

# Military Budget At \$46 Billion

## Democrats Say Eisenhower Skimps on Arms Spending

By Alex Harte

The annual rooking of the American people by their big-business-dominated government was spelled out in dollars and cents on Jan. 18 when Eisenhower presented his new budget to Congress. It called, as usual, for gigantic sums for the brass hats and relatively little for projects and services beneficial to the working people.

Eisenhower asked for a total appropriation of \$79,816,000,000 for government spending during the fiscal year July 1, 1960 to June 30, 1961. Of this, 57% or \$45,568,000,000 is directly and admittedly for military and military-connected purposes.

Actually the amount is even higher, for wars — past as well as future — take their bite of this budget in the form of appropriations to the Veterans Administration (7%), interest on the national debt (11%), and debt retirement (5%). If only half of the last two items (although well over half of the national debt is for past military expenditures) and the VA amount is added to the admitted military appropriation, it is seen

that 69% of the whole budget is for military costs.

Yet Democratic criticism of the budget, led by presidential aspirants John Kennedy and Stuart Symington, is that it skimps on military spending.

A 7% slice is for agriculture — with the big farmers, farm corporations and food-processing companies sure to get the lion's share while the family farmer gets the crumbs. All other government expenditures put together account for only 16% — this includes myriad functions such as running the federal executive department, courts, Congress, the promotion of business by the Department of Commerce, conservation, Central Intelligence Agency (whose appropriation is hidden under various fake headings undisclosed even to Congress), and last and least — labor and welfare.

Out of the close to \$80 billion, only \$4,569,000,000 or less than 6% is earmarked for labor, welfare, health and education. Even this figure is deceptive for, with revealing psychology, the administration lists \$48 million — the cost of running federal prisons — as a labor-and-welfare expenditure. Moreover, part of the labor appropriation will be used against unions under the anti-labor Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin law.

Eisenhower's arm is out of joint from patting himself on the back over a projected surplus of \$4.2 billion. This he says should be used to reduce the national debt. Since the 1959 deficit was almost three times this amount, the hoped-for surplus is not world shaking. But even this depends on Congress upping the postal rate a penny and the gasoline tax a half cent — unlikely in an election year.

## Defy Blacklist In Hollywood

Producer-director Otto Preminger disclosed Jan. 19 that Dalton Trumbo had done the script for his screen version of the novel "Exodus." This marks the first time that Hollywood's blacklist has been openly disregarded.

Like many others in the industry, Trumbo was blacklisted for defying the House Un-American Activities Committee. Preminger said he viewed such blacklisting as a violation of legal rights akin to lynching and he saw no reason for inquiring into a script writer's political beliefs.

## Wilkinson and Braden Appeal to High Court

By Harry Ring

JAN. 18 — Reaffirming a dangerous new ruling that would make it a crime to urge abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and other legislative witch-hunting bodies, the U.S. Court of Appeals last week refused to reconsider the "contempt-of-Congress" convictions of Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden. They were sentenced to 12-month terms for defying the House committee during 1958 hearings in Atlanta. Both convictions will now be appealed to the Supreme Court.

Wilkinson, said the Appeals Court, "admitted that he was en-

gaged in aggressive opposition to the continued functioning of the [House] Committee." Thus his activities "presented a more direct threat to the national security than those of which Barenblatt was suspected." The Supreme Court last June upheld the conviction of Lloyd Barenblatt who in 1954 refused on First Amendment grounds to answer questions about alleged "Communist affiliations."

In the Braden case, the Appeals Court reinforced in effect the growing number of southern state legislative committees which are using the House committee model for a drive to smash the NAACP and other civil-rights organizations. "One who is known or believed to be a Communist," the court asserted, "and is suspected of being engaged in Un-American Activities does not acquire immunity by adopting the role of a racial integrationist."


The House committee had staged the Atlanta hearing to aid southern racists in their campaign to smear fighters for integration as "Communists" and "subversives." Braden was hailed before the committee because of his activities as field secretary for the Southern Conference Education Fund, an interracial organization in the South working for integration. He and his wife, Anne Braden, had previously defeated attempts of Kentucky authorities to frame them for the bombing of a Louisville home which they had purchased for a Negro family in an all-white neighborhood.

Wilkinson is executive secretary of the Los Angeles Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms which has been in the forefront of the national campaign for abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

When the Atlanta hearings were announced Wilkinson went

(Continued on Page 4)

## Antiwar Students Fight Japanese Cops



Some 3,000 Tokyo students fight steel-helmeted police at the International Airport in an attempt to stop Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi from leaving for the United States. Kishi departed for Washington Jan. 16 to sign a new U.S.-Japanese military pact. The Japanese Socialist and Communist parties, the SOHYO labor federation and Zengakuren, leading student organization, have been waging a vigorous campaign against renewal of military ties with the U.S.

## On Tour

### Thugs Attack Pickets In Newspaper Strike

Portland, Oregon

Editor:

About as slick and sinister an anti-labor scheme as I have seen has been cooked up by the newspaper bosses in this city. It combines a move to merge the local capitalist papers into one monopoly organ and a simultaneous union-busting attack on the newspaper workers.

With a hue and cry against "featherbedding" the bosses have forced the mechanical and editorial workers out on strike. They are publishing the Oregonian and the Journal as a joint newspaper on a scab basis.

According to union reports, the bosses are financing their attack through a \$1-million strike insurance policy. On this basis they have already spent two months trying to starve out the workers without financial loss to themselves.

On top of that professional strikebreakers have been imported through the Schleppey-Klein firm which specializes in union-busting in newspaper plants.

Brutalities faced by union pickets at the hands of the hired thugs are described by the Oregon Labor Press: "They have been attacked with cars, bottles and baseball-size rocks. They have been threatened with sawed-off shotguns, rifles and late-night phone calls."

As usual the cops are generally blind to acts of violence against the pickets. The capitalist politicians ignore union demands to take legal action against the strikebreakers and safeguard the constitutional rights of union members.

The strikers face the kind of union-busting-in-the-raw which is becoming ominously typical of present-day capital-

ist policy. It is a grim threat to the labor movement, comparable in its implications to the attack by Wilson and Co. on the packinghouse union.

Workers in the Portland area sense the danger to themselves and have been coming to the aid of the embattled newspaper unions. The AFL-CIO has issued a special edition of the Oregon Labor Press to tell the strikers' side of the story and spike the lies in the scab press. Some 300,000 copies of the special edition, an unprecedented number, were distributed.

The union paper describes the boss attempt at wholesale elimination of union rights won in struggle across the years. It outlines the harsh employer demands on the unions: an open shop; a no-strike pledge; super-seniority for scabs; revision of work rules; and a five-hour increase in the work week with no increase in pay.

Every demand is calculated to set the clock back to pre-union times; and the last one turns upside down one of the most burning social needs of the day.

Automation, mergers and related trends in industry have been steadily whittling away at employment, undermining the economic security of working people. Job uncertainty looms for more and more men and women who have spent most of their lives producing super-profits for some boss only to be thrown on the scrap heap as the victims of technological change.

It is not scientific progress that is wrong but the brutal fashion in which the capitalist turns such progress entirely to his own advantage at the workers' expense. No worker

(Continued on Page 4)

## Wilson Company Moves To Bring in Scab Outfit

MINNEAPOLIS, Jan. 16 — The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service announced yesterday that it was calling off contract negotiations it had promoted between the United Packinghouse Workers of America and the Wilson Company. The union has been on strike at the company's six plants since it was locked out at the Albert Lea, Minn., plant Nov. 1.

The reason offered for breaking off mediation is that the National Labor Relations Board has been called on to determine whether the Wilson workers are represented by the UPWA or by an "independent" union, the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers, which has been signing up scabs at the struck plants and which the company desires to have certified as the bargaining agent.

Meanwhile, 61 strikers at Al-

bert Lea were cited for contempt-of-court last week allegedly because they violated an injunction issued by the Freeborn County District Court against interfering with scabs. All of the strikers pleaded not guilty. They face trial Jan. 24.

Perhaps to show he is "impartial," Judge Cahill then turned down a company request for an order barring the union from using the slogan, "The Wilson Label Disgraces Your Table."

Sen. John McClellan (D-Ark.), chairman of the Senate subcommittee on improper labor activities, also got in the act. He sent an investigator to observe the situation at Albert Lea. Whether he has found anything improper about workers striking for better conditions has not been disclosed.

All the packinghouse locals in

(Continued on Page 4)

# Democrats, GOP Bow To Rule of Lynch Mob

## Justice Dept. Has No Plans To Punish Killers of Parker

By John Thayer

When the federal grand jury in Biloxi, Mississippi, closed the Parker lynching case on Jan. 14 by failing to return any indictments, and the judge congratulated the jurors before sending them home, it was proved once again that the most powerful institution in the South is the lynch mob.

Last year the county grand jury refused to even hear evidence in the case, proving that the lynch mob is beyond the state laws on murder. The lynch mob is now shown to be beyond federal prosecution. The lynch mob is the supreme law in America.

The federal authorities in Washington and the leaders of the Democratic and Republican parties have announced no plan of action to punish the brutal murderers of Mack Charles Parker. They have said nothing about legislation to make such murders a federal offense. The two capitalist parties who run this country have bowed to the lynch mob.

Newspaper accounts from the social jungle of Mississippi report that witnesses were afraid to talk before the grand jury. Threatening or even inducing witnesses to withhold evidence from a federal grand jury is a federal offense. But there is no likelihood of any FBI agents tracking down the offenders. The FBI dropped the Parker case over a year ago and wants no more involvement.

Nor are there any loud demands in Congress for an anti-lynch law. Democratic and Republican liberals are leisurely and courteously discussing with the Southern gentlemen who run Congress their need for another toothless "civil rights" measure for vote-catching next November.

