ambassadors to Tito's conscience, Khrushchev and Bulganin & entourage, have ended their act in Belgrade as they began it at the airport: with a drama serious in intent though acted out with a wide touch of farce.

It is no doubt true that Khrushchev is a ham actor, what with his bearhug rush at Tito from the airplane and such bits of business as a spittle-drooling embrace of Rankovich (Tito's GPU hand who has been busy up to now doing sticky things to Khrushchev's friends in Yugoslavia). But a criticism of Khrushchev's histrionic taste is not the most pertinent comment on his politics, and dramatic criticism should not be confused with an evaluation of his strategy.

The Kremlin's mission to Belgrade has got to be viewed as a blow in the new campaign of political warfare being waged by the Russians.

A number of Americans and other Westerners have begun talking about political warfare. As we showed last week about Sarnoff's plan, and as we intend to show in subsequent weeks, few of them know anything about it, not because they are ignorant but because their political mentalities cannot begin to absorb the concept of neither-peace-nor-war in the struggle for the world.

But the Russians are showing them.

The Stalinist totalitarian heirs of the bureaucratic-collectivist empire went to Belgrade in what seemed to be—and of

course actually is and should be—a humiliating repudiation of their attempted hatchet-job on Tito. But world observers had to constantly keep reminding themselves that this was the case, that here was a "Canossa," etc.

For Khrushchev set about, in his own ham-handed way, converting this retreat into a new offensive in the political war which is called the Cold War.

This is the significance of the 24-hour-a-day act which the Russians put on in Yugoslavia. When Khrushchev stepped off the plane and grabbed the microphone to hurl love and kisses at Tito, inviting governmental and party rapprochement, and using the fairy-tale of Beria's guilt to step out of responsibility for the anti-Tito period, it was he who was on the offensive and it was Tito and the Westerners who were taken aback, finding themselves suddenly off-balance.

The Russians (as Gordon Haskell pointed out last week in *LA*) were not
(Turn to last page)

UAW Victory at Ford Gives —

(Continued from page 1)

raise of about 12 cents per hour. Since the GM and Ford offers were similar but not identical, a moment of panic seized some UAW leaders who thought that the Big Two had agreed to gang up on the UAW. This theory fell flat on its face this past week, when GM sat tight, doing nothing, while the UAW put the squeeze on Ford and forced a major break in negotiations.

What happened concretely was that poor Henry Ford II (we don't mean "poor" financially) was induced by his brain trust and assorted academic advisers to put the "union dictator" in his place, by a letter warning Reuther to take into account the wishes of the rank and file in making any settlement. It spoke glowingly of democracy, etc. etc. It was the kind of letter only an idiot from Mars, not knowing anything about labor relations, or more specifically about the UAW, would write as a contribution to industrial peace. It received, to be sure, a big coverage in the newspapers, and it was supposed to put Reuther behind the eight-ball.

The day after this strike of public-relations genius, Reuther and his team of hard-headed negotiators neatly boxed John Bugas, chief Ford negotiator, into an admission that Ford was prepared to admit that its real offer was about 12 cents per hour; and then Bugas repeated the nonsense of the previous week that the Ford package is what the workers wanted. (The Surveys had said so, you see.) The UAW team agreed generally that the price tag on the settlement wasn't too bad; in fact, an agreement at that amount would be generally OK. As for the package? Well, that was worth thinking about.

HOME RUN HIT

On Memorial Day—and it will be forever remembered at Ford's—Reuther came out with a written proposal countering the Bugas claim about the popularity of the package, having of course, received many reports along the lines recounted in last week's LABOR ACTION.

Reuther proposed, quietly, simply, and most effectively: Let the Ford workers decide what package they wanted. The UAW would agree in advance to accept the ballot verdict of the Ford workers. Conversely, since the company had made the suggestion, the company would also have to agree to accept the verdict, with the voting to be conducted by an outside impartial agency.

It was such a nice, decent democratic—and revolutionary — proposal that it shocked the Ford officials into 24 hours of complete silence. How little the newspapermen covering the negotiations understood the proposal was shown by the way it made Detroit headlines: "UAW to Ford: Let The Workers Decide Package!" How little businessmen and management in Detroit know about the feelings of the auto workers was shown in the almost unanimous belief that Ford would OK such a proposal!

For Reuther, it was a public-relations home run, and it put the Ford company completely on the defensive, for on recovering from a swoon they realized what Reuther had done to them. In a vote between the UAW GAW package and the Ford package, the vote would be about 99½ per cent for the UAW.

On Tuesday, after the Reuther proposal hit the headlines, every UAW leader in this area was chuckling: they knew Reuther had Ford on the run. Now if the UAW was forced to strike, the blame could be put squarely on Ford for failing to allow the vote he originally had proposed. By way of a small needling job on Henry Ford, the UAW kept asking him



REUTHER

to come into negotiations and speak for himself.

Another news blackout was then announced in negotiations, and everyone knew that Ford was about to make another offer. It ended up making two. The first was a kind of joke, as far as the UAW was concerned, but the second really admitted the basic idea which Reuther considers the heart of his plan, namely, a company-created unemployment-reserve fund out of which workers would be paid a supplement to their unemployment compensation. The UAW and Ford quickly agreed on the over-all amount, a sum estimated in three years of about \$55 million, with Ford putting money into the fund at the rate of first 5, then 6 and then 7 cents yearly, for the next three years. Since the UAW and Ford cannot agree on details of the plan, including the percentage of take-home pay the total unemployment check would equal, Reuther proposes to arbitrate that issue. Ford wants to guarantee about 65 per cent of take-home pay and the UAW wants the amount to be higher.

Many other features of the original Ford offer are, of course, largely satisfactory to the UAW negotiators, with non-economic demands and the length of the contract yet to be determined as the deadline for strike approaches.

But the negotiations themselves are only part of the story of the class struggle in Detroit, for there is far more to this wage crisis than the arguments between the spokesmen for the union and management.

STELLATO'S ROLE

The determination of the UAW, to get a package that would include some form of GAW, suggested to Ford that by June 2 it would either have to give in on this issue or else its plants would be shut down. Here, any agreement or verbal understanding or hope that Ford had with General Motors of a united front against the UAW fell apart. Sure, General Motors could secretly agree not to give the UAW a GAW, but it could not agree not to sell GM cars while Ford was on strike. Nor could it find any way to prevent Chrysler from regaining second place in the industry, if Ford was out very long—and if Ford forced a strike, the settling price would be higher. Besides, Ford had only 64,000 Fords in dealers hands, and any strike would mean that eight years of hard work and huge financial expenditures to beat Chevrolet would go down the drain.

It was the memory of the long and costly Chrysler strike in 1950 that haunted Ford; that's why it began its serious negotiations with a 12-cent package.

And the memory of that long strike to establish the "principle" of a funded pension plan was not absent in union circles either: it was too much of a pyrrhic victory for Reuther. One of the reasons for a news blackout in the negotiations was to give Ford a chance for face-saving rather than go into the kind of bitter public argument at Chrysler that makes a strike inevitable and extremely bitter.

Even more important than those considerations, however, is the social dynamite contained in the auto workers' union, which if aroused would signify a deep change in American labor. A hint of what kind of strike the UAW might go into, if Ford got adamant, came in the special role and function of Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, in the current situation.

Entirely on his own, Stellato called a mass demonstration and a brief walkout at the huge River Rouge plant on Thursday, to show the corporation—and Reuther—that the Ford ranks wanted real results this time. The huge rally, with over 35,000 workers present, almost took things in its own hands and shut the plant down, but Stellato managed to keep them under control. At other Ford plants there were brief walk-outs—all of which was obvious pressure on the company.

At this point a word must be said about Stellato. From a political standpoint he is in a strategic position. Time and again, when the company has made some proposal he has indicated his displeasure, sufficiently so that the word is bruited around in the plants that Stellato is the "real" tough guy in negotiations.

The big rally was a neat illustration of his technique. No top Reuther leader was there. We didn't disapprove nor did we approve, was the UAW comment on Stellato's move. Young, earnest-looking, verbally very militant and down-to-earth, Stellato acts the role of the spokesman for the men in the shop, talking their language.

It was reminiscent of the kind of moves Reuther made ten years ago. The idea is supposed to be: "If the contract is good, it would have been better if Carl had his way. If it's fair, it's Reuther's fault it isn't better."

The vast social implications of the struggle seem lost to Stellato. He is appealing strictly to the bread-and-butter unionists without social vision.

And he has history on his side on the next contract. For his aim, the 30-hour week with 40-hour pay, is No. 1 target of the UAW next. Unless there is a drastic and unlikely change in the situation, Stellato may possibly capitalize on the hard work of the Reuther negotiators better than they will, even though in the public press Reuther gets the dominant play.

POSSIBILITIES

Another factor to take into account in the current developments is that Reuther has been deliberately holding back much ammunition. To be sure, much is implied in the possibilities of a turn to the left by Stellato's existence. Any idea that the auto companies had in mind of "cutting Walter down to size" signifies not a downtrend for the UAW but the emergence of another leader, with a somewhat less responsible attitude and with a more radical series of demand, namely Stellato.

In contrast to the old GM negotiations, where Reuther was publishing the proceedings daily and thus arousing the rank and file, the cloak of secrecy has covered most of the present talks. A hint of what Reuther could do was the vote proposal. He hasn't attacked the Ford family yet, their wealth, or the tax-dodging device of the elder Ford's estate through the creation of the Ford Foundation, or the give-away program

of at least \$75,000,000 a year by the foundation, while Ford argues about giving a \$25,000,000 package to the men who toil to create the wealth. In a word, Reuther has been very responsible, if firm and uncompromising, on the idea of a GAW plan.