NAACP leader Roy Wilkins has wired Attorney General Rogers "to release to the public the complete text of the FBI report on that lynching so that the world may know who the suspects are and be able to appraise the quality of justice administered in the state of Mississippi."

The same demand was voiced by four Negro organizations including the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights. This statement said Southern Negroes were pondering "whether their patriotism should be measured by the protection they can expect."

## Church Groups Join Probe of Voting Rights

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Three major organizations here have joined as sponsors of a hearing at which voteless Negroes from the South will testify on Jan. 31. They are the Baptist Ministers Conference of Washington and Vicinity; the Methodist Ministers Union of Washington and Vicinity and the Elks Civil Liberties League of Washington, D.C. Seven leading pro-integration organizations in the South had previously announced sponsorship of the event.

Negroes denied the right to vote in the South will tell their stories to an unofficial Volunteer Civil Rights Commission headed by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Their statements will be recorded and presented to Congress in an effort to influence passage of civil rights legislation.

The hearing will begin at 3:00 p.m. on Sunday, Jan. 31, and will be held at the Asbury Methodist Church, 11th and K Streets, Northwest, Washington, D.C. The public is invited to attend.

## 'Risks' Win Jobless Pay

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ruled Jan. 19 that unemployment compensation cannot be denied to industrial workers fired as "security risks." The ruling reversed a decision of the Unemployment Compensation Commission in the cases of Paul E. Ault, fired by Bethlehem Steel, and Evelyn Darin, fired by Westinghouse Electric. The court said, "The possible abuses of such a doctrine are shocking to imagine."

## Premier Kishi Put on Plane In Sneak Play

By Lillian Kiezal

JAN. 19 — It took 5,500 cops to get Japanese Premier Kishi out of his own country so that he could sign a military pact in Washington yesterday that will keep U.S. troops in Japan for at least another decade. A militant demonstration of Japanese students against signing the agreement compelled the premier to sneak to the Tokyo airport by a round-about route.

Some 2,500 steel-helmeted cops fought for several hours to evict 700 students from the airport terminal while 3,000 police along the route to the airport tried to hold back another 1,200 students who sang, waved red flags and banners protesting the treaty. The declared purpose of the student demonstration was to prevent Kishi from leaving the country.

At the airport, the demonstrators, including 100 women, erected barricades of tables and chairs and made the cops' job more difficult with liberal doses of red pepper.

The premier's departure had little of the dignity that is supposed to be associated with his office. Official limousines were

(Continued on Page 3)

# Union Ranks Want Firm Stand

## Antilabor Drive Spurs Resistance

By Tom Kerry

The hitherto tranquil world of the labor bureaucrat is being shaken by the storm and stress of mounting class conflict. The "get tough" attitude of the employers has generated a growing mood of resistance in the ranks. Caught between these opposing pressures, the labor statesmen ache for a return to the golden days of harmonious labor-management cooperation. It seems impossible for them to reconcile themselves to the fact that those days are gone forever.

For a decade following the war, the American capitalist class was in a favored position. It exercised a virtual monopoly of the world market. The war had shattered the economy of its major imperialist rivals. Out of the super-profits amassed during and after the war big business was able to grant a series of concessions to the organized labor movement.

Despite the uninterrupted inflation and increased taxation, the workers' standard of living was maintained at a relatively stable level. The ability of the unions to garner morsels from the groaning banquet tables of big business, enabled the labor bureaucracy to solidify its position, consolidate its power and augment its privileges. In exchange, the union bureaucracy performed many useful services for the employers — not the least of which was to discipline the workers on the job and

teach them the "virtue" of seeing management's point of view in disputes over working conditions.

In pursuit of this task, the initiative of the rank and file has been systematically throttled. The local union has been deprived of the right to act in defense of the union contract. "Unauthorized" work stoppages to halt management abuses are outlawed. A fossilized grievance structure has become the graveyard of workers' grievances. The entire edifice is crowned by an "impartial" arbitrator, whose word is law.

## Workers' Resistance

So long as select teams of "negotiators" were able to record regular gains, opposition moods and movements found little soil for nourishment and growth. But times have changed. Faced with mounting competition abroad, with the prospect of a declining rate of profit at home, and with a shrinking world market and the threat of unbridled inflation, the American capitalist class is determined to maintain its profit plateau by debasing the standard of living of the working people.

The assault on labor's living standards and working conditions gives rise to resistance. The resistance of the ranks tends to strike a discordant note in the theme of labor-management harmony so diligently trumpeted by the labor bureaucracy. Just as the harshest sound is the braying of an ass, so the crudest expression of labor-

management harmony is David McDonald's formula of "mutual trusteeship."

Despite the lessons of recent experience the labor heads still cling to the illusion that it is possible to restore the "labor-management harmony" of yesterday. This is giving rise to membership expressions of discontent and moods of opposition. The Dec. 26 issue of Business Week reports that:

"Despite the apparent solidarity in the ranks of the United Steelworkers and other major unions, there's a lessening of

strong leadership in unions. A number of recent reports to the Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service from regional offices have noted this. One commented that union officers are finding it hard to compromise issues in dispute because of rank and file pressures. Another said this has a "disrupting influence at bargaining tables."

What this indicates is that the select negotiators are no longer given a free hand. So long as the negotiators registered gains at the bargaining table

(Continued on Page 4)

## Landrum-Griffin Invoked In Lithographers' Strike

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 17 — In a decision that will affect all unions, a federal court here has applied the Landrum-Griffin law against the striking Amalgamated Lithographers Union. Federal Judge William T. Sweigert decreed Jan. 13 that certain work rules, traditional in the industry for years, are now illegal.

Chief among these is the rule that work bearing the union label must be produced in its entirety by union workers. This policy, the court ruled, violates the "boycott" provision of the new law. From now on union lithographers may be required to work with printing plates made in non-union shops. Employers may have part of their work done in low-wage shops abroad and still carry the union "bug" on the finished job.

Unionists may also be forced to work on jobs sent in from struck shops under the judge's ruling that the union's traditional "struck work" clause is illegal. He also brushed aside the union's argument that the Landrum-Griffin law is unconstitutional because it exempts the building trades and the garment industry from the "trade shop" and "struck work" provisions. Union attorneys argued this is discriminatory against other labor bodies.

Declaring he would retain jurisdiction and decide what would and could not be included in the union contract, the judge not only enjoined the union from striking the 15 large lithographic shops for these demands but also outlawed contracts already reached with other shops that


(Continued on Page 2)

# The Record of John L. Lewis According to "The Worker"

By M. L. Stafford

Since Khrushchev dealt the Stalin cult its death blow at the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist party, the American Communist party press has displayed commendable reserve in praising the late dictator. Its treatment of important historical material has altered little, however; it still seems to be playing the sedulous ape to the most brazen fabricator, slanderer and frame-up artist the world has known.

This may sound like an exaggeration. Yet it can be proved without much difficulty. As an example, let's take the Dec. 27 issue of the Worker which considers the career of John L. Lewis. What the Worker says can be checked from the record in this country; we don't have to know the intricacies of Russian history and politics, or probe for the internal contradictions in charges levelled in a Moscow purge trial to discover the truth.



JOHN L. LEWIS

The Worker's labor editor, George Morris, praises Lewis for his role in forming the CIO in the thirties and for accepting the aid of Communist party members in the organizing drives. Lewis, of course, won his place in history for his leadership of the movement that formed the CIO. And his permitting socialists and communists and other radicals to spearhead the organizing drives was to his credit, for it was a key element in the success of the CIO. Now watch the history that emerges from Morris' typewriter:

At the time, the CP was still proclaiming "The Yanks Are Not Coming!"

Union leaders sympathetic to CP policies, showered congratulations on Lewis for his break with Roosevelt. Harry Bridges, head of the West Coast Longshoremen's union, sent an enthusiastic telegram, hailing Lewis for showing the "courage of a lion."

Arthur Osman of New York District 65 sent a similar telegram: "Your radio speech of last night was a masterful indictment of the Roosevelt administration . . ."

"Same Direction" as Hitler

As its own contribution in carrying out the Stalin-Hitler pact, the CP directed heavy fire against Roosevelt. Thus, on June 17, 1941, William Z. Foster wrote in the Daily Worker that Roosevelt's use of federal troops to break the North American Aviation strike "was a taste of the Hitlerite terrorism that Wall Street capitalists have in mind for the working class . . . Roosevelt's use of troops at Ingleswood was . . . a considered phase of a developing anti-labor policy."

The Sunday Worker of June 22, 1941, featured a statement by party leader Earl Browder which declared: "The Rooseveltism of the New Deal has capitulated to the reactionaries. The new Roosevelt course is essentially for America the same direction which Hitler gave for Germany in 1933."

On June 22, 1941, the day on which this indictment of Roosevelt appeared, was of course the same day that Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. On June 23 the anti-Roosevelt line disappeared from the Worker and the CP became his most fervent and most uncritical supporter. The placards declaring "The Yanks Are Not Coming!" were thrown into the incinerator and union leaders under CP influence outdid all other sections of the labor bureaucracy in waving the red, white and blue.

They also became the most rabid advocates of the "no strike" pledge. Harry Bridges even went so far as to pledge "no strike" after the war. The Negro people were callously told that the fight for civil rights stood in the way of the "war for democracy."

On Aug. 24, 1939, Stalin signed the pact that freed Hitler to begin his conquest of Poland, precipitating the second world war. The American Communist party leaders at once lost interest in "quarantining the aggressor" — as Roosevelt had named the preparations of American imperialism for war with Germany and Japan.

Instead the party leaders vowed that "The Yanks Are Not Coming!" That is, they opposed American troops going to the aid of the French and British imperialists in the war they had declared on the German imperialists. Roosevelt, they said, was a warmonger seeking to take America down the road to fascism. (Does that sound incredible, the way the CP now practices the cult of "FDR"? Wait a moment and we'll cite documentary proof.)