Some of the propaganda possibilities of the union have been coming out in the very popular radio programs of the UAW. By song, by speech, by report, by ridicule, Guy Nunn continues to speak for the UAW in a fashion that has heartened all union men in the shops. There is a growing pride among the active union strata for the kind of team Reuther has around him—the way they can out-talk, outsmart and outwit the corporations. Given a good contract, the Reuther leadership should emerge with more prestige with the active strata.

The trouble is: What will be the determination of the non-economic demands? How long will the contract be? (The convention mandated a two-year contract policy.) How will the GAW work in practice? On these longer-range issues the future of the UAW depends, at least internally.

LINES WILL HARDEN

How much of a barrier will a modified GAW be to the giant steps toward automation—and unemployment—in the auto industry? Soon comes the model change-over layoffs. How will the GAW affect them? And will the UAW work out better answers in the contracts to the inevitable problem of speed-up on new-model production?

All of which is to say that any surface indications of a new epoch of industrial peace in the auto industry are purely superficial, even with the establishment of the principle of a guaranteed annual wage. The struggle will continue and class attitudes harden.

Today, many of the UAW intellectuals and ex-radicals who have repudiated the theory of the class struggle, as outdated and outmoded in America, are up to their ears in a struggle against the auto industry, and are finding more moral and personal satisfaction than in all the theorizing they had done in other days either for or against the class struggle. The contract crisis of 1955 is bound to have a greater effect on them and the ranks than they are likely to realize, even if the gains are made without a strike. For basically, it was the power of the working class that called the tune to which everyone is dancing. Its progressive role in society once again is demonstrated by the new ideas that are coming out of the auto industry battle.

The NAM is right in calling a conference from its point of view to appraise the full implications of the GAW. Labor ought to have its own conference on this issue too. For the idea of a guaranteed living wage for the men and women in the factories and shops is not going to die down. It has just begun to have its impact on the American social scene.

LABOR'S SCOPE

THE POLITICS OF ORGANIZING THE UNORGANIZED

By BEN HALL

Thomas Kennedy, vice-president of the United Mine Workers, recently chatted about his union philosophy in an interview with Associated Press writer Don Whitehead.

"Organized labor's role in the American economy," he said, "is to check and balance the financial power of the modern corporations. It is one of the three essential checks and balances of our economic system, the other two being business and the consumer." What is the role of government? He does not say but presumably it should function as a sort of neutral umpire among the three.

He is rather diffident about politics. Of course, "there is no need for a labor party in the United States." When asked whether he thinks that labor's next gains will come through "increased union membership or by united political action," he replied: "The UMWA foresees the greatest advances for labor to be gained through organizing the unorganized . . . organized labor still has a tremendous job of organizing to do and it stands to reason that political action is not the No. 1 job of organized labor but is secondary to the basic job of organizing the unorganized."

His way of putting the problem shows how far he lags behind the times. What

faces American labor is not a choice between the primacy of organizing or politics but rather the inseparable connection between the two. Consider how Kennedy discusses what he calls labor's "greatest failure," namely, "the failure to spread organization into unorganized fields, particularly in the Southern states."

But what caused the failure of the Southern drives by AFL and CIO alike? "In nearly every case, these drives were hog-tied and stopped by restrictive legislation and court injunctions."

Obviously, labor's No. 1 job of organizing the South is wrapped up in politics.

A. H. Raskin, in the *New York Times*, summarizes the changing attitude of American unions toward politics as follows: "The great forward surge of unions under the New Deal and the subsequent passage of the Taft-Hartley Act to clip labor's wings convinced the current generation of United States leaders they could not draw an absolute line between labor and government. This was accentuated by the experience in World War II and the Korean war, when federal stabilization agencies virtually superseded the normal practices of collective bargaining and became the supreme arbiters of labor conditions."

Such is now the predominant attitude of organized labor.

The definitive biography!
A masterly political portrait
of the totalitarian dictator

Leon Trotsky's 'STALIN'

This book is out of print, but
we have copies available for
\$6.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

British Press Trying to Push Labor Party over to the Right

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, June 1—"It is the next chapter in the history of the Labor Party that is so hard to write. Is it to be a story of fratricide, disintegration and oblivion? Or is there now going to be a revival, a blaring out of new hymns, and a resumption of the march toward the Promised Land?"

This piece of picturesque prose was the opening passage penned by the political correspondent of the *Observer*, a British Sunday newspaper, as he reviewed the situation created by the result of the recent general election.

While his command of the English language is probably greater than that possessed by his fellow political correspondents on other British newspapers his questions were by no means unique. Every politico-journalist at present pounding the typewriter keys has posed these questions before the British newspaper public since it became apparent that a Tory prime minister was to occupy No. 10 Downing Street for the next five years.

Many columnists not only posed the questions—they also provided answers. They have made it quite clear that, as far as they are concerned, the Labor Party is not only dead but the corpse is now firmly buried and has putrefied beyond any hopes of resurrection.

In view of such displays of wishful thinking, many of which have trickled through to the United States, it will be valuable to present a few of the hard facts which have emerged from the electoral conflict.

First, for purposes of comparison, a quick skip back to the previous general election:

In 1951 the labor government, faced with economic problems with which it felt unable to cope because of its small majority, sent the country to the polls; the verdict was a win for the Tories who gained 321 seats against the laborites 295. Some 82 per cent of the 34½ million people entitled to vote did so and 13,948,385 of them endorsed the Labor Party. The Tory party, and its hotchpotch of associates who call themselves all manner of peculiar names, gained 13,724,418 votes.

Thus the Labor Party polled the greater number of votes but, because of the construction of electoral boundaries, received fewer seats in the House of Commons than the Tories. This almost fourteen-million-vote for the Labor Party was the highest ever recorded for the Labor Party or any other party in Britain. The Liberal Party managed to push 6 of its 109 candidates into Parliament and received 730,551 votes in the process.

Such, then, are the bare bones of the 1951 election, against which the 1955 results must be measured.

APATHY

The first thing which stands out in the mass of statistics of last week's election is the marked reduction in the number of people voting. The average turnout of voters over the whole country dropped to just under 77 per cent, but in many areas it was far lower than this. In Leeds and Liverpool it fell to 61 per cent while in London and Glasgow only 70 per cent could work up sufficient enthusiasm to place a cross on the ballot paper. These areas, it will be noticed, are industrial centers which contain a large Labor potential.

The final count showed that the Tories received just under 50 per cent of the poll (13,336,182 votes) while the Labor Party collected just over 46 per cent (12,405,130 votes). Comparing these with the 1951 figures it will be seen that both parties received smaller votes but the Labor vote dropped by about 1½ million compared with a fall of less than half a million in the Tory vote. The hand-out

of seats was: Tories 344; Labor 277; Liberals 6; others 3. Thus the Tory party has a majority of 67 over Labor and 59 over all other parties. (In case any readers are mathematicians and notice an apparent discrepancy in this latest figure, it must be explained that one of those designated as "others" is the Speaker who—as chairman of the House of Commons—does not vote.)

Having thus sketched in the hard facts which form the background of recent comment, readers should now be able to judge whether the Labor Party is as hard-hit as some would have us believe.

Much of the British press saw the election results as marking the point at which the Labor Party would cast aside all pretensions of being a socialist organization. The ultra right-wing *Daily Mail*, which in pre-war days displayed considerable sympathy for the black-shirts of the fascist Sir Oswald Mosley, was overjoyed by the results. It predicted, in a leading article, that the split in the Labor Party, would once again be ripped open with the result that by 1960, the date of the next election, the Labor Party would "break away from socialism."

The Liberal *Manchester Guardian*, also in a leading article, advised the Labor Party to spend its coming years in opposition in a more profitable way than it did last time. This, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, means it must "recast its policy, even if it has to break away from the old parrot cries about 'socialism' and the sentimental alms-giving of which there has been too much."

DISINGENUOUS ADVICE

The *Sunday Times*, one of the many newspapers owned by the Lord Kemsley group, faithfully followed the pattern. The Labor Party, it said, failed to inspire its own followers with faith in a dynamic program, "Its old policies have been exhausted or discredited and there is nothing to take their place except the snares of neutralism and the exercises of the Left intellectuals, which are deeply distrusted by trade-unionists."

The *Observer*, whose political correspondent was quoted earlier, also freely handed out advice to the Labor Party concerning its future activities: "What the Labor Party needs to do," it said, "is first to stop pretending to be revolutionary—or, more precisely, pretending that the Tories are worse enemies than the Communists—and then to work out a policy which would offer a distinctive and challenging approach to the real issues of the day."

From these few quotes it is easy to see that the British press, which is greatly in favor of the Tories, is now busy sorting out the problems of the Labor Party. With practically a unanimous vote it is urging the laborites to sort themselves into a "respectable opposition party" so that British politics will become a mirror of the conflict which exists between the two capitalist parties in the United States.

The *Observer* (and no apologies are necessary for continual quotes from this source) put the matter quite bluntly when it said: "It is really the Labor Party which today has nothing to lose but its chains—the chains of servitude to ideas once generous and forward-looking, but no longer in tune with the times. If it can deal as effectively with its extremists as the Conservatives have done with theirs (and as we earnestly hope they will continue to do), it will have an equal chance of reviving its fortunes and contributing indispensably—first in opposition and then in office—to the welfare and progress of the nation."

This candid comment neatly sums up the advice which has been offered to the Labor Party during the past few days from all quarters who are anxious to maintain the semblance of conflicting political parties so long as the item of so-

cialism is removed from the agenda.

Another point which has prompted considerable discussion in the British press is the question of the Labor Party leadership. This is seen not only as a question of right or left wing leadership but also in terms of age.

The *Star*, a London evening paper, put it this way: "Consider Labor's Front Bench in 1960. Mr. Attlee will be 77, Mr. Morrison 72, Mr. Shinwell will be 76, Mr. Griffiths 69. Mr. Dalton will be 72, Mr. Ede 77. Even the 'youngsters'—Mr. Bevan and Mr. Gaitskell—will be 62 and 54 respectively." The problem, as the *Star* and other newspapers see it, is will such an aged team be capable of leading the Labor Party?