About a year later, Lewis also broke with Roosevelt. This did not come suddenly on the eve of the war, as Morris asserts. The first crack appeared right after the 1937 Memorial Day massacre of Republic Steel strikers by the Chicago police. Roosevelt reacted to this cold-blooded assault on unarmed workers in a dispute between capital and labor by saying, "A plague of both your houses!"

Lewis, who had poured \$500,000 of Mine Workers funds into the 1936 Democratic campaign, scored Roosevelt bitterly for this "fine impartiality." Relations between the two became increasingly strained thereafter.

Finally, on Oct. 25, 1940, Lewis ruptured relations for good, and, in a nationwide radio broadcast, declared his support — not for a labor party, as many militants hoped, but for Wendell Willkie, the Republican presidential nominee.

Unlike George Morris, Harry Bridges apparently realizes that to falsify history can be perilous and that sometimes the less said about embarrassing events the better. In a tribute to Lewis in the Dec. 18 issue of the Dispatcher, newspaper of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, Bridges comments tersely that "We in the ILWU had our disagreements with Lewis, primarily around the isolationism he demonstrated during World War II."

After seeing the record straightened out, someone might ask, "Is Lewis, then, beyond criticism from the socialist point of view?"

The answer to that is no. But historians still writing in the tradition of Stalin's frame-up system are incapable of making such a criticism. There are powerful reasons for this besides the need they feel to cover up their own record.

Lewis' Real Faults

Lewis is open to criticism on two great counts which happen to be interconnected. First of all, the United Mine Workers Union is not exactly a model of democracy. As a matter of fact, "communists" are proscribed — as is the case with many other unions in America to their shame. Workers who seek to exercise their democratic rights as loyal union members are likely to find themselves driven out in short order, if nothing worse happens.

Leaders of the American Communist party would indeed look ridiculous criticizing Lewis about his iron-handed rule after their years of practicing the cult of Stalin and now the cult of Khrushchev, one of the hand-picked heirs of the Kremlin dictator.

Secondly, Lewis never broke from the two-party system. On discovering Roosevelt's real anti-labor policies, he refused to take the road of independent political action. Instead he flopped over to the Republican party.

Lewis is all the more to be blamed for this failure, since with his enormous prestige among American workers and with the power he held as head of the CIO, he could have opened up a completely new chapter in American politics, bringing a labor party into the picture.

Long before now such a party could have put a majority of congressmen and senators into office, not to speak of winning local, city and state offices. In fact we might well be enjoying the benefits of a Workers and Farmers government in Washington today instead of the two-party, anti-labor political monopoly we now suffer from.

The conservative, even reactionary political outlook of John L. Lewis dealt momentous injury to the American labor movement as a whole. And it did the mine workers no good.

Miners Suffer, Too

Through a labor party, the mine workers could have found a political solution to such agonizing problems as automation. Instead, under the policy maintained by Lewis, automatic machines have displaced miners by the hundreds of thousands, and thrown uncounted numbers of them onto the scrap heap.

Communist party leaders, however, are just as unable to criticize Lewis on this issue as on democracy. They have done perhaps even more than Lewis to keep the American workers trapped in the infamous two-party system.

Leaving aside the "Yanks Are Not Coming!" interlude, they have been turning socialist-minded militants into door-bell ringers for the Democratic party since 1936. Consequently they are scarcely likely to start their campaign for Democratic "lesser evils" in 1960 by asking Morris to criticize Lewis for his failure in Roosevelt's days to start a movement for an independent labor party.

United Mine Workers as "traitors," the CP provided the shrillest voices. They even sought to initiate strikebreaking back-to-work movements.

Foster Tells Them to Scab

The April 29, 1943, Daily Worker, for example, carried a front-page appeal by William Z. Foster urging the miners to ignore the union's strike call. On May 4, after the strike began, Foster addressed a meeting in Town Hall, Philadelphia, where he called on the miners to return to work.

The CP even bought radio time for strikebreaking purposes. Charles Spencer, CP secretary in the Wilkes Barre, Pa., anthracite region, spoke over a local station May 2 to tell the miners "not to follow Lewis in a reasonable strike."

In the thirties British intellectuals were concerned with arguments about which class owned the means of production; in the fifties what mattered to them was which class put the tea in before the milk and vice versa. So the myth runs.

Disillusionment with revolutionary politics has been a theme among British intellectuals ever since Wordsworth. Since 1917 autobiographical accounts of disenchantment with Marxism have multiplied until we have all come to believe that the history of British intellectuals between 1929 and 1956 was a kind of rite's political progress; generous young minds moved by pre-war unemployment and fascism were drawn into the nefarious revolutionary clutches of the Communist party and imprisoned there until some particularly repulsive deed of bolshevism brought them back into the clear light of liberalism.

In the thirties British intellectuals were concerned with arguments about which class owned the means of production; in the fifties what mattered to them was which class put the tea in before the milk and vice versa. So the myth runs.

Like all good mythology this piece of folklore contains a large element of truth. But it contains some error and distortion, too, and it is important to realize this. Fortunately a number of studies of the history of the British Communist party have recently been published which make it possible to sift out the truth and the error.

One of the most interesting is Dr. Neal Wood's new work on "Communism and British Intellectuals." (Gollancz, 21s.) From this one can draw some striking conclusions about the role of the Communist party in British political life. The most important of these conclusions is that for the last thirty years the Communist party has been an essentially conservative force.

end of which enables men to control their own destiny. So far as social life is concerned, the manipulation of society is possible to those who possess the secret of these laws.

As Marx saw it, this doctrine implies the sharpest of divisions in society between those who know and those who do not, the manipulators and the manipulated. Classical Marxism stands in stark contrast to this: it wants to transform the vast mass of mankind from victims and puppets into agents who are masters of their own lives.

But Stalinism treated Marxist theory as the discovery of the objective and unchangeable laws of history, and glorified the party bureaucrats as the men who possessed the knowledge which enabled and entitled them to manipulate the rest of mankind.

In this Stalinism coincided with an entirely different version of the same doctrine which flourished in Britain. This was the doctrine that the rational society would be run by scientists. All that we needed was the discovery by scientists of the laws governing social development; and then these scientists should be given power so that they might apply their discoveries. H. G. Wells, Sir Richard Gregory, Sir Julian Huxley and countless others all expressed themselves in this sense.

Sir Julian could speak in 1937 of the need for "some sort of scientific control of society." H. C. Wells had argued as early as 1906 for the management of society by a small elite of scientists whom he named "the Samurai."

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

# Revolutionary Politics and the Intellectuals

## Whom Should They Indict?

By Alasdair MacIntyre

Disillusionment with revolutionary politics has been a theme among British intellectuals ever since Wordsworth. Since 1917 autobiographical accounts of disenchantment with Marxism have multiplied until we have all come to believe that the history of British intellectuals between 1929 and 1956 was a kind of rite's political progress; generous young minds moved by pre-war unemployment and fascism were drawn into the nefarious revolutionary clutches of the Communist party and imprisoned there until some particularly repulsive deed of bolshevism brought them back into the clear light of liberalism.

## Ritualized Pseudo Conflicts

Anthropologists have familiarized us with the idea that what looks like conflicts in a society may not really be so. Where there are possibilities of disruptive struggle, the risk of destroying the established order may be avoided by providing outlets in the form of ritualized pseudo conflicts. The motions of conflict are gone through and by doing this the tensions are relieved and the real conflict is avoided.

This happens in some African tribal societies and it has sometimes been thought to be the function of British parliamentary life.

But the imitation of conflict can be effective only if the imitation is plausible and if it secures the belief of the actors who have to carry it through. The life of parliament obviously fails to satisfy this criterion. Yet if the larger political parties have ceased to head off and tame down the young disruptive radicals, they have hardly had cause for anxiety.

The Communist party has done the job for them. Radical militancy has swept into the party and by it been diverted, dissipated, and finally disillusioned.

This contention will be so new to most people that it will inevitably meet with strong resistance; not just from present supporters of the Communist party, but from all those de-

## University Reds of the Thirties

Dr. Wood's study describes the social climate from which most of the Communist intellectuals of the thirties came. They came, like their more conformist fellows, from upper middle-class homes and public-school backgrounds. They were almost all products of Oxford and Cambridge, especially Cambridge.

Some of the best of them died in Spain: David Guest, a young Cambridge mathematician who spent a year at Gottingen in 1930 and saw what National Socialism really was; John Cornford, son of a poet and a classical scholar, himself a poet and a historian; and the best of them all, Christopher Caudwell, not an upper middle-class, but a journalist, an engineer, and a genuinely original thinker.

Caudwell stands out from the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties as one for whom the Marxist classics were an incentive to, not a substitute for, thought. And the existence of Caudwell's work illuminates by contrast the passivity of most other Communist intellectuals in the thirties.

"Passivity" those who remember the period will reclaim with horror. And they will recall the endless meetings, the Daily Worker selling, the posters and the circulars, the ceaseless round of activity.

But what they could not recall — despite much authentic anti-Fascist heroism — is a specifically intellectual contribution. Nor could they find an instance where the work of the intellectuals would have built policy or transformed theory. There could be no contribution to the making of policy and

## A Party No Longer Marxist

Feuerbach, Marx wrote: "The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed up-bringing forgets that it is men that change circumstances and that the educator must himself be educated. Hence this doctrine necessarily arrives at dividing society into two parts, of which one is superior to society . . ."

Marx attacks here one of the doctrines dominant in Europe since the eighteenth century. According to this doctrine there are objective causal laws both of nature and of history, know-

ing about which class owned the means of production; in the fifties what mattered to them was which class put the tea in before the milk and vice versa. So the myth runs.

Like all good mythology this piece of folklore contains a large element of truth. But it contains some error and distortion, too, and it is important to realize this. Fortunately a number of studies of the history of the British Communist party have recently been published which make it possible to sift out the truth and the error.

One of the most interesting is Dr. Neal Wood's new work on "Communism and British Intellectuals." (Gollancz, 21s.) From this one can draw some striking conclusions about the role of the Communist party in British political life. The most important of these conclusions is that for the last thirty years the Communist party has been an essentially conservative force.

end of which enables men to control their own destiny. So far as social life is concerned, the manipulation of society is possible to those who possess the secret of these laws.

As Marx saw it, this doctrine implies the sharpest of divisions in society between those who know and those who do not, the manipulators and the manipulated. Classical Marxism stands in stark contrast to this: it wants to transform the vast mass of mankind from victims and puppets into agents who are masters of their own lives.

But Stalinism treated Marxist theory as the discovery of the objective and unchangeable laws of history, and glorified the party bureaucrats as the men who possessed the knowledge which enabled and entitled them to manipulate the rest of mankind.

In this Stalinism coincided with an entirely different version of the same doctrine which flourished in Britain. This was the doctrine that the rational society would be run by scientists. All that we needed was the discovery by scientists of the laws governing social development; and then these scientists should be given power so that they might apply their discoveries. H. G. Wells, Sir Richard Gregory, Sir Julian Huxley and countless others all expressed themselves in this sense.

Sir Julian could speak in 1937 of the need for "some sort of scientific control of society." H. C. Wells had argued as early as 1906 for the management of society by a small elite of scientists whom he named "the Samurai."

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

## Talk Given over BBC

We are republishing this article from the January 7 issue of the Listener, a British publication. It was originally presented as a talk over BBC under the title, "Communism and British Intellectuals."

Our readers will be interested, we think, in the subject, which happens to be one of the topics under intense discussion among radical circles in both Britain and the United States the past few years.

It will also give our radio and TV fans an idea of the quality of the programming available to the public on the air waves in Britain.

The author, Alasdair MacIntyre, is a lecturer in philosophy at Leeds University. He was a delegate at the National Assembly of Labor held in London November 15. (Reported in the Militant December 7, 1959.) — Editor.

edge of which enables men to control their own destiny. So far as social life is concerned, the manipulation of society is possible to those who possess the secret of these laws.

As Marx saw it, this doctrine implies the sharpest of divisions in society between those who know and those who do not, the manipulators and the manipulated. Classical Marxism stands in stark contrast to this: it wants to transform the vast mass of mankind from victims and puppets into agents who are masters of their own lives.

But Stalinism treated Marxist theory as the discovery of the objective and unchangeable laws of history, and glorified the party bureaucrats as the men who possessed the knowledge which enabled and entitled them to manipulate the rest of mankind.

## Bridge Between Liberals and Stalinists

The cultural ancestry of this view was, in Britain at least, entirely non-Marxist, but its propagation in scientific and other circles provided just what was needed to bridge the ideological gap between liberals and Stalinists.

Russia's achievements were presented as primarily those of scientific control and manipulation rather than of revolutionary participation. The rise of the bureaucracy in the USSR, from the standpoint of Marxist critics such as the Trotskyists, represented what had gone chiefly wrong in Russia; this was not represented as the dominance of a Wellsian elite, although H. G. Wells himself was never taken in.

Wells had tried and failed to transform the Fabian Society into a school for his Samurai. But Fabianism was a theory of social manipulation similar to that which Wells advocated and to what Stalinism was. What mattered to the Fabians was the conversion of those in power so that the masses might be rationally and benevolently controlled.

To see this kinship between Fabianism and Stalinism is to understand that the visits to the Soviet Union by the Webbs and their conversion to Stalinism are not eccentricities of aged liberals cunningly duped by the guile of the Stalin Constitution. They are an authentic expression of the ideology of the left intellectuals of the thirties.

If I am right, this ideology exercised such dominion that Communist intellectuals cut their Marxism to fit its cloth rather than vice versa. This is what I meant when I said they were really no more than an extreme type of fellow-traveler, producing a left-wing version of H. G. Wells and projecting this on to the Soviet Union.

The Webbs made the passage from Fabianism to Stalinism; Mr. John Strachey made the

## Three Types of Intellectual Career

This situation has led to three types of intellectual career in the British Communist party. There have been first of all those in whom idealism has been transformed into straightforward timeserving. Consider for instance the career of such utterly devoted party members as Palme Dutt or James Klugman.

Klugman was an apologist of Tito's until the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform; his chief denouncer in an appalling book, "From Trotsky to Tito," where the old slanders against Trotsky are allowed to father Moscow's new lies about Tito; and finally an obedient member of the party hierarchy when Tito was restored to favor and Klugman's own book was withdrawn.

Twists and turns like this do not merely spell the death of the intellect. They spell the political immobilization of the intellectual in anything more than the shortest run.

The second type of career is what the mythology I referred to has taught us to regard as the standard one. This is the man who goes so far along the road and then returns to liberalism. But if I am right his stay inside the party was not really as far removed from a liberal position as he may now believe. And he was not a dangerous

revolutionary impulses and beliefs.

That is, there is not only the much publicized exodus to the right; there is as important — or more important — exodus to the left.

Most of those who left the Communist party over the Soviet aggression in Hungary left in this direction. They did so after a series of internal party revolts, the publishing of an internal opposition paper and an appeal to moral principle which one member of the party's executive described as "an immodest parading of conscience."

All most of them remain on the left in British politics; many of those who remained Marxists joined with their predecessors the British Trotskyists in founding a new Marxist revolutionary organization, the Socialist Labor League.

Dr. Wood's book is limited because he does not consider this alternative with sufficient seriousness. He considers the possibility of the intellectuals being corrupted because of inherent defects in Marxism; he does not consider the possibility that the intellectuals were corrupted because of the party's desertion and distortion of Marxism.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

## ...Lithograph

(Continued from Page 1) embodied these clauses.

The union, which is prepared to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court if necessary, is also scheduled for a hearing before the NLRB next week. Since the board itself sought and won the present injunction, the outcome of the hearing is a foregone conclusion. In fact, the board is expected to declare additional contract clauses in violation of the anti-labor law.

While union leaders are trying to figure out how to live with this extremely restrictive legislation, the strike is continuing into its seventh week. Although they realize the government has dealt them a serious setback, union members are still confident they can win wage increases and find ways to protect their jobs despite the courts and Congress.

Prior to the court case, the membership turned down an agreement hastily reached by the international officers. The members felt the wage gains were too meager. Now they have set up a rank-and-file strike committee and insist that it have a voice in the negotiations.

## Series by Trotsky

Written in the tense days when the German workers faced the rise of Hitler, Trotsky's writings on the Nazi danger proved prophetic.

What others said at the time is largely forgotten, but Trotsky's observations still retain their vitality and meaning for the political struggle today.

As part of your basic political education you need "The Only Road for Germany" (\$65), "Germany, the Key to the International Situation" (\$35), and "The Turn in the Communist International and the German Situation" (\$20).

Send \$1.10 and get all three postpaid.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N.Y.

## Subscribe!

To keep up with the real meaning of big events at home and abroad, you need the Militant. Try it for six months. Send your name and address and \$1.

revolutionary impulses and beliefs.

That is, there is not only the much publicized exodus to the right; there is as important — or more important — exodus to the left.

Most of those who left the Communist party over the Soviet aggression in Hungary left in this direction. They did so after a series of internal party revolts, the publishing of an internal opposition paper and an appeal to moral principle which one member of the party's executive described as "an immodest parading of conscience."

All most of them remain on the left in British politics; many of those who remained Marxists joined with their predecessors the British Trotskyists in founding a new Marxist revolutionary organization, the Socialist Labor League.

Dr. Wood's book is limited because he does not consider this alternative with sufficient seriousness. He considers the possibility of the intellectuals being corrupted because of inherent defects in Marxism; he does not consider the possibility that the intellectuals were corrupted because of the party's desertion and distortion of Marxism.

Intellecutuals who have left the party have testified in both directions. Both need to be examined. Historians who take the first alternative for granted are apt to see the relations of British intellectuals to Marxism as an episode now beyond recall.

But, if I am right in my argument, then to indict the British Communist intellectuals of the thirties is to indict the Marxism of Stalin, not the Marxism of Marx. Any encounter between British intellectuals as a group and authentic Marxism is a matter not of the past but of the future.

## Series by Trotsky

Written in the tense days when the German workers faced the rise of Hitler, Trotsky's writings on the Nazi danger proved prophetic.

What others said at the time is largely forgotten, but Trotsky's observations still retain their vitality and meaning for the political struggle today.

As part of your basic political education you need "The Only Road for Germany" (\$65), "Germany, the Key to the International Situation" (\$35), and "The Turn in the Communist International and the German Situation" (\$20).

Send \$1.10 and get all three postpaid.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N.Y.

## Subscribe!

To keep up with the real meaning of big events at home and abroad, you need the Militant. Try it for six months. Send your name and address and \$1.

The Militant  
116 University Pl.  
New York 3, N.Y.

Enclosed is \$1 for a six-months trial subscription.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

Zone .....

State .....

## Book Service

Rare and out-of-print books and pamphlets. If not readily available, we will search for them. We can also supply you with any current book that socialists put on their "must" list.

Our specialty: the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky.

Catalog sent on request.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N.Y.