DEMAND ATTLEE'S HEAD

The *Daily Mirror*, a paper which always pursues a peculiar policy of its own but is generally right-wing Laborite, had some harsh words to say on this subject in the first of a series of articles dealing with what is called "Labor's Future."

"Labor," it said, "lost the general election because its leaders are too old . . . The chief architect of defeat was Mr. Clement Attlee."

After telling Attlee that the time had arrived when he should resign, it offered this advice to what it called the "Old Boys" of the Labor Party: "Move over, Dad. Make room for youth. The best you can do for Labor now is to announce your decision to stand for election to the new shadow cabinet. By the time Labor fights the next election, by the time Labor takes office, you will be too old for the job."

All of these newspaper comments make, of course, an unholy din. But they are not so important as the opinions and actions of the Labor Party members themselves. As yet it is a little too early to accurately gauge the temper of the party—its organization is still busy recovering its breath from the exertions of the election campaign—but the inevitable post-mortem will begin very shortly.

The National Executive Committee of the party meets on June 22 and will discuss the election and make some analysis of the situation. The statement which it issues after this meeting is likely to be the center-piece from which all discussions in the party will sprout out. The debate will culminate in a major discussion at the party annual conference, which is scheduled to take place at the coastal town of Margate in four months time.

The local organizations will, within the next few weeks, be formulating their resolutions for inclusion on the agenda of this conference. With the general election defeat still sharp in their minds there is no doubt that many of them will deal with the subject and endeavor to outline the future perspective of the party. outline the future perspective of the party.

Tories Face Problem Of Strike Struggles

Although the future of the Labor Party is an important topic of conversation in British political circles the problems confronting the new Tory government must not be underestimated. Already it is faced with a total stoppage on the railways as a result of a strike called by the locomotive engineers and firemen in support of a claim for an increase in wages. This claim is prompted by the desire to maintain the wage differentials above the other grades of railwaymen who received a rise due to the successful efforts of the National Union of Railwaymen (reported in articles in *LA* at the beginning of the year).

Trouble has also broken out on the docks where 20,000 members of the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers union have been on strike for ten days in support of their claim for recognition on the port committees. This claim is resisted by the Transport and General Workers Union which at the moment holds all the workers' seats on these bodies. Some months ago the NASD was suspended from the Trades Union Congress for poaching members from the TGWU, and relations between the two unions have been strained ever since. These outbreaks of industrial strife have

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

with the reputation of men and their right to work—things more precious than property itself. We have here a system where government with all its power and authority condemns a man to a suspect class and the outer darkness, without the rudiments of a fair trial. The practice of using faceless informers has apparently spread through a vast domain. It is used not only to get rid of employees in the government, but also employees who work for private firms having contracts with the government.

"It has touched countless hundreds of men and women and ruined many. It is an un-American practice, which we should condemn. It deprives men of 'liberty' within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment, for one of man's most precious liberties is his right to work. When a man is deprived of that 'liberty' without a fair trial, he is denied due process. If he were condemned by Congress and made ineligible for government employment, he would suffer a bill of attainder, outlawed by the Constitution. An administrative agency—the creature of Congress—certainly cannot exercise powers that Congress itself is barred from asserting. See the opinion of Mr. Justice Black in *Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath*."

"Those who see the force of this position counter by saying that the government's sources of information must be protected, if the campaign against subversives is to be successful. The answer is plain. If the sources of information need protection they should be kept secret. But once they are used to destroy a man's reputation and deprive him of his 'liberty,' they must be put to the test of due process of law. The use of faceless informers is wholly at war with that concept. When we relax our standards to accommodate the faceless informer, we violate our basic constitutional guarantees and ape the tactics of those whom we despise."



Attlee—On the Way Out?

prompted many rumors of intending action by the Tory government to enact legislation restricting the right to strike. Personally it seems to me doubtful whether even a Tory government would be so foolhardy as to attempt such action at this moment of time.

In the economic sphere the government also has worries—in fact it is widely held that these worries were the dominant factor in prompting the recent election. Even before all the election results became known, the press began discussing "new measures to safeguard the pound," and other papers reported that "a special budget in the autumn is already being discussed in the City and Whitehall."

Tying together all the threads at present hanging around British politics one gets a pattern which is full of movement and potential. The general election has given a win to the Tories—but it has really not settled anything. Although the events in Britain have crowded in fast after one another in the first half of this year one gets the definite impression the big things are yet to come and that the big battles will be fought out in the coming half of the year.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

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

A sub is only \$2 a year!

BRAZIL

Janio Is Petering Out Now

By J. R.

SANTIAGO, May 25—The Vargas government ended last year with the president's suicide, but the liberal pro-capitalist forces in Brazil are incapable of overcoming the political and economic crisis.

Brazilian industry is growing and needs dollars for the acquisition of industrial equipment and machinery. But the only source of dollars is the export of coffee, which has fallen off because the price of coffee has fallen.

The previous policy of the Brazilian government—supporting coffee prices by buying up the coffee surplus not absorbed by the international market—resulted in inflation, because the government paid the producers for the coffee with paper money printed up by the state bank without gold backing. Thus Vargas' policy of economic state intervention remained ineffective.

The new minister, Whitaker, abandoned this policy and does not buy coffee for the state's account; he leaves the coffee in the market to fight for prices and buyers in accordance with the classical liberal policy of free competition. We shall wait to see the results of this new turn.

The Brazilian economy is in the middle of a tension between the state-capitalist policy of controls and state intervention, and the liberal free-competition policy. The situation is difficult because of the great domination exercised by the U. S. economy and of Brazil's need for new capital investment in industry and imported machinery to be paid for in dollars.

On the political field the fight is continuing over the succession to the presidency.

The liberal right has selected as its candidate Etelvino Lins, ex-governor of Pernambuco; but Lins is not sufficiently popular with the masses to have much of a chance of winning against the candidate of the so-called "Social-Democratic Party" (which is not social-democratic or socialist and should not be confused with the Brazilian SP). This candidate is backed by the Vargas ("Getulist") camp and by the Getulist "Labor Party," which was the party machine behind Getulio Vargas.

The governor of Sao Paulo, Janio Quadros, withdrew from candidacy, preferring the safety of the Sao Paulo government to the uncertainties of the presidential struggle. There arose a new candidate in the person of General Juarez Tavora, with the support of the "Janist" (pro-Quadros) forces, Quadros himself, the SP, and the Christian-Democratic Party.

General Tavora, who contributed to the downfall of the Vargas government, is looked on as a partisan of democracy and of social and economic reforms. But he will be opposed by the rightist UDN (National Democratic Union) as well as by the Getulist forces. The groups that back him are minority parties, like the SP and the Christian-Democrats, as well as the Janist "Movement of March 22."

But now the latest events in Sao Paulo, the leading industrial and proletarianized city of Brazil, shows the decomposition of Janism. This is the mayoral election, which saw the defeat of the Janists and the victory of Lano de Mattos, the candidate of Adhemar de Barros' corrupt party, backed officially by the Stalinists, over the candidates of the rightist UDN, as well as the SP.

The sole explanation for this dramatic defeat is the disappointment and disillusionment of the pro-Janist voters with the policy of his candidate in the state government and with Janio's pull-out from the presidential fight. Janio, perceiving the course of popular sentiment, declared himself impartial in the election, withdrawing from participation in the contest. The voters answered with a 50 per cent abstention from the polls, and a win for his opponent.

Thus the Sao Paulo election registered an important defeat for Janio Quadros, who began his career so promisingly as the leader of a new popular movement.

Janio's support for Tavora's presidential bid is now very problematical, seeing that he is running against such strong opponents as the Getulist Juscelino Kubitschek and the UDN's Line. As a consequence of Janio's defeat in Sao Paulo, a big boost has been given to a candidacy by Adhemar de Barros, backed by the Stalinists.

CP's ROLE

Only a big effort of the popular movement, inspired by a working-class upsurge, could defeat the reactionary candidates, clearing the way for social and economic reforms. But the SP is too weak to organize and guide any movement, all the more after the recent inner-party "coup d'état" against the socialist left. The Janist movement is in open disintegration, hit hard by its leader's desertion and its defeat in Sao Paulo.

The CP, in the interest of serving Russian policy and demagogically making game of American imperialism, is throwing its support to the corrupt and reactionary party of Adhemar de Barros, simply seeking opportunist electoral success. Much of the working class is divided between Getulism and Stalinism, and does not have any independent class policy of its own. The defeat of the SP left was not only the result of the pro-Janist domination of the party but also foreshadowed the defeat of the Janist movement.

In this enormous country, the political situation remains as chaotic as the economic situation. Under these circumstances, an anti-democratic tendency toward a solution by coup d'état has a chance of conquering, perhaps through the shameless party of Adhemar de Barros.

MOROCCO

French Right-Wing Labor Leaders Sabotage Free Trade Unions in Colony

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, June 2—When the Union Marocaine du Travail (Moroccan Federation of Labor) was founded at the beginning of this year, its appearance at once forced the French labor movement to define its position clearly on the whole North African question.

The Stalinist-led CGT immediately expressed violent hostility to the new federation, and denounced it as an "American maneuver." Nothing could be more natural, since the rise of a free Moroccan trade-union movement will automatically reduce the Moroccan section of the CGT to insignificance.

The situation is different as far as the non-Stalinist unions are concerned, in particular Force Ouvrière (FO). The UMT's affiliation to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was confirmed at the recent Vienna Congress of the international labor organization with the agreement of the FO representatives. Any reason FO might have had to maintain separate unions in Morocco disappeared, and the natural thing for the FO leadership to do would have been to direct its Moroccan sections to affiliate with the UMT. In fact, the very contrary happened.