Subscription: \$3 a year; Canadian, \$3.50; foreign, \$4.50. **THE MILITANT** Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN Managing Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS Business Manager: KAROLYN KERRY  
Published weekly by the Militant Publishing Assn., 116 University Pl., N.Y. 3, N.Y. Phone: CH 3-2140.  
Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. XXIV — No. 4

Monday, January 25, 1960

## The Opposition in China

As we have reported in previous issues, the Chinese Communist party press has carried a running attack during the past five months on unnamed "rightist-inclined opportunists." The CP press has described them as Communist party members — indeed, as persons of "definite revolutionary background and political status." The party membership of some appears to go back as far as the 1925-27 revolution.

The "rightists" are under fire because they criticized official party policy. They have been barred from expressing their view in the Chinese press, but their opponents, who monopolize the press, say that the critics argued against economic tempos pursued during the past two-and-a-half years, including the "great leap forward" — which aimed at overfulfilling China's five-year plan in two years — and the pace at which peasant communes were established.

Such questions are crucial to the fate of the Chinese revolution. Too slow a rate of planned economic growth can foster rapid development of capitalist tendencies. A breakneck pace, on the other hand, can dislocate various branches of the national economy. Too rapid a tempo can also exhaust the energies of the producers, and too hurried a rate of farm collectivization can arouse the bitter resistance of the peasants. The result in any of these can be chaos.

Are the critics of the official policy genuine "rightists" — that is, do they want to slow the growth of state-owned industry so as to encourage capitalist tendencies? This is what they are being accused of.

## Still Far From Communism

In his speech to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Jan. 14, Khrushchev declared, "The year 1959 just ended will go down in history as the opening year of full-scale construction of a Communist society in our country."

By way of celebration, the premier announced a reduction in the Soviet armed forces of 1,200,000 men. He explained that this partial disarmament by no means signified any weakening of the defenses of the Soviet Union. "We are several years ahead of other countries in the development and assembly line production of intercontinental ballistic missiles of various types." The Soviet Union possesses sufficient atomic and hydrogen bombs and the necessary rockets so that in face of aggression "we would be able literally to wipe the country or countries which attack us off the face of the earth." Besides this a secret new weapon "in the hatching stage is even more perfect and even more formidable."

The military defenses are obviously incomparably stronger in relation to imperialism than in 1939 when Stalin acted as a supply sergeant for Hitler. In other respects, too, the Soviet Union is much more powerful. Comparing the growth of industrial production in the USSR and the United States since 1953, Khrushchev declared:

"Gross industrial production increased 90% in the USSR and 11% in the United States. Per capita production increased 71% in the USSR and 0.3% in the United States.

"Production of iron increased 57% in the USSR and 16% in the United States. Steel increased 57% in the USSR and dropped 16% in the United States. Coal increased 58% in the USSR and dropped 12% in the United States. Oil increased 145% in the USSR and 9% in the United States.

"Power generation increased 97% in the USSR and 56% in the United States."

Besides these impressive figures, testifying to the powers of planned economy, Khrushchev pointed to big gains in 1959 in production of consumer goods (10.3%) and in national income (8%). More than 13,000,000 factory workers and salaried staffs were put on reduced 7½-hour and 6-hour days without a reduction in pay.

As a further concession, bound to win the applause of virtually the entire country, Khrushchev announced the dissolution of the MVD, the dread secret political police. He did not indicate, however, what agency or agencies would take over its powers.

With such achievements it would seem that the Soviet masses could settle down happily to enjoy the fruits of communism. Yet they seem discontented.

This conclusion is borne out by a 7,000-word decision issued by the Central Committee of the Communist party Jan. 10, only four days before Khrushchev's speech. This expresses the committee's deep concern over national morale and directs that corrective propagandistic measures be taken.

But "rightist" is a stock Stalinist label pasted on all critics of official CP policy, including socialist critics of a breakneck economic tempo.

Furthermore, whether they are right or wrong in what they say, the critical voices apparently are voicing a number of grievances of the masses. This alone, we believe, makes it imperative that a genuinely democratic discussion of their point of view be conducted in the ranks of the Communist party and in the country as a whole.

Correct economic policy cannot be established by bureaucratic edict. It must be based on the determination of what Leon Trotsky, in the debates inside the Russian Communist party, called the "optimum" rate of growth. This rate can be fixed only through the broadest participation of the masses. For after all, they alone can accurately ascertain the kind of work norms that allow for the swiftest pace of economic growth consistent with their health and safety.

The optimum tempo must also safeguard the living conditions of the masses and allow for improvements. This again requires the democratic participation of the masses in determining the ratios between the different parts of the plan.

Without participation of the masses, on the other hand, economic tempos and plans readily lose touch with reality and head the country into crisis.

The critical opinions, we believe, should be published without delay. A democratic discussion of the differences would immeasurably strengthen China in its progress toward socialism.

The gist of the document is that the relaxation of international tensions accompanying "peaceful coexistence" must "not weaken the ideological struggle." Opponents of communism are "intensifying the propaganda for the capitalist way of life."

But Soviet propaganda has become "divorced from life." Party propaganda has a "narrow sphere of influence" and "does not embrace the masses." The main reason for this is that party units themselves display but half-hearted interest. Top officials take no part in propaganda efforts. Social scientists are "dogmatic" in their assertions. Communism is presented abstractly and taught by "mechanical memorizing." The advantages of socialism and communism are described weakly. Current policies are taught without grounding them in Marxist theory.

Among rampant evils that must be fought are political indifference, nationalism, contempt for labor and social duties, bureaucracy, graft and speculation, favor-seeking, drunkenness and hooliganism. Party propaganda has not succeeded in coping with "shirkers and the remnants of parasitic elements who want to sponge on society without giving anything in return."

How are we to explain such dismal public morale in the "opening year of full-scale construction of a Communist society?" The 7,000-word document leaves us in the dark.

The obvious explanation is that the Soviet Union is nowhere near communism. It is still much closer to capitalism. In fact its principal economic task, as so much of Soviet propaganda testifies, is to catch up with capitalism. That the gap has been narrowed, thanks to the planned economy, does not change the fact that the standard of living in the Soviet Union is still considerably behind that of the highly developed capitalist countries.

The Soviet people, we must believe, are well aware of this. They thus take with the appropriate amount of salt the high-powered self-advertising of the Kremlin. The real questions which they are thinking about run like this: (1) Isn't the cost of the bureaucracy far too high for our economy? (2) If we could get the parasites off our backs, wouldn't the planned economy function more productively and couldn't consumer goods be shared more equitably? (3) Wouldn't the introduction of Soviet democracy, which would make possible these long overdue economic reforms, also revitalize our entire morale, our culture, and our world position in politics? (4) Wouldn't such a change speed the victory of socialism in the capitalist centers and thus bring immediate relief from the terrible strains we have endured for 43 years?

With such questions on their minds, the Soviet people hardly hear the exhortations of Stalin's heirs. They are thinking of how to win the political democracy that has become absolutely essential if they are to move forward to the real construction of communism.



"But without a little birth control the expanding population just won't leave room for people like us."

## The Long Knives Were Drawn But the Blades Were Rubber

By George Lavan

The long-heralded "revolt" of the liberal Democrats in the Senate against the conservative, Southern leadership of the party embodied in Senate majority leader Lyndon Johnson took place Jan. 11 and 12. The "battle," "onslaught," "night of the long knives," etc., predicted by liberal newspapers and columnists, turned out to be about as fierce as the bark of a society lady's lapdog and to have far less bite. Equally inglorious was the shrinkage of the liberal Democratic forces to a mere dozen when the vote was taken, a number of the liberals having deserted to Senate boss Johnson from the sound of the first popgun.

Russel Baker, Washington correspondent of the New York Times chronicled Jan. 12 the first day of the "battle" as follows: "After a brisk opening on the Senate floor, the annual uprising of the Democratic liberals bogged down today in confusion over what they were fighting for."

Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) led off by pointing out that lack of party policy plus the eagerness of the party leadership to compromise with the Republicans had resulted in a Democratic "rout on economic issues" in the previous session of Congress.

Senate boss Johnson, the target of the "revolt," did not deign even to reply to the liberals' speeches. Before the debate had begun he had let it be known that he would call a party caucus whenever any senator requested one and that there would be a caucus meeting the next day to hear the liberals' proposals.

To break Johnson's absolute monarchy, Gore proposed the nine-man Policy Committee be increased to 15 and selected by majority vote of the Democratic Senators rather than appointment by Johnson. Liberal Democrat Carroll (Col.) objected that the Policy Committee didn't make any policies anyway and that it was the Steering Committee (also Johnson appointed) which needed reform. Gore's reply was that the Policy Committee should be changed so that it would form policy instead of merely scheduling the order of

debate on bills as at present.

But the Democratic liberals hadn't fired their last shot of the day. Here is how N.Y. Times correspondent Russell reports it: "At this point Mr. Gore further confounded those who thought he was unhappy with Mr. Johnson's leadership by delivering an unsolicited testimonial to the excellence of the Texan. 'I think that Lyndon Johnson,' he declared, 'is the ablest Democratic leader that has served this Senate in my lifetime.' Shortly thereafter everyone retired in confusion to await tomorrow's caucus."

Gentlemanly Affair

Reporters were barred from the Democratic Senators' Jan. 12 caucus meeting, but apparently the liberals had spent their "fighting spirit" in the public debate the previous day. Emerging victorious from the 2½-hour caucus, Johnson announced to the press that the meeting had been harmonious and that "all had behaved like gentlemen." This was confirmed by Sen. Gore. Proposals for democratic election of the Policy Committee Steering Committees had been voted down 51-12 and 51-11 respectively. This was the smallest negative vote cast in a leadership fight in a Senate caucus since 1933.

Among liberals voting to confirm the Texas overseer's grip on the party were presidential aspirants John F. Kennedy and Stuart Symington.

The only comment approaching bitterness came from Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), who told reporters: "It is apparent some Senators are not ready for political democracy and prefer, for the present, to live under political colonialism." But Douglas, like Gore, emphasized that he was not trying to put any roadblock in the way of Johnson's campaign for the presidential nomination. Indeed, Johnson's easy triumph enhances his bid for the Democratic nomination.