FO president Bothereau's scandalous statements about the "undemocratic" and "nationalistic" character of the UMT leadership were only a foretaste of things to come. In April, André Lafond, secretary of FO, denounced the "anti-French maneuvers" of the ICFTU in Morocco. Finally, in May, the leadership of the Moroccan FO took action against one of its affiliates which wanted to join the UMT.

FO RENEGES

The FO affiliate is the Warehouse and Maintenance Workers Union, made up mainly of the French workers of the Casablanca harbor. The union decided to join the UMT in order to help create a Moroccan Federation of Dockworkers and Longshoremen, which would include roughly 11,000 Moroccan and European workers in Casablanca, Port-Lyautey, Safi, Mogador and Agadir. Dual membership was to be maintained with FO for whoever desired it, but the union's secretary, Zanetini, decided personally to leave FO and join the UMT.

A general meeting of the union was

called for May 20, to take a formal decision on the UMT merger. The authorization for the meeting had already been given by General Granger, commander of the Casablanca garrison.

At the last minute, and to the great surprise of the Maintenance Workers, the authorization was withdrawn—at the insistent demand of the FO leadership. The same leadership that has been accusing the UMT of chauvinism and undemocratic practices has thus enlisted police cooperation to keep one of its sections from building a joint union of Moroccan and European workers.

Zanetini declared: "We do not understand the position of this organization, which greets the young UMT at the world congress of the ICFTU, demanding that it be recognized, and which, on the local level, fights so vigorously against the recognition of full trade-union rights in Morocco."

Against this sabotage from their own leadership, the FO Maintenance Workers decided to call a limited protest strike.

In fact, at the ICFTU Congress itself, the Moroccan question had led to incidents between representatives of FO and of the UMT.

The congress had been asked to vote on a resolution demanding that Franco-Moroccan negotiations "lead to conditions favorable to real democracy in Morocco." To this resolution, André Lafond of FO proposed an amendment denouncing nationalist violence. The UMT delegate, Mahjoub Ben Sedik, protested against this amendment on the grounds that the French authorities in Morocco were themselves guilty of violence, and reminded the audience of his own tortures at the hands of the French police. So Lafond's amendment was rejected and replaced by a condemnation of violence "from whichever side it may come."

In the end, the final resolution adopted by the congress demanded that "in Morocco, as in the other dependent territories, the colonial regime and all forms of administration incompatible with democratic principles be ended, and that the Moroccan people be granted the right to self-determination." The resolution also "greeted the creation of the UMT, expresses its profound solidarity with the Moroccan workers, stresses the need for legislation granting Moroccan workers full trade-union rights, demands the liberation of all Moroccan trade-unionists still imprisoned, deported, under forced residence or otherwise prevented from exerting their profession and carrying out their trade-union functions."

The FO delegation further attracted unfavorable attention at the congress by a speech of Le Bourre, a gentleman already notorious for an article praising EDC in *Le Figaro*. Speaking of the national resistance movement in Algeria, he said: "the problem of banditism in Algeria has nothing in common with real trade-union action and with the defense of the workers. . . . I declare in the name of the French delegation that we shall tolerate no interference of the ICFTU in Algeria, and that any action that would threaten French unity would have very serious consequences."

This is the very language of the colonialist lobby. It is all the more shameful for FO since the small Moroccan section of the CFTC, the Catholic union, has never discriminated between Christian and Moslem workers, and has consistently defended the right of Moroccan workers to free-ly organize.

Le Bourre, Bothereau, Lafond, as well as the SP's colonial specialist and presidential candidate Naegelen, are revealing these days what might well be the most vicious and reprehensible aspect of their policy of class-collaboration: the unconditional support of imperialism abroad. As long as their positions are not publicly denounced by conscious socialists and trade-unionists in France, as long as every effort is not made to oust them from the leadership of the SP and of FO, these organizations will remain weak and ineffectual.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Cole and Working Class

The following letter was received 'way back in March and has been kicked around in our files in a manner that we have shamefacedly explained with apologies to its writer, who requests however that it be published now. Since its receipt, the main question it poses (role of the working class) was fully taken up in our May pamphlet-issue on "Socialism and the Working Class"; and our May 2 article on G. D. H. Cole constitutes a relevant comment also.—ED.

To the Editor:

I sense a further need to defend Professor G. D. H. Cole, against both Mr. Dix's recent criticism and the editor's reply to me in which several more charges were leveled against Mr. Cole.

First let me say that I am a new subscriber to your fine paper and did not read the previous article in LABOR ACTION, not by Dix, which pointed out that Mr. Cole's lack of a positive point of view of his own has pushed him in the direction of all kinds of illusions about Stalinism. Please send me this article. Your editorial reply to my letter stated that I did not discuss this political criticism of Cole. As stated, I was not aware of this criticism.

But I am aware, as is Professor Cole, that the working class is, in the last and final analysis, responsible for the sad state of the socialist parties in the democratic world. For the workers are clearly and overwhelmingly the majority and must realistically take responsibility for what they vote for.

I am also aware that it is sheer heresy for any socialist to say this. But it is well within the facts. From where do the Communist Parties in France and Italy draw their support? The workers, employed and unemployed. The Socialist Parties in France and Italy have even joined in the anti-democratic election schemes to deprive the Communists of their just representation.

This, is, I think, the basis of Mr. Cole's despair. But he is not as bad off as most socialists, because he is in contact with reality and does not suffer from illusions about the desired but undemonstrated brilliance of the working class in emancipating itself through its own class struggle.

I know the workers are still slumbering but nothing, not even Mr. Cole's penetrating and convincing pleas, or bombs, or poverty and unemployment seems able to awaken them. They continue to support reaction of the left (Communist) and of the right (Conservative; I do not believe in conserving reaction).

Mr. Cole, in his recent articles, definitely and clearly stated that the growth of the Communist Parties in France and Italy has harmed the cause of Socialism. I do not think he is suffering illusions about Stalinism or about the ability of the working class to emancipate itself.

LABOR ACTION must be aware that the workers have the vote in the western democracies. We Socialists must begin to place responsibility for what takes place upon the workers who vote the reactionaries into office rather than upon the reactionaries who are only doing what any intelligent voter should have known they would do.

As to your charging Mr. Cole with failure to offer a positive, consistent alternative I would suggest you read "Is this Socialism?" again. In this remarkable pamphlet he suggests a number of basic actions that must be taken if we are to advance toward socialism. I know of no other person who has offered such a positive program of action.

One final question—What is the basis for your great confidence in the ability of the working class to emancipate itself? In Great Britain are you impressed by the trade-union leaders whom the workers elect?

I would very much like to believe that as the workers more clearly come to see

(Continued on page 7)



LABOR ACTION

June 13, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 24

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

June 13, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

EDUCATION AND CLASS IN AMERICA A Study of Social Structure and School Opportunity

By MARTHA WOHLFORTH

It is the general consensus among sociologists and social psychologists that the most serious challenge facing educators today has its roots in the class system. According to Allison Davis, "In education, the ineffectiveness of middle-class sanctions upon the great masses of lower-class children probably is the crucial dilemma of our thoroughly middle-class teachers and school systems."

In other words, all the goals, rewards, punishments, habits, values, and morals fostered by the school system, while they are effective for middle-class children, are lost on working-class children. These children remain unsocialized and unmotivated, from the middle-class point of view.

The sociologists Warner and Hollingshead found that the upper classes control the schools for their advantage, frequently to the detriment of working-class children. In Yankee City and Jonesville, studied by Warner, the large property owners prevented the classes below them from securing the funds necessary to improve the schools.

These funds were secured from property taxes, which the upper classes consistently opposed. Consequently the schools were very overcrowded and in very bad repair. What funds were made available to the schools were so controlled that they were given in disproportionately large amounts to the schools in the better sections of town, so that the lower classes had the most inadequate school facilities.

CLASS CONTROL

The same sort of financial control by the upper class to the detriment of the schools was found in Elmtown. (See A. B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth*.) Furthermore, the Board of Education, which was responsible for salary scales, maintenance of the school property, appointment of personnel and general policy, was organized in such a way as to make a farce of democracy.

In the words of Hollingshead:

"Theoretically, any adult citizen in the district may be a candidate for the School Board, and, if he receives enough votes, elected. In practice, the members of the Board of Education come mainly from the two upper classes and have to qualify under informal ground rules. Even to be considered for the board a person has to be male, Protestant, Republican, a property owner, preferably a Rotarian, or at least approved by the Rotarians. (Rotarians are proud of the way they have controlled the selection of the board for more than twenty-five years.)"

"When a vacancy is to occur, the selection of a man for the Board of Education is left to the president of the board. He discusses possible candidates with his friends on the board and in the Rotary Club. Generally he invites a fellow Rotarian with whom he believes he can work to become a candidate. The president then files this man's name with the election clerk; nothing is said publicly about the impending vacancy or the forthcoming election until after the last date for filing has passed. Then *The Bugle* runs a news item stating that the date for filing names for the school election has passed, that such-and-such men have filed as candidates for the Board of Education, and that Mr. X has filed again for president of the board. Little additional publicity is given to the election until *The Bugle* carries the necessary legal notices of the polling places and names of candidates. On election day, only a handful of voters go to the polls to elect the hand-picked candidates. In 1940, 132 votes were cast; [remember that this is in a town of 10,000—M. W.] in 1941, 114; and in 1942, 84. This carefully controlled system for the selection of board members has resulted in the election of conservative men who have represented through the years the political, economic, social, and educational interests of classes I and II (the upper classes) rather than the other four-fifths of the population...."

"Evidence derived from personal interviews showed that the members of the Board of Education for more than a generation have been concerned primarily with two phases: operating the schools as economically as possible, and seeing that teachers conform, in the classroom and in their personal lives, to the most conservative economic, political, religious, and moral doctrines prevailing in the local culture...."