The liberal press, which had trumpeted beforehand the coming "battle" against Johnson's one-man rule, painted the defeat in heroic terms. The New York Post Jan. 14, deploring the outcome said: "It was like a mas-

sacre of the innocents. A hardy band of liberal Democratic Senators went into battle against Majority leader Johnson Tuesday and emerged with almost nothing intact but principle. . . . But although the battle was lost, the war goes on."

It would be less dramatic but more accurate to liken Johnson's punishment of the liberals to a slap on the backside rather than a massacre. They had been naughty boys but not really bad! And how much happier this world would be if "battles" and "wars" were fought with so little bloodshed and anger.

As for emerging with "principles intact," the sad fact is that neither Republicans nor Democrats, liberals nor conservatives in the Senate have any principles to keep intact.

In this case, the Democratic liberals were not engaging in a serious struggle against the Southern racists' and labor-haters' control of Congress, but staging a show for their home constituencies — particularly for labor and Negro voters in their districts. The whole affair was strictly a sham to "make the record." That is why there was so little heat in it.

## In Other Lands

### USSR to Slash Size of Army

#### No Reduction Now In Nuclear Arms

When Soviet Premier Khrushchev announced Jan. 14 that the USSR plans to reduce its standing army by one-third in the next year or two, official spokesmen in this country sought to prove that the reduction did not represent a serious step toward disarmament. They pointed to Khrushchev's statement that the Soviet Union would keep its nuclear potential intact. This means, they argued, that the Soviet Union, like the United States is relying on nuclear weapons rather than on foot soldiers.

However, U.S. commentators concede that millions throughout the world will credit the Soviet Union with carrying out a step toward disarmament. For instance, Marguerite Higgins writes in the Jan. 18 New York Herald Tribune that ". . . the gift that Washington would appreciate far more than the new year's present of caviar Khrushchev sent to President Eisenhower last week is a little of that psychological know-how that permits the Russians to put dove-coated wrapping paper around a box of nuclear bombs and present it to the world in such a way that millions cheer . . ."

Washington lacks "psychological know-how" for a good reason. During fourteen years of the cold war, the actions of the U.S. government have convinced millions that America's capitalist economy breeds war whereas the Soviet Union, with its planned economy, does not seek war. Soviet military outlays are therefore looked upon by millions as purely defensive in character.

#### Chinese Govt. Buys Sugar from Cuba

Cuba and the People's Republic of China signed their first commercial agreement Dec. 31. It calls for the delivery of 50,

## The American Way of Life

### Who Says We Don't Appreciate Art?

The New York Times, which commissioned a search not long ago of Outer Mongolia and then Antarctica for colorful news, has also been keeping an eye on Greenwich Village, a couple of subway stops from the main office. As odd as anything in this world, it appears, is an American who refuses to follow the herd. The Times man found a good one last week at 100 St. Marks Place, just off the Bowery.

A sculptor, Jacob Lipkin, lives there with his wife Dorothy, son Carl, 14, and daughter Laura, 17. Their home is "three plywood cubicles, hardly bigger than closets," in back of the basement studio. This was not what interested the Times man, for living in quarters that foster thoroughness is no novelty in Manhattan. What brought him to the studio was the trouble the sculptor had got in. "About a year ago," said Lipkin, "I bought six dolly wheels to move thousand-pound blocks of marble around. Well, I didn't exactly buy them. I never have anything to do with money if I can help it. I promised to give Eugene Gomes a piece of sculpture for them."

"That's the way I get along. I made my dentist a lovely rooster in wood, and he made me a beautiful bridge in porcelain; fair exchange. "Another time, I carved a squirrel in stone for my veterinarian, who altered one of my Siamese cats."

"But when Mr. Gomes came to pick his sculpture, he didn't like anything. I offered him a ram's head in travertine, one of the most sensitive I ever did. No. I offered him a six-foot female nude — you could feel the blood pulse through; the rosewood itself cost me \$300. No."

"He wanted something abstract. He and his wife collect abstract art."

Lipkin doesn't believe in abstract art. "Abstract art is the fad of tasteless taste-makers who hate humanity and nature. It will pass in time." A man of principle, he wouldn't think of reducing good marble to a mere abstraction.

So Mr. Gomes got a judgment for \$153.33 and Lipkin learned that the marshal was on the way to seize whatever could be sold. The sculptor took a taxi to the Legal Aid Society. They managed to get the sale postponed.

The Times man told about Lipkin. Now a lean, wiry man of 51, he was the youngest of 16 children. His mother had to put him in an orphanage when he was 5 to keep him alive. At 14

he ran away from the lower East Side and went to sea.

Later he became an artist. But it was hard times all the time. Nobody would take his sculptures. He wanted them in public institutions where they would be on exhibit. They wouldn't even take them free.

The sculptor, nevertheless, refused to give in. "I am an enormous success," he told the Times reporter. "I am not driving a taxi or working in an office. I am swinging a mallet and chisel every day."

Two days later, the Times had to run a sequel. Strangers, reading the story, had poured \$8,300 into the studio.

"Hundreds of letters from half the nation have been delivered here in the last two days," said Lipkin. Gifts ranged from \$1 to \$3,000.

"All day from early morning until late at night, people have come here begging to be allowed to help with cash."

What did the lucky sculptor do? "I have sent back every donation," he said. "That is, I sent back every one until I ran out of stamps; as soon as I can buy more stamps, I'll return the rest."

This was a new one to the Times man. Didn't the sculptor owe it to his wife and children to take the money?

"No; they would lose all respect for me. They might even leave me. They are more idealistic than I am." And, after all, the family is not on charity. Lipkin makes \$30 a week giving two art classes; his wife makes \$70 a week as a secretary.

But the rain of money was an inspiring thing, the sculptor added. "A little girl sent me three \$1 bills with a note saying she was sacrificing a piano lesson to help me. A workman in overalls stopped in last night after work and tried to force upon me the few dollars he had in his pocket. He said he would bring me more next payday."

"I had to walk away or I'd have bust out crying."

Even the creditor softened up. He forgave part of the bill and offered easy terms on the rest.

"Life is funny," the sculptor mused. "All my life I have been hanging away to get into the Ball of Fame. One day I fail to pay a bill, and fame sneaks in my back door."

—Paul Abbott

## ... Premier Kishi Put on Plane

(Continued from Page 1)

left at the garage and ordinary Japanese cars were used in making the ten-mile detour to the airport where the government party sneaked through a little-used terminal entrance for their waiting plane.

The demonstration was organized by Zengakuren, (National Federation of Student Self-Government Associations) which has played a prominent role in the series of popular demonstrations that have been held in Japan since the terms of the "security" pact were made public. The agreement gives Japan "equal partnership" in U.S. plans for eventual war against China.

The extent of Japanese opposition to the pact, which will further revive Japanese militarism, was graphically shown when 200,000 workers and students, led by Zengakuren, battled their way through police lines last November to register their views with the Japanese parliament. More than 500 were injured when cops began to use force.

The leaders of Zengakuren were expelled from the Japanese Communist party last December as "Trotskyists." Socialist party tops have also denounced them for their militancy and their opposition to U.S. imperialism.

In an interview published in the Jan. 17 New York Times, Takeo Hayama, a Zengakuren leader, said, "We cannot but be pitted against the non-Marxist Japan Communist party, which has no aspiration at all for revolution."

He also declared that Soviet Premier Khrushchev opposes "class struggle" and that "he is suppressing rising class struggles in Asia and Africa in the name of peaceful coexistence."

The Revolutionary Communist League, a Japanese Trotskyist group, reported Dec. 21 that while the Zengakuren leaders have accepted their collaboration, they do not consider themselves Trotskyists, "but remain neutral between the Stalinists and us."

We Changed Them Every Election But Couldn't Win

I have been a member of the Painters Brotherhood since 1900. I have seen and participated in many political maneuvers aimed at bettering labor's lot. I earned \$2.50 a day for nine hours in Chicago in 1906 and was comparatively better off than I am today at \$30 a day. There was another advantage. You didn't need both hands to drive home from a dance. The horse knew the way.

Republican and Democratic "friends of labor" made us promises but somehow nothing happened to help us through their terms of office, and at every election we had to elect new "friends."

has defeated resolutions calling for a labor party. The Militant could help reverse this trend by (1) printing the text of any resolution for a labor party passed by a union body; (2) listing people and unions interested in developing a labor-party program so that a united effort could be made through correspondence.

In 1947, Meany indicated that the AFL alone could mobilize thirty-six million votes by members of unions, their families and friends. So with support from the CIO, Railroad Brotherhoods, Miners and other independent, a labor party could become the largest political party in a very short time. Union members could occupy a majority of political offices in the U.S. They would be elected on a pledge to carry out the program adopted by organized labor.

H. C. B. Santa Cruz, Calif.

Bipartisan Robbery

Mr. Butler, the Democratic national chairman, reports that Mr. Nixon promised Big Steel it could raise prices after election day, 1960.

But what did Mr. Joseph Kennedy promise Big Steel via his McDonald-reported talks with

Wall Street banker pals — for John, of course. No doubt you are about to comment on this, though. Surely it's a confirmation of the obvious bi-partisan setup to perpetuate legalized robbery of taxpayers, consumers and workers (except those sharing in the loot). Vote? What's the use?

Offers to Help Build A Workers' Party

Enclosed please find \$1.25 for which please send me your newspaper and a copy of the pamphlet about the Socialist Workers party by Joseph Hansen.

Recently I had begun to be uncertain of my true feelings with regard to a socialist labor or workers party and had lost a lot of enthusiasm plus being afraid to identify myself with a radical group.