"We concluded from the information given to us by Elmtowners, and by what we saw in the high school, that the members of the board had a highly developed sense of responsibility for the preservation of the economic power and prestige interests of classes I and II. Their sense of responsibility to the remainder of the community was interpreted in terms of these interests. Thus, the policies they followed and the ac-

tions they took with respect to the school reflected the interests of classes I and II, and to a less extent those of the little business and professional people in class III (the middle class). The relationship between the well-being of the community as a whole and the education of approximately four-fifths of the children was not comprehended by the classes the board members represented."

DISADVANTAGES OF WORKING-CLASS CHILDREN

The school system, controlled by the upper classes for their own interests, puts working-class children at a great disadvantage. In the first place, lower-class children rarely finish school. Only a few of the class IV (working-class) fathers in Elmtown finished high school; in class V (the pariah class) virtually no one went beyond elementary school. Hollingshead calculates that the odds against a V boy finishing high school are 230 to 1, and for a girl they are 57 to 1.

In Yankee City, Warner found that the proportion of children enrolled in school decreased with class position. He concluded that probably many able children are prevented from advancement because of their families' status.

Secondly, many of the values of lower-class children are not reinforced by the curriculum, goals, and methods of the schools. On the contrary, they are undermined.

The main goal of the educational system is that of advancement: the main ideal held up by teachers to strive toward is a skilled or white-collar occupation. The children are told that education will get them ahead in the world.

How true is this? Warner believes that education is the main avenue of advancement. However, he believes that mobility has decreased for the working class as a whole:

"The evidence from Yankee City and other places in the United States strongly indicates that mobility through the schools is also slowing up and that the higher positions tend to be filled in each succeeding generation by the sons and daughters of families who already enjoy high positions. The evidence from a great variety of studies clearly demonstrates the truth of this last statement. While newer educational routes are being formed for the ambitious, the older ones are becoming increasingly tight, and it seems predictable that in time education may not be a certain route for those who seek success. It seems probable that our class system is becoming less open and mobility increasingly difficult for those at the bottom of the social heap."

Members of the working class, including the children, are aware that they have slight chance of becoming rich or achieving the most respected positions in society. Several studies indicate that many workers do not share the traditional American belief in equal opportunity for all. In a study made by Richard Centers, adults were asked: "Do you think most people succeed because of luck, pull, or better opportunities?" Of the big-businessmen, 62 per cent answered ability alone; of the unskilled workers, only 26 per cent believed that ability was the road to success.

Because of this awareness of the lack of opportunity, working-class people do not expect, in general, to achieve success in terms of wealth or prestige. Evidence indicates that working-class youth expect to earn less, and have less interesting jobs, than upper-class youth. Thus the goal of advancement, so emphasized in the schools, is by and large meaningless to working-class children.

Another goal, greatly emphasized by modern educators, is that of active participation in community affairs: "Being

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

The following article is reprinted from the spring issue of *Outlook*, a student socialist magazine published by the Eugene V. Debs Club of Oberlin College, Ohio. We are grateful to the magazine and to Martha Wohlforth, author of the article, for permission to publish it in *Challenge*.

"Education and Class in America" points a finger at the class nature of the organization, methods and values of our schools and thereby, among other things, helps shed some light on one aspect of the recently much-touted problem of "juvenile delinquency" in the schools of the nation.

But we would comment that this study in good part seems to accept the classification of classes promulgated by contemporary sociologists, with all of the defects of the concepts thereby involved. Thus the "working class" seems to be equated with specially depressed sections, rather than with the class as a whole as socialists understand it. It is perhaps for this reason that the picture given of "working-class children" in school may appear overdrawn.—ED.

a good citizen" is held up as the highest virtue. The teacher tries to bring current problems, local, national, and international, into the classroom. The pupil whose family participates actively in community affairs, and is informed and articulate on current happenings, has a great advantage in this sort of situation.

DIFFERENCE IN ATTITUDES

Since the parents of working-class children are for the most part isolated from organized community activities, have no control over community affairs, have little interest in them, and lack verbal facility and experience in self-expression, most of the efforts of the school to make the children into active participants in community life are lost upon them.

Another reason why the school fails to make an impression on lower-class children lies in the difference between middle and lower-class attitudes toward school and public authority. Middle-class children are taught by parents to respect authority; their parents tell them to do what the teacher says; policemen are considered a source of help. These authorities rarely get the support of lower-class parents, however. The idea that a policeman or a teacher is a friendly source of help would be laughed at by a working-class child, whose conception of these people (usually true) is that they exist mainly to keep him from doing what he wants to do.

Many other values and behavior patterns are imposed on the working-class child at school, which not only are unfamiliar to him, but contradict everything he has learned at home and from his friends. The emphasis on correct

(Continued on page 7)

YSL FUND DRIVE

We'll Need Every Effort!

With a little over a week remaining to the 1955 YSL Fund Drive, the final outcome is still in doubt. As of this writing the sum of \$1193, or close to 75 per cent of the \$1600 total, has been raised. Over \$400 more is needed to finish the drive successfully.

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$1600	\$1193	74.6
Cleveland Area..	50	54.50	109
At Large & N.O.	150	154	102.7
Los Angeles	100	100	100
Chicago	400	389.50	97.4
Berkeley	100	71	71
New York	700	405	57.8
Pittsburgh	75	19	25.3
Seattle	25	0	0.0

Cleveland, "At Large" and National Office, and Los Angeles have 100 per cent of their goals and over. Chicago is \$10 within striking distance and Berkeley is only slightly more behind. New York, with a very large quota which accounts for a high proportion of the total YSL goal, stands considerably behind; there are doubts that it can achieve its aim. Should New York fall short, the drive as a whole will be seriously affected. Pittsburgh, too, is lagging.

A real spurt by the New York unit in the closing days of the drive, plus a number of other units surpassing their current achievements, are essential for the success of the drive. Challenge readers can do their share by sending contributions to YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York. Make all checks and money orders payable to Max Martin.

NOTE CHANGE OF DATE!
POSTPONED TWO WEEKS TO
JUNE 24
FRIDAY from 9 p.m. on
New York YSL's
BIG BOOK BAZAAR

Bizarre bargains on books of every breed—political, fiction, non-fiction, semi-fiction, etc.

114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

A Document on Stalinism

Excerpts from His Forthcoming Book

ANDRE MARTY'S OWN STORY

THE REAL REASON FOR MY EXPULSION FROM THE CP

[The policy of the ruling group of the French Communist Party is a] baldly parliamentary policy, based on secret compromises with the enemies of the workers? It is a policy of class-collaboration, such as has always been denounced by the revolutionary working-class movement and the Communist International as sacrificing the workers' interests. It is what Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* and Leninism calls a social-democratic policy.

It was only because I reminded the CP Central Committee of this in 1952 that the Marty-Tillon affair broke out.

On February 13, 1952 I had been assigned to present the report to the Central Committee on one of the fundamental questions of our era: the liberation movement of the subject peoples in the colonies.

... Now the CP's activity on this issue, especially against the war in Indochina, was exceptionally weak. First I demonstrated that in France everything has to be transformed, but that everything depends on popular action, hence on the ability of the CP to organize it. That is why I underlined the fundamental difference existing between a social-democratic party and "a revolutionary workers' party of a new type," the Communist Party. This difference is the one which exists between words and deeds.

... My report had been examined beforehand by Duclos and Fajon, CP secretaries. They had judged it to be completely correct. However, when one of the secretaries of the party (myself) reminds the Central Committee of the CP of the difference which exists between a party of electoral promises (social-democratic party) and a party which carries them out (communist party), to whom can he be addressing this reminder? Evidently, to the members of the Central Committee. If he is addressing them, it must be because the Central Committee is carrying on a social-democratic policy.

When the members of the CP ruling group understood that I had thus called on the Central Committee to break with their parliamentary policy, in order to return to a class policy with revolutionary perspectives which alone are capable of effectively defending the workers' interests, they should at least have asked me for an explanation. That was not done.

... If my ideas were counter-revolutionary, it was necessary to place them before the Central Committee and open up a discussion in the whole party, in conformity with the statutes. Only, that was what they could not do. The Communist Party includes in its ranks workers who are ardently revolutionary; it is supported by proletarians who wish with all their strength the end of the capitalist regime. To put before them my ideas of class struggle and class action, ideas which were well known to the workers and approved by them, was impossible: the leadership would have been beaten. It was then that the preparation of the intrigue got underway.

... The secretariat of the CP launched the Marty-Tillon affair at the September 3-4, 1952 session of the CP Central Committee, when the Duclos report put forward the necessity to achieve the "United National Front," that is, the union of the workers with their exploiters and enemies (what was called "union sacrée" during the war of 1914-18).

The campaign against Tillon and myself and the steps taken against us were obviously the necessary complement of the achievement of the United National Front.

WE "MISSED THE BOAT" BETWEEN 1944 AND 1946

The secretariat of the CP claimed that I had wanted the seizure of power by the proletariat in September-

October 1944. That is false; it was not possible at that time, the conditions for it being far from fulfilled. But, as we established at Alger, I simply asked that ministerial participation [of the CP in the government] should take place on the basis of the decisions of the 7th Congress of the Communist International. That meant: by developing popular mass action and basing ourselves on the popular masses, as I explained publicly and constantly. Remember! It was the only way to get decisive advantages for the working class. I never called for the socialist revolution, but I called for support to the Communist members of the government in order to put into application the program of the National Council of the Resistance.

For example, the seizure of traitors' property was the first step to take. That would have been enough to change completely the orientation of our participation in the cabinet; for these traitors constituted a big majority of the magnates of the banks and big business. *There's something that would have aroused the enthusiasm of the popular masses; there's something that would truly have opened the road to the creation of a "New France" of the people.*

... It is known how the systematic reining-in of the mass movement ended in a situation which was exactly the reverse. On the other hand, De Gaulle, who had no party in 1944, found that he could not kick out the Communist ministers; he maneuvered in such a way as to keep them within the bounds of strictly parliamentary ministerial collaboration. Being unable to dissolve the 800,000 FFI [Resistance fighters], he dispersed them.