Tonight's news of the steel strike settlement and the outrageous political connotations thereof have shaken me badly. I want to help establish a workers' party and I don't give a damn who knows it.

Your advice will be appreciated. D. W. New York

Requests Grow For President To Free Sobell

JAN. 24 — The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell has submitted a report to President Eisenhower informing him of "the growing public requests" that he grant Sobell a commutation of sentence. Sobell has served nearly ten years of a thirty-year sentence for "espionage."


The committee urged Eisenhower to "please listen to the voice of educators, clergymen, writers, and editors representing the American people," who have asked for executive clemency. The report, dated Dec. 28, was made public today.

The McCarthyite witch-hunt atmosphere in which Sobell was tried together with Ethel and Julius Rosenberg has changed, the committee said. "Today scientists and publications are commenting on the manner in which our country went overboard in its fears about espionage and its appraisal of the relationship between espionage and world affairs."

In the report, the committee cited an editorial, entitled "Who's Giving Away Secrets Now," which appeared in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, on Nov. 14, 1959.

"MOST SCIENTISTS AGREE that had there never been a Klaus Fuchs, a Julius Rosenberg or Morton Sobell, or a single case of scientific treason on this side of the Iron Curtain, by this time it wouldn't have made a shadow of difference in the balance of power between ourselves and the Russians," says the Times. "Soviet performance in the field of missiles and space exploration, has demonstrated conclusively that Russian science and technology doesn't have to get any secrets from us to be able to more than hold its own."

Appeal to High Court



Frank Wilkinson (left) and Carl Braden are appealing "contempt-of-Congress" convictions to the Supreme Court.

Wilkinson and Braden

(Continued from Page 1) there to rally public opposition. As soon as the witch-hunters learned of his presence they subpoenaed him.

Both Braden and Wilkinson refused to answer the committee's questions on the grounds that since the First Amendment prohibits Congress from curbing the free expression of political ideas the House committee lacked the power to investigate.

In ruling against Wilkinson, the Appeals Court stated further that: "The Committee had been informed that the appellant was a hard-core Communist, and he was attempting as a Communist activity to develop opposition to the Committee and its investigations; hence it was within the province of the Committee to ascertain whether Un-American Communist influences were attempting to weaken the government by impeding and crippling

Labor's Political Role Debated at Cleveland Forum

CLEVELAND, Jan. 18 — "American labor's survival as an effective voice and force is what is at stake in the 1960 political arena," declared Sam Pollock, president of Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 427, AFL-CIO, in a panel discussion here last night on "The Challenge of 1960."

"If one were to describe labor's real position since 1947," he continued, "it would be as one of defeats and defensive actions, as indicated by the organizational defeats in the South, and, to a lesser extent, in other regions; the legislative defeats — particularly Taft-Hartley and the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin Labor Control Act; the election of 'friends' who are indistinguishable from enemies. Even the victories of labor — defeat of 'right-to-work' laws in a number of states and the victory in the steel strike — are more accurately described as 'defensive' victories."

Pollock's views turned the panel discussion into a virtual debate. Taking issue with Pollock, panelist Morris Riger, regional director of the AFL-CIO Textile Workers, said that labor must understand that the nature of the American political system requires, in the first place, work in the primary elections of the two major parties.

The third panelist, Charles Loeb, managing editor of the Cleveland Call & Post and a former Republican candidate for Congress seeking Negro representation, said the "basic challenge for 1960 is to keep our nation peaceful and prosperous." He predicted, however, that "politics will take precedence over legislation" this election year and that it would be "overly optimistic to look for more than ineffective compromises" in Congress.

The symposium was the first in a series of forums sponsored by the Social Action Committee of the Unitarian Society of Cleveland. The moderator was Walt Davis, successful labor candidate for Cleveland Board of Education in last November's election.

Keen interest in this type of political discussion was evident from the way the audience of more than 100 plied the speakers with questions. Considerable debate developed over Riger's view that Senator Hubert Humphrey, a contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, should be supported. One person asked Riger how

he, as a labor leader, could "rationalize" his support of Humphrey who voted for the Landrum-Griffin Act. Seemingly nettled, Riger replied that he didn't have to rationalize it, that the criteria of the AFL-CIO for judging Congressmen was not how they stood on the vote that passed the bill but on the earlier vote, before the measure went to the joint congressional committee for final drafting.

Pollock commented: "This is our great problem. To accommodate our 'friends' in the two parties, we have to relegate certain votes out of account. But many people in the labor movement refuse to make this kind of fine distinction."

Pollock then urged that work should begin for the creation of labor's own party, declaring that "it is a snare and delusion to spread the idea that the two parties which joined hands to chain American labor can be trusted to maintain peace in the world, extend prosperity to the poverty-stricken or defend the unions against legislative tyranny."

Wilson Strike

(Continued from Page 1)

the area have continued to send money and food to the embattled strikers. Aid has also begun to arrive from other unions. United Auto Workers secretary-treasurer Emil Zerk addressed a strike rally in Albert Lea last week and presented the UPWA with a check for \$25,000 from the auto workers.

An additional \$25,000 was contributed by the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Department.

With local and county cops running scabs into the plant, the company apparently feels it is in a strong position and is sticking tough.

The role of Minnesota Governor Freeman in the strike is now confined to sending telegrams to the company and the union urging them to submit the disputed issues to arbitration. The union readily accepted the governor's proposal but the company turned it down.

I'm Switching to Beer

By Reba Aubrey

"Danger in Your Drinking Water," an article by Alvin B. Toffler, has me really worried.

I thought the gray foaminess of my kitchen tap water was air in the pipeline. When the water tasted a little "off-color," I thought too much chlorine or something had been added. Now I'm not sure.

According to Toffler whose article appears in the January 1960 Good Housekeeping magazine, you can't "take it for granted" that the water you're drinking is fit for human consumption. He says our water now contains "untreated sewage," "higher-than-natural levels of radioactivity," "detergents," "traces of insecticides, weed killers, fertilizers," "new industrial chemicals."

Toffler points out that it is well known by the experts that sewage carries the "seeds" of diarrhea, typhoid, hepatitis, the "mild cold." However, the experts can't prove that the "waves of vomiting, cramps, upset stomachs, which sometimes whip mysteriously across a community," are water-borne.

It's hard to believe that the water pouring from the kitchen tap contains all these "things." It looks more or less the same, tastes more or less the same. But Toffler has evidence that should make everyone wonder.

In Rensselaer, New York, for instance, the people were "ordered" to boil their drinking water. This order was based on findings of the Rensselaer County Board of Health that water drawn from the Hudson River just above Albany was "so polluted it is dangerous for human consumption . . ."

In Salt Lake City, Utah, experts warned residents that their health was endangered "as hepatitis cases shot up three times higher than the previous year's level."

In New Jersey, the cities of Paterson, Passaic, Clifton, Nutley and Harrison had to switch to alternate water sources when Passaic River "pollution became so bad it killed thousands of fish."

In November 1958 residents of a Denver, Colorado, suburb complained about the "dirty, rotten water" they were drinking. It was found

that their tap water, milky and swamp-smelling, originated in a creek into which six other communities were dumping raw sewage.

Last March, the people in Eugene, Oregon, were warned "that sewage was contaminating the McKenzie River one-half mile above the Eugene water intake."

In addition to the old problem of sewage that is dumped by enormous tonnage into the water sources of "downstream neighbors," there is considerable other waste now being added to our water — "slaughterhouse remains, toxic industrial and mine wastes, garbage and cannery refuse, petrochemicals, coal-tar dyes, rotting animal carcasses" — even the "effluent from mortuaries and hospitals." I don't know what "effluent" is; but it doesn't sound like root-beer extract.

Along with population and industrial expansion, so much sewage and waste products are being dumped into our water sources that present water-treatment methods can no longer decontaminate the water fast enough.

In Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, for instance, "disease-bearing water" broke through the plant. An "explosive outbreak of poliomyelitis" resulted. A similar outbreak in Nebraska "was probably traceable to the same source of infection." And "There is also sufficient . . . evidence that the [infectious hepatitis] epidemic that occurred in the small town on the Tidal River (Pennsylvania) was water-borne."

Toffler's facts and figures have me convinced that there is "danger" in our drinking water. But what can I do about it? When the papers carried stories about a cancer-producing pellet going to market in the necks of chickens, I stopped eating chicken necks. When the government picked up tons of lettuce because it was poisoned with DDT, I switched to escarole. I gave up cranberries for Thanksgiving when the Department of Health declared they were contaminated with aminotriazol. What can I do about water flavored with sewage?

Well, I'm switching to beer; but even so I'm not sure I'm not still drinking water.

Union Ranks Resist

(Continued from Page 1)

the ranks were inclined to refrain from intervening. However, now that "bargaining" begins to involve the surrender of previously won gains in exchange for concessions of dubious value, the ranks are beginning to intervene in the determination of their living and working conditions. It is a healthy tendency which will probably grow more pronounced in the period ahead.

Another manifestation of worker discontent is expressed in the power struggle now taking place at the Cleveland convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The Jan. 4 issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that an opposition movement has been organized around the union's secretary-treasurer, William J. Weil, to oust the incumbent president William Parker Kennedy from office. Kennedy is an old mossback whose ingrained conservatism has driven a large section of the union into opposition.

"... the main plank in the dissidents' platform," reports the WSJ, "is Mr. Kennedy's alleged 'softness' in his dealings with railroad management. Even if Mr. Kennedy wins railroad executives fear the pressure from the militant

wing of the union may force him into a more rigid bargaining position."

The leader of the opposition, says the WSJ, "sums up his platform in one word — 'toughness.' His group claims that the union president has spent too much time hobnobbing with railroad officials at their private clubs, giving banquet lectures and touring foreign countries. He has spent too little time, they claim, fighting the railroads' publicity barrage on the 'featherbedding' issue that is a key to the 1960 contract negotiations."