... On October 27, 1944, Duclos declared in his report to the informational meeting of the Paris regions of the CP: "The patriotic militia must remain the vigilant guardian of the republican order, at the same time actively taking up the military education of the popular masses..."

... Suddenly, without anyone explaining why, this directive was buried at the beginning of November. No one mentioned it any more, till an exactly opposite slogan was launched by Thorez soon after his arrival [from Russia] on December 2, 1944: "A single state, a single police, a single army." That meant the suppression of the Liberation Committees, and the transformation of the factory committees (or management committees) into company committees (for class-collaboration).

The workers were called on to make exceptional efforts to put into operation the factories and railroads, which was correct. Only, the slogan "Produce! Produce!" remained the only one repeated for months and years; it filled the pockets of the exploiters and calmed their fear, while the workers and their families could live only through the black market, which meant rationing by the pocketbook, the most unjust kind. Every movement for workers' demands was held in check. That was not the program of the Resistance; that was not the development of a "democratic and social policy which would galvanize the energy of the people"; that was not even equality of sacrifice, and still less was it punishment of the traitors!

A large number of workers, then, were right in stating that "we missed the boat in 1944-45-46."

AND WE MISSED IT AGAIN IN 1953

... In August 1953 the workers in the big public services took matters into their own hands. At first, on behalf of their demands against the Laniel-Reynaud decree-laws; but on the fourteenth day of the strike of the PTT [government P. O. and Tel and Tel workers] and railroad workers, the government had been backed up in a corner. The strikers had themselves indicated the solution to their troubles and to the sufferings of the working class. The end of paid vacations,

In the May 12 issue of the French weekly France-Observateur, it is announced that André Marty is publishing a book entitled The Marty Affair, to appear "in a few weeks." The book deals, of course, with the break, which aroused world-wide interest and speculation, between the French CP and one of its oldest leaders, Marty, who was expelled in 1953.

At the same time the magazine published selected excerpts from his forthcoming book—choosing those passages, states the editorial note, which deal not with Marty's replies to the CP's routine slanders but which are "on the political motives of his expulsion and on his own conception of Communist strategy in France. It is very rare" (adds France-Observateur) "to see brought to light the exact nature of the disputes which took place within the Communist Party."

Whether or not Marty's account can be relied on for this "exact nature," we have here translated everything as it appears in France-Observateur. We need scarcely explain to our readers that we do this only because of the great and legitimate interest in the nature of this split in the Communist Party, and Marty's account is a document of value for consideration. We can at this time add no other information (none appearing in our source) about any other facets of Marty's brand of "left-Stalinism" as he explains it in his book; e.g., whether in any way he criticizes his own past; whether he pushes his disagreement with the party to a disagreement with Stalinism in any sense; etc. It's interest is therefore purely documentary.—Ed.

permitting the metal workers' entrance into the struggle, could bring them considerable support. Unfortunately, there was no revolutionary leadership.

... The Communist Party would have had to address itself to the Socialist Party in order together to organize action to support and spread the strike.

As has been said, the orientation of the strikers was directed against the government.

That was the moment to work up a minimum program for a united front between the CP and SP for a workers' and peasants' government.

In Nantes, the central strike committee united with in its own ranks representatives of all the workers in the struggle, united to carry out the strike slogans without distinction as to trade-union, political or religious affiliation. This central strike committee began to act like a popular revolutionary committee. Not only did it lead the strike but it took care of the food supply. It maintained order without worrying about Laniel's prefect.

Thus the central strike committee directly opposed itself to the power of the bourgeois state; it already was the germ of a second power, the people's power.

Suppose that this Nantes example had been immediately popularized through all of France by the Communist and Socialist press; at a time when the PTT and railroad workers held all the means of communication and transportation in the country, it would not have been two weeks before similar committees sprang up and developed rapidly in all of the big working-class centers, through the impulsion of the CP and SP.

Isn't it true that under these conditions parliament would have been called into session in a few days? These revolutionary committees would merely have had to put forward the basic demands: immediate annulment of the decree-laws (which violated the Constitution of the republic); annulment of the electoral law of the succession; immediate dissolution of the Assembly and general elections inside of three weeks by the list system. Since at this time road-blocks were beginning to be set up by the peasants of the central, west-central and southern regions; since teachers, professors and students were becoming more and more discontented with the inadequacy of the education appropriations, we could have had elections carried out by these popular revolutionary committees supported by the CP and by the socialists in the united front, and based on the powerful workers' and peasant movements.

The Renault [auto factory] workers, then, were right in their discussions in October 1953 when they declared that "once again we have missed the boat."

PETITIONS DON'T TAKE THE PLACE OF ACTION

There has developed a habit since the Liberation: continually sending letters to deputies, for everything and nothing. But under a capitalist regime it is not parliament that fixes wages, it is the boss and the boss association; even when the government makes a decision, the employers do what they like; this has been seen often enough at sessions of the High Commission on Collective Bargaining. Wage rates and working conditions are always questions of relative strength between the exploited and the exploiters, even where the state is involved.

... Besides, it is not petition signatures that can stop the big bankers of London or New York, for example, the 60,000 signatures sent by the Department of Bouches-du-Rhône to the Peace Congress of June 1953 at a time when ships were continually sailing for the Far East...

This is not to say that signatures are useless; to get them, the signer must be convinced; but to count on the simple accumulation of signatures in order to stop the war in Vietnam was a fraud; it was a poultice for a wooden leg. To stop the war in Vietnam, what was

Ex-Leader of French CP Gives 'Left-Stalinist' Criticism of Party

needed was an intense campaign throughout the whole country.

Nothing of all this was done. The only genuine and determined action against the war in Vietnam was that taken by the Algerian longshoremen, in Oran especially.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT— WHAT IT OUGHT TO BE

There is no use hiding the truth, and the truth is this: Joliot-Curie, the president of the World Peace Movement, in his report to the Vienna world congress in 1953, had asked that the Peace Movement be made a real mass movement. But that does not exist. To be sure, they publish many statements with Sartre's signature, for example, but what do these personalities represent? They bring practically nobody with them. What is represented by the departmental or national "rallies"? There are always pretty nearly the same people there, namely, a great majority of Communist militants or sympathizers plus a few personalities. How many sections of the Socialists are in the Peace Movement as a group? how many trade-union sections? how many of the Force Ouvrière, or the autonomous unions, or any other? None.

... The workers must participate in the Peace Movement, but maintaining complete independence, above all complete independence for their own action.

... When a Daladier speaks against German rearmament, that's good. When he joins the Peace Movement, accept him. But after what he did from 1936 to 1940 against the French working class, against the people of whom he speaks so highly, for example before the RGR parliamentarians, it is necessary to keep an eye on him.

... To repose confidence for a single minute in these professional politicians is once again to nourish a serpent.

MENDES-FRANCE MADE A TRUCE ONLY

In Indochina Mendès-France did a good job for the colonialists; he gave away what had been lost, he kept what he was going to lose. Finally, and above all, a

dividing line runs through the country for at least two years till general elections take place before July 20, 1956.

What will the result be? Look at Korea.

So the "Mendès-France peace" bears within itself the germs of a new war.

Why was he able to do that? Because they let him do it. The CP organized a big meeting at the Vel' d'Hiv' [Paris's Madison Square Garden], but that was on July 22, i.e., after the truce. Thus Mendès-France could present himself as the man who ended the fighting in Vietnam, as the new dove of Peace.

Mendès-France did not establish peace; he only concluded a truce which is going to permit American imperialism to obtain new strategic positions, looking toward war, by replacing a too-weakened French imperialism.

It is necessary to establish a real peace in Vietnam, in the only way possible, by the immediate withdrawal of the expeditionary corps from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; by recognition of the right of the Vietnamese people to govern their own affairs themselves. Since an international commission is supervising the carrying out of the truce, it could supervise just as well also the holding of an immediate general election in the country by the government of the Democratic Republic (Ho Chi Minh) and the Bao Dai government in Saigon. In this way the dividing line would rapidly disappear.

So action must go on.

FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE TRADE UNIONS FROM PARTIES

There is something else which periodically crops up: the direct intervention into trade-union life of any political party, and even more so of conscious or unconscious agents of the bosses or the government, immediately leads to division and a break in unity of action, hence defeat.

... It is clear that the sole possibility for maintaining and regaining trade-union unity is for each trade union to follow a single policy, that of the working class. That requires its absolute independence with re-

spect to political parties and the government. That does not prevent one from having differing opinions, for example, about what tactics to pursue. That does not prevent trade-unionists from belonging to any party or philosophical or religious association that they please.

But it is impermissible that some trade-union militant should be kept out of any post because he does not belong to a certain party or because he has left it. To stick a political label on a trade-union worker is to make him an annex of the given party; it is therefore to lose him a good part of his supporters.

I HAVE SEEN OLD REVOLUTIONISTS CRYING

... I have seen old revolutionists crying when they signed the dissolution of the Communist International, in May 1943. That was because the Communist International achieved an enormous job, especially in its first years under Lenin's impulsion. It is enough to leaf through the *International Press Correspondence* (its biweekly bulletin) or its monthly magazine *The Communist International* to get firsthand information immediately on all the important big events, explained by the people involved themselves. But also, and above all, one could find there different and even opposed estimations of what was going on and on what it was necessary to do. That's where the role of Lenin's international was so useful; discussion did not consist in simple approval. Today the worker-militant who wants to keep informed about the international workers' movement or the colonial peoples' is forced to read... *Le Monde* and the weekly *France-Observateur* (!)

... Why hasn't the time come to re-create the revolutionary workers' international on the basis of the last congress of the Communist International (1935), recognizing the right of every party to adopt its own political and practical orientation on the basis of the situation in its own country—of course, within the framework of the general resolutions and doctrines of the world congresses. This new International of the Socialist Revolution, opening the road for communism in all countries, could bring considerable aid to those who are fighting and falling.

Education and Class in America — —

(Continued from page 5)

grammar is a good example of this: other middle-class values which are strange to him are a great emphasis on repressing aggression, inhibiting sexual impulses, attending Sunday School regularly, avoiding bars, drinking, and gambling, and on the importance of cleanliness and a balanced diet. In the life of the lower-class child, fighting is an accepted means of settling disagreement; sex is treated much more frankly; churches, clubs, etc. hardly exist for many; drinking, gambling, and broken marriages are common. Economic insecurity alone places a huge barrier between the working class and the middle class.

Thus the goals, values, and behavior patterns idealized by the middle class and stressed in the schools have no meaning for working-class children.

BUILT-IN BIAS

Another great disadvantage that workers' children have in the schools is that the teachers and administrations in the schools show a great favoritism toward middle- and upper-class children. The teacher usually holds up these children as models for the others to follow, chooses them to perform special tasks, and bestows other marks of favor upon them.

The most vicious aspect of this is that in spite of our great American ideal of equal capabilities in all classes, the authorities do not expect much of lower-class children. Intelligence tests have a definite class bias in favor of the middle and upper classes so that lower-class children consistently receive lower scores. They do not take much interest in school; their grades are generally low; the teachers disapprove of their manners and their morals. So they are not expected to amount to much in this world.

According to Hollingshead:

"The higher-ranking classes do not expect community leadership from class IV [the working class], but they do expect them to work, produce, pay taxes, vote right, pay their bills, and buy the things they need locally while the higher classes provide the direction and reap the profits from their efforts. . . . The members of the Board of Education in Elmtown did not believe that everyone deserved a high school education. They believed that many boys and girls were better off working in a factory or on a farm. No member of the board believed that the community was responsible for the education of all young people."

Thus the working-class child has a strike against him, even before his teach-

ers have had a chance to know him—even before he has had a chance to prove himself. If your teachers don't respect you as an individual, and don't have faith in you, but on the contrary assume that if you come from the wrong side of the tracks you are bound not to learn much, you have a tough fight ahead. In fact, if society does not expect much of you, you will usually lose any great expectations you might have had for yourself. Experimental studies made by psychologists have shown that the socially defined opportunity of a group affects specific aspirations.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

We have examined the problem of the failure of the schools, dominated by the middle and upper classes, to motivate and arouse the interest of the working-class child. It is shown that the lack of opportunity for advancement, the awareness of this lack, the low expectations of the teachers, and the difference between middle-class goals, values, and behavior from those of the working class, are some of the basic reasons for this lack of motivation, although it would be difficult indeed to assess the relative importance of each of these factors.

Let us now examine possible solutions to this problem. The solution advocated by an overwhelming majority of educators is to convert lower-class children into middle-class children, insofar as values and attitudes, goals, and behavior is concerned. Allison Davis asserts that this would enable them to "reap the privileges of upward mobility" and that it would "enable society to function more efficiently."

This attitude is based on the assumption that the middle-class "way of life" is the most desirable one. There can be no objective way to test this assumption. It is no more valid than the contrary assumption, that the lower-class "way of life" is the most desirable. In a democratic, multi-class society, there is no justification for imposing the values of one group upon the whole society.

A second difficulty with this solution is this: Supposing we did grant that all the traits of the middle class were superior. Could we still maintain that it would be beneficial to society and to the individuals concerned if working people raised their level of aspiration and became as striving, ambitious, and anxious as the members of the more privileged classes? Supposing everyone wanted to be a business executive, or a lawyer, or a professor, or an artist, and trained themselves for these occupations. Would

it not be inevitable that most of these people would fail, would be frustrated in their attempts? It might be possible for an isolated member of the working class, here and there, to attain one of the respected positions in society; but this would not in the least affect the position of the working class as a whole.

We saw that the low level of aspiration of working-class youth was due in part to a realistic appraisal of their chances to get ahead. Certainly a person who sets his goals in terms of reality will be healthier than one who strives for something which he in all likelihood cannot attain. Perhaps this low level of aspiration may not be altogether bad, after all.

A second solution is advocated by many: Since working-class values and aims are so different from those of the middle class, why not set up special trade schools which would be consistent with working-class aims? This solution presents a problem to those who believe in democracy, for does it not increase the inequality of opportunity? It would be assumed that children going to these special schools would be earmarked for "hand work" rather than "brain work."

REFORM IS NOT ENOUGH

Are there, then, any solutions within our present class structure? A few reforms could be made: it might be possible to have the schools run a little more democratically, and attempts could be made to instill in teachers a greater feeling of respect and tolerance for working-class children.

But these reforms would not remove the basic cause of the problem of class in the schools, which is the very existence of classes. The upper classes control the school system to perpetuate their control over society; the school provides an ideal opportunity to instill conformity to the conservative economic, political, and moral beliefs of the upper classes; the financial control is such that the best buildings and the best teachers go to the schools in the better residential areas; the school board is in the hands of the most wealthy and powerful citizens, and the administrations and faculties of the schools act in their interests; and the curriculum, with its emphasis on preparation for college, where most working-class children can never expect to go, favors the upper classes.

Thus any serious alleviation of this problem will come from working toward the children of the class structure itself. The basis of the social inequalities we find in this country is the private ownership of the means of production, owner-

ship which leads to the tremendous differentials in wealth and power that we have found to be the basis of the problems of a democratic education. Only under social ownership of the means of production—i.e., under socialism—will we be able to abolish class distinctions.

Given the opportunity, indeed the necessity, of managing the plant in which they work, workers and their children will have a real use for education. When workers are represented on school boards in proportion to their numbers, they will see to it that the schools serve their interests. When the great wealth of our nation is put into the hands of those who have earned it, they will have more leisure time, and some energy will be left to them after work, so that they will be able to do something more constructive than looking at television. I contend that the most devoted intellectual, if he spent forty or fifty hours a week at hard physical work, would have little ability, even if great desire, to engage in strenuous mental effort the rest of the time.

Of course, all this is not going to meerge full-blown, of its own accord. Nor will it solve all the problems of education. The problem of individual differences in interests and abilities, for example, will always be with us; the solving of the class problem will leave us free to concentrate on these other problems, and give them the attention which they deserve. All children will come to school on an equal footing; there will be no artificial distinctions between groups, no privileged classes; opportunity will be denied to no one. And working-class children will come to school with a feeling of self-respect and self-confidence which they have never yet been able to obtain from school.

Readers Take the Floor

(Continued from page 4)

the light they will surely respond. But in light of the tragic events of the past and present I cannot feel certain or even confident. Professor Cole wrote something to this exact effect way back in 1934 in his book, *Studies in World Economics* (first chapter, as I recall).

This then is the basis of my despair and also, I think, of Mr. Cole's Won't LABOR ACTION show us some sympathy? Won't you give us the clue to your great confidence in the working class's ability to emancipate itself through its own class struggle?

LIONEL FORD HOLMES

Political Warfare — —

(Continued from page 1)

talking only to the Yugoslavs. In a dialogue with the Yugoslavs, they are the apologetic party, and this is not usually a strong position. In a manifesto to the world—"See, we are changed, see how changed we are!"—they are once more seeking to win people's sympathies and minds where the U. S. works hard only to buy them.

After that first scene at the airport, some correspondents cabled home their deduction that Khrushchev had made a bad mistake; Tito was irritated; all this was interpreted from the twitching of his face muscles. Daily newspaper correspondents had an opportunity to make up for this as the parley in Belgrade and Brioni got thicker and thicker. The Belgrade correspondent for the weekly *New Leader* was less favored; his piece in the current issue appears on the stands with the same item of firsthand, eye-witnesses, uncensored inanity—after the final communiqué had made clear that the Russians did not do badly by themselves at all.

As is known, once the Kremlin's strategists decide on a line, they throw it in the water together with hook and sinker, and then dive in after it. So in Yugoslavia, Khrushchev spent his time before the reporters of the world press like a celebrity trying to impress the customers.

His bodyguard did not spirit him away when he got a little tight one evening; he was duly exhibited walking tipsily to his car (we are willing to assume that he had drunk something). Before dutifully present reporters, he and Mikoyan took advantage of a breakdown (we assume the auto really broke down) to indulge in some playful wrestling in the roadway.

No wrestling match has had a wider world coverage since the sport began. What regular guys! Surely you recognize the different atmosphere that reigns in Moscow? Why, if these are totalitarian dictators, then it must be in the humanistic tradition of Haroun-al-Raschid, Richard the Lion-Hearted, King Solomon, the Sultan Suleiman (as played by Rex Harrison) and other famous monarchs whose hearts notoriously beat as one with the lowest of their people, according to all the old romances.

HOW U. S. DID IT

To get an even better idea of what we are talking about, in re political warfare, let us turn to a contrast: we give you the picture of John Foster Dulles caught in the act of making a retreat (just like Khrushchev).

Readers will remember that at first he refused even to attend the Geneva Conference. His allies convinced him this was necessary. So he attended. With mouth set in a grim line, he glowered at all and sundry. His world-publicized major accomplishment at this conference was that he succeeded in sitting through it without recognizing the physical existence of the Stalinist representatives. While a peace was made, he sat up there on the world stage visibly biting his nails up to the elbow that such goings-on should be taking place at all. The peace was practically made over his dead body; at least, if it is an exaggeration to say *dead* body, still his corporeal presence at the conference did not give everybody equal assurance that there was some life in the old hide.

Thus Dulles retreated, in such a way as to do his best to convince the whole world that the U. S. was not interested in peace, but only in H-bombs.

To be sure, this is a lopsided conclusion: Washington does not want war; like Russia itself it merely wants its own world domination, preferably peacefully; it merely does not know any other way of countering the Stalinist push than by brandishing H-bombs—or, to put it less dramatically, by relying on the threat of military preparedness, military allies however reactionary, military forces gained at the expense of whatever loss in sympathy among the people who will have to do the fighting. . . .