A Chummy Gathering

Hobnobbing with the boss is the essential feature of "mutual trusteeship." The Wall Street Journal, Jan. 12, carries the news of a chummy little dinner party at the home of Vice-President Nixon. "Among those invited," says the WSJ, "were [Secretary of Labor] Mitchell, Roger Blough, U.S. Steel Corp. chairman, and David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers Union — the chief antagonists in the steel dispute that ended last week."

"The guest list was confined to officials of the steel industry and the Steelworkers Union . . . The other guests at the small stag affair at Mr. Nixon's home were A. B. Homer, president of Bethlehem Steel Corp.; T. F. Patton, president of Republic Steel Corp.; R. Conrad Cooper, an executive vice president of U.S. Steel who headed the industry bargaining team; and Arthur J. Goldberg, chief counsel of the Steelworkers. Mr. Nixon's office said it was a private affair, that no press coverage was allowed, and no statement would

be made about what happened there." Undoubtedly the object of this cosy little gathering was to devise ways and means of shoring up the badly mangled "mutual trusteeship" policy after the mauling it received in the 116-day steel strike, the longest in the industry's history. It is a foregone conclusion that whatever commitments were made and understandings reached at Nixon's little stag party will be at the expense of the steel workers.

If there is any one lesson that impressed itself on the steel corporation executives during the course of the steel strike, it is that the "softness" of McDonald was not an accurate reflection of the temper of the ranks. Just as railroad management prefers the "soft" William Kennedy so the steel barons feel more secure with McDonald as head of the union. In pointing up the folly of forcing a "last offer" vote in the steel strike, which would be tantamount to asking the union members to repudiate their leadership and disown their union, New York Times correspondent Joseph A. Loftus made this astute observation: "Union members sometimes repudiate their leaders, but rarely in a way that gives comfort to a common adversary."

The days of the unchallenged reign of the "soft" union bureaucrats are drawing to a close. American labor has entered the period of sharpening class struggle. To survive, a new type of leadership is required. The "common adversary" can find little comfort in the fact that the process of change has begun.

On Tour

(Continued from Page 1)

would object to the idea of a machine saving him from having to work like a mule. His problem is that the capitalist tries to save him so completely from labor that he winds up without any means of livelihood.

Scientific progress should both lighten human labor and improve living conditions for all. It should not benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Union demands to compensate for technological change with a 30-hour week at 40-hours pay are a partial step in the right direction. But capitalist demands for longer hours at existing wages are antisocial in the extreme.

When I witness such greedy capitalist demands, coupled with a union-busting attack of the kind going on here, I become more convinced than ever that the boss class is driving American labor toward adoption of class-struggle policies in industry and in politics; and the labor statesmen of the union bureaucracy won't be able to stop it.

Fraternally, Farrell Dobbs

Local Directory

- BOSTON Boston Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Room 200. CHICAGO Socialist Workers Party, 777 W. Adams, DE 2-9736. CLEVELAND Socialist Workers Party 10609 Superior Ave., Room 301, SW 1-1818. Open Thursday nights 8 to 10. The Militant, P.O. Box 1904, University Center Station, Cleveland 6, Ohio. DETROIT Engene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward. TEmple 1-6135. LOS ANGELES Forum Hall and Modern Book Shop, 1702 E. 4th St. AN 9-1953 or WE 5-9238. MILWAUKEE 150 East Juneau Ave. MINNEAPOLIS Socialist Workers Party, 322 Hennepin Ave., 2nd floor. Open noon to 6 P.M. daily except Sundays. NEWARK Newark Labor Forum, Box 361, Newark, N.J. NEW YORK CITY Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place, AL 5-7852. OAKLAND-BERKELEY P.O. Box 341, Berkeley 1, Calif. PHILADELPHIA Militant Labor Forum and Socialist Workers Party, 1303 W. Girard Ave. Lectures and discussions every Saturday, 8 P.M., followed by open house. Call PO 3-5820. SAN FRANCISCO The Militant, 1145 Polk St., Rm. 4. Sat. 11 A.M. to 3 P.M. Phone PR 6-7296; if no answer, VA 4-2321. SEATTLE 1412-18th Avenue, EA 2-5554. LIbrary, bookstore. ST. LOUIS For information phone MO 4-7194.

Notes in the News

ATOM 'DOOM CLOCK' MOVED BACK — The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, has moved back the hands of the "clock of doom" on its front cover from two minutes before midnight to seven minutes before midnight. The magazine has carried the clock since its first issue as a warning to mankind of the danger of atomic annihilation. It began — June 1947 — with the hands pointing to eight minutes before midnight. The minute hand was advanced twice thereafter as the Soviet Union caught up in the atomic race. The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists gave the following reasons for moving the clock back five minutes: "the treaty for demilitarization of the Antarctic; the resounding success of the International Geophysical Year; plans for other cooperative scientific efforts; and the actual cessation of bomb tests."

CONGRESSIONAL WISDOM — Defending government rental of commercial storage facilities for surplus grain. Secretary of Agriculture Benson declared Jan. 15 that Congress "wisely gave the job to private enterprise." A Senate investigating committee three days earlier heard managers of three grain-elevator firms admit that their respective companies showed profits of 69%, 105% and 167% over costs for storing surplus grain. The total government storage bill comes to about \$1 billion a year.

FEDERAL STRIKEBREAKING AID — U.S. Attorney General Rogers and Immigration Commissioner Swing were attacked in federal court Dec. 28 for permitting a struck Texas packinghouse plant to use commuting Mexican aliens by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) after Secretary of Labor Mitchell issued a finding that the use of the Mexican migrants at the Payton Packing Co. in El Paso adversely affected wages and working conditions of the striking U.S. workers. Immigration laws forbid the admission of aliens when such a finding is made.

COAL PRODUCTIVITY SOARS — Coalmine operators no longer consider their industry a sick one. They had a good year in 1959 and expect a better one in 1960. The prosperity of the operators is largely due to the fact that the actual labor cost of the average operator under

contract to the United Mine Workers is less per ton than it was ten years ago. In the past decade, technological advances have approximately doubled the output rate per man. The men still left working in the mines enjoy what is said to be the highest wage scale in the world, an estimated \$3.27 per hour, plus fringe benefits. But there are now only 200,000 men working in the industry which once employed 600,000. In West Virginia and other mining areas, layoffs have brought untold suffering.

OLD SOLDIERS NEVER DIE — A House Armed Services subcommittee revealed Jan. 17 that 762 former military officers are employed by the country's 100 largest defense contractors who get some 80% of new weapons work. None of the brass held a rank lower than colonel in the Army or the Air Force or of captain in the Navy.

YOU CAN'T FIGHT CITY HALL — "When I have a promise from a representative of the city of New York I expect it to be kept," angrily declared New York attorney Max Steinberg Jan. 15. Steinberg is counsel for Mrs. Minnie Smith, officer of a corporation which owns a slum building that had 150 violations filed against it. The lawyer said that Mrs. Smith and the lessee of the building, Hyman Applebaum, had pleaded guilty only because assistant-city-corporation-counsel John Halpin had promised a minimum penalty. But something went awry and the judge slapped a \$550 fine and a 60-day suspended sentence on Mr. Applebaum and fined Mrs. Smith \$125.

ECONOMY ON CAPITOL HILL — Last year the Senate voted \$100,000 to install de-luxe tile floors in the new Senate Office Building. When it was discovered that the tile wasn't skid-proof the problem was solved by appropriating another \$150,000 for wall-to-wall carpeting. A new hazard was found in the carpeting. When people walk on it static electricity accumulates and touching a brass door knob brings a shock. So far no one has figured out a good expensive way to lick the problem. Meanwhile some of the offices are meeting the problem by encasing the knobs in transparent plastic wrappers.

Calendar of Events

- CLEVELAND Interested in socialism? Join a weekly class in a study of Frederick Engels' classic work, "Socialism from a Utopia to a Science." Next class Thurs., Jan. 28, at 8 p.m., 10609 Superior Avenue, Third Floor. "A Socialist View of Recent Developments in the Labor Movement and Perspectives for 1960." Speaker: Frank Lovell, State Chairman, Michigan Socialist Workers Party. Sponsors: Cleveland Militant Forum. Saturday, Jan. 30, 8 p.m., YMCA, Prospect and E. 22 St. LOS ANGELES School of International Socialism presents its winter lecture series. Milton Alvin on "THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION TODAY: How the Stalin Regime Was Formed and Defeated Its Rivals — 1918-1928." Sunday, Jan. 31, 11 a.m. "The Consolidation of the Stalin Regime — 1929-1945." Sunday, Feb. 7, 11 a.m. "The Soviet Union as a World Power — Its Present Position and Future — 1946-1960." Sunday, Feb. 14, 11 a.m. Forum Hall, 1702 East Fourth St., Los Angeles 33. Telephone, AN 9-4953 or WE 5-9238. NEW YORK Murry Weiss, editor of International Socialist Review, will discuss "The Leninist Concept of a Revolutionary Party — Myth and Reality" on the thirty-sixth anniversary of Lenin's death. Question and discussion period. Chairman, Daniel Freeman, chairman, Young Socialist Alliance. Friday, Jan. 29, 8:30 p.m. Militant Labor Forum, 116 University Place (off Union Square). Contribution, 50 cents.

On American Radicalism

Has socialism a future in America? Why is the socialist movement so small in this country? How can socialists help to rebuild it into a power greater than it was in the 1930's and in the days of Debs?

James P. Cannon, founder of the Socialist Workers party and active participant in the socialist movement for fifty years, attempts an answer. His examination of the ups and downs of the radical movement since 1900 makes illuminating reading. In the International Socialist Review. Send 35 cents for a copy.

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