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

In contrast, the Russians know political warfare, and are using it effectively for the aggrandizement of their own despotic power.

(To round this picture off, we ought to repeat here, word for word and even more strongly, the very important point made in last week's *LA* about the dangers to Moscow inherent in this wooing of Tito. Our present emphasis on the effectiveness of Khrushchev's broadside in the political war is only half the picture. But it is that half of the picture that we want to discuss in this article.)

To whom is Khrushchev appealing with this effort in Belgrade? In at least three directions, though of two of them no one knows much of any value.

TWO MOOT POINTS

First, we would remind our readers that the present Khrushchev-sponsored détente must be viewed as a continuing piece of the Great Relaxation that followed Stalin's death; and much, if not all, of what was said then still applies. The "relaxation" policy of the top Kremlin bureaucracy, of which the relaxation of the tension with Yugoslavia is a part, is likely in the first place aimed to assuage the lower echelons of the bureaucracy at home, as well as a people who have been whipped and pushed for some decades to the frayed ends of capacity. We tried to give one analysis of the internal social roots of this need for a "relaxation" in the July 6, 1953 issue of *LABOR ACTION*; at that time, soon after Stalin's death, similar discussion was widely going on; but since then this whole phase of the subject has been overlaid by spicier speculations about cliques in the Kremlin, etc.

While everything concrete that can be said on this is highly moot, we would only make the point here that the Khrushchev Relaxation must also be viewed, at least in part, as aimed at internal tensions.

Secondly, it is being widely speculated that Khrushchev's appeal to the Titoists for party-to-party reconciliation is aimed at the ranks of the Yugoslav Communists behind Tito's back; the assumption is that many, or most, of these have never been happy being at outs with

Moscow, and want to go back—in one version, have always wanted back but have been kept from capitulating to the Cominform only by Tito's terror; and so on.

Maybe. All one can record is that none of these speculators has found it possible to base this story on any documentable or checkable facts. One writer refers to his private advices from Yugoslavia; but after some experience for seven years with weird "inside stories" about the Tito-Stalin break that came straight from private advices in Belgrade, one has a right to maintain skepticism.

Still, in spite of this, it may be that Khrushchev aimed in part somewhere behind Tito's back. If so, we have still to learn what is involved.

VISIBLE TARGETS

But (thirdly) the one area where Khrushchev's targets are entirely visible is in the non-Stalinist world. In terms of political warfare, this is a broad enough field to consider.

The Stalinist "peace" drive is awakening and deepening Popular-Frontist moods among wider sections of European and Asian elements—whatever elements are still susceptible to them.

It is explicitly in terms of Popular-Frontism and in its name that the neutralist French organ *France-Observateur* greets Khrushchev's trip to Belgrade. An article by editor Claude Bourdet takes off from its own contemporary mythology: "Just as Tito imposed Yugoslav neutralism on the Soviets, so also the non-Communist Left, if it wants to exist and do useful work, will have to impose on the Communists the conditions of a Popular Front without boring-from-within and without domination. . . ."

It is much too early to say whether the Khrushchev Relaxation will flower internationally in some 1955 version of a pseudo-Popular Front reborn; those who are anxious to be its dupes are looking forward to it.

As our Paris correspondent reported in our May 2 issue, the neutralists in the French "New Left" are quite ready to convince themselves. And the CP has given them a fact to gnaw on: it assigned them a role. A little later in the

month of May, after we had reported it, the *Nation* reflected the CP's outstretched hand to the group. An editorial said "The New Left Moves Ahead," without revealing that the move ahead that had taken place on the part of the New Left was mainly in the heart and head of the CP.

The fact that André Marty (see page 6) is finally speaking up in a book about his CP break may be indicative too; for Marty was a "left-Stalinist" deviant; he obviously has no hope any more of regaining the CP; and this may be because the CP is readying itself for a turn in the opposite direction.

In Italy, the CP has been going from bad to worse in influence, according to a well-informed article in the current *Reporter*; the Nenni Stalinoid-Socialists are giving symptoms of pulling away; and a new Popular-Frontist push might be just the thing the CP needs; especially if the Italian counterparts of Marty are gotten rid of by Togliatti.

Internationally the Stalinists have the means to involve even Mendès-France's Radicals in a Popular Front if they mean business that way, for they have things to trade with French imperialism (trade and commerce with Ho Chi Minh, for example, as the French mission in Hanoi is angling for right now).

Perhaps we should mention also that the degree of oiliness in Chou En-lai's tactics at Bandung (like Khrushchev's expenditure of calories for the purpose of wrestling) has not been seen since the days of the wartime honeymoon with Russia when our Stalinists were making more enthusiastic pro-management speeches than Eric Johnston.

Whether or not this trend is systematized and coordinated into a new Popular-Front version, the Russians have done their best to utilize their retreat on Titoism for the purpose of making political capital for themselves. This they can do because they have an enormous room in which to maneuver.

This room to maneuver is provided for them by the fact that the reactionary policies of their rivals—the U. S. camp—are incapable of calling their bluffs or challenging them on the political field. It is under these circumstances that even weaknesses can become weapons.

This is why the Russian dictatorship is winning in the political warfare which is the real war going on in the world today.

LA Teamsters Learn About Beckism

By AL PRICE

LOS ANGELES, May 26—One of the biggest and quietest strikes in Los Angeles history entered its second week today with no sign of a break. AFL Teamster line drivers and members of numerous Teamster short-haul locals were out of work in a combined strike and lockout of most of the freight trucking industry.

Teamster President Dave Beck and his West Coast lieutenant, Frank Brewster of Seattle, want to strengthen their hand in the International (presumably against Hoffa of Michigan) by signing all long-haul trucking companies in eleven West-coast states under a single contract.

The May 1 expiration of line-driver contracts coincided with the expiration of the local freight drivers contract in Los Angeles (and elsewhere). The line drivers are asking a wage increase of 26 cents over three years and the local drivers for a slightly larger package including a pension plan.

Negotiations broke off with the California Trucking Association offering an increase of five cents a year for three years. Brewster's strategy was to strike the three largest carriers, Pacific Intermountain Express, Consolidated Freight Lines, and Pacific Motor Trucking (a Southern Pacific RR subsidiary), which did over 30 per cent of the total trucking business. If other companies continued to operate, they would take all the business of the struck firms and quickly force the latter to settle, setting a pattern for the rest of the industry. The only other alternative was for the whole industry to declare a lockout, in which case the onus for tying up business would rest with the companies. In addition, the ICC and state Public Utility Commission could revoke their franchises.

This strategy started to pay off when on May 19, the first day of the strike, the California Trucking Association ordered its members to shut down. The larger Association members complied, but Pacific Freight lines and dozens of smaller truckers continued to operate, "scabbing" on the Association. Certain sections of industry felt the

effects of the strike immediately. The big General Motors plant at South Gate shut down the second day of the strike. Pacific Motor Trucking, which delivers this plant's output of Buicks, Oldsmobiles, and Pontiacs to the dealers, had to accept the line-drivers' demands because of pressure from GM, and signed the contract immediately.

If the above were the complete picture, a quick union victory would be inevitable. But the prospect now is for a poor settlement or for a long strike followed by a decisive defeat, for the backward Teamster bureaucracy has systematically dissipated the most important resource in any strike, rank-and-file morale.

The events in Local 208, the Los Angeles local freight drivers union, shows how the morale of the drivers was destroyed. This year marked the expiration of a ten-year no-strike pledge which the leadership had signed during the closing days of World War II. During the last ten years, drivers' wages in Los Angeles had dropped more than 20 cents an hour behind those of San Francisco drivers.

RANKS TALK BACK

At a meeting early in April, the membership authorized a strike for a one-year contract, an increase over San Francisco wages, time and a half on Saturdays, two weeks vacation, a pension plan, and other benefits. The ranks were enthusiastic and eager for a strike.

Weeks went by, the contract expired, and no meeting was called; the leadership released no information on the progress of negotiations or of the strategy planned for a strike.

On May 14, two weeks after the contract expired, the membership of Local 208 was called into a meeting to vote on the companies' proposal (5-5-5). Over three-fourths of the membership attended (exceptional in the Teamsters union). After shouting down the management proposal, the ranks learned that the leadership had arbitrarily cut the union's almost in half (to 10-10-12 cents), had thrown out almost all the other contract improvements, and was proposing a three-year contract.

John Filipoff, local secretary-treasurer,

made a motion to approve Brewster's strategy. Then the rank and file took the floor, at least thirty members in a row, to attack Filipoff's administration for acting without authorization, for not having called a meeting earlier, for chopping the demands, for proposing a three-year contract. Filipoff was accused of having sold out, of selling out, and of intending to sell out (Such accusations in Local 208 are usually a one-way ticket out of the industry, and the accuser is lucky to get out intact.) One Negro member attacked the toleration of Jim Crow in the industry by the union, and received general applause.

Various members who made motions to reinstate the original demands or to improve the proposed strike strategy were ruled out of order. Since the membership was allowed to vote only on the motion introduced by Filipoff, that motion became a 'vote of no-confidence in his administration as it was defeated by at least 100 to 1. As soon as the vote was taken, he declared the meeting adjourned. The strike has now been in progress a week on the basis the membership rejected, and no new meeting has been called.

Many of the drivers who are out seem to feel that the difference between the union and Association proposals is not enough to strike for, and their antagonism is now being directed not at the companies, but at "the union" (meaning the leadership) and at those drivers who are working and earning plenty of overtime.

To reduce the latter source of friction, it would have been simple to assess each member who is working 10 to 25 dollars a week to augment the low \$15 strike benefits the union pays; but the response of one of the business agents to this proposal was: "Absurd; you can't make a guy give up part of what he's earned."

The local has no picket lines anywhere; there are no dispatches sent to the membership on the progress of the strike or of negotiations. The leadership leaves the reactionary Los Angeles press and rumor as the strikers' only source of news.