

# SPEAK YOUR PIECE

## About the Baker-Metcalf Bill

BROOKLYN.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The N.Y. Times in an editorial estimate of the current legislative session in Albany called upon it to facilitate its work, and, for passage of certain preferred legislation. It pointedly omitted one, namely, the Baker-Metcalf Bill. The omission is worthy of comment.

Max Gordon in his report from Albany points to the lack of optimism regarding getting the bill out of committee this year.

This bill if passed will extend our state anti-Bias law to:

1. The rental or sale of all single family houses in developments of 10 or more houses;
2. The rental or sale of all apartment dwellings.

I believe an effective campaign of letters to all N.Y. legislators, with constant newspaper publicity, can be decisive for passage of the bill at this session. Passage is necessary for the final elimination of segregation in housing and in our school system.

## Victory For UAW

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

The UAW has won an overwhelming victory in an NLRB election at the New Process Gear Corp., once a mighty open shop fortress. In balloting March 7 at six plants in Syracuse and the nearby Auburn, the vote was 1233 to 530. The victory ends a three year effort to organize the 2,000 production workers, with the company winning two previous bargaining elections. An important producer of truck and auto transmissions, New Process is considered by the union to be controlled by the Chrysler Corp.

The success of the auto workers is expected to put some new life into a campaign to complete organization of large shops in the Syracuse area. Three plants with a total of over 6000 workers, remain non-union—Smith-Corona Typewriters, Onondaga Pottery, and Crouse-Hinds (electrical equipment).

—EDDIE.

## What Is a "Correct" Interpretation?

Editor, Daily Worker:

I did not catch the Mike Wallace interview of Earl Browder, but I found myself in sympathy with the remarks of Robert Friedman. A. B. Magil's response, however, elicited some second thoughts.

If it is true that Browder's

factional activity justified his expulsion, as Magil holds, I'm afraid our newly-won rights of dissent in the Party are destined to be meaningless. I was present at the N.Y. county meeting when the motion to expel Browder was first proposed and adopted. As a matter of fact, the issue at that time was not his factionalism. The delegate who introduced the motion was merely carrying "to its logical conclusion," an attack on the continuing influence of revisionism.

Now at that time I agreed that Browder had indeed revised Marxism. Like Magil I still think so, though unlike Magil I thought so (and wrote letters while in the Army saying so) from 1943 on. But at issue is not whether Browder's theories revised some aspects of Marxism. Nor is it even at issue to discuss whether, having "revised" Marxism, he was right or wrong from the viewpoint of revolutionary, scientific socialism. (Labeling an idea, after all, does not refute it.)

But what is very much at issue now, or in any future unified socialist party, is whether there is room for differences of view, even on interpretation of basic Marxist principles. Naturally such a difference could not be so fundamental as to hold socialism itself in question. An adherent of capitalism would not be in such a party—except perhaps as a police agent. But Browder's differences were not of this nature. One can even assume that his differences would be still less fundamental had he not received from the Party the treatment he did.

Involved in Magil's view is the implication that "correct" interpretations can be established

by fiat. Browder's characterization of the capitalist class is un-Marxist, someone decides. Browder disagrees and insists that it is Marxist. But it isn't enough that his views be submitted to examination by the membership, with the majority interpretation governing policy. No, Browder and all who agree with him must recant or face expulsion. And if Browder dissents and continues to express his views, this is factionalism.

Today we recognize that the 1945 discussion was carried on in an atmosphere of kowtowing to hierarchial authority. The treatment the Duclos intervention got this year was much more worthy of a mature Party. As a result, the "majority" view is therefore more meaningful, though numbers of themselves are no guarantee of historical validity.

But the problem remains. We have proscribed factionalism. Perhaps it won't matter in the near future, since the recent convention avoided taking a stand on many issues. But once the Party decides a number of questions the members have been debating these many months, what then? Of what value is a dissent that can't be voiced without expulsion for factionalism? If Magil, who raised some pertinent comments on democratic centralism in the recent discussion, still feels there isn't room enough in the same Marxist party for him and a Browder, to what avail was all this talk about ending the monolithic nature of our organization?

These are just some random thoughts. I'd like to see some answers.

—HANK.

March 6, 1957

## PROBE RADIOACTIVE EFFECT ON BABIES IN BRITISH TOWN

CHELTENHAM, England, March 11.—Scientists will investigate a theory that atomic radiation is responsible for Cheltenham's epidemic of abnormally tiny babies, according to a London newspaper.

This resort town has the highest death rate among infants of any community in Britain, and an unusual number of babies born in recent years have weighed less than three pounds.

The Sunday pictorial said scientists will investigate "the chance that radioactive dust from atomic bomb explosions may have heightened the amount of radioactivity already believed to exist in this spa."

"The theory is that even before the atombomb explosions the radioactive level was high because of the 'active' local health-cure mineral springs," the newspaper said.

"Now the question is asked: Could Cheltenham's level of radioactivity have been raised to an extent which could influence babies' births?"

The newspaper said scientists also are investigating the possibility that parents picked up radioactivity from milk because "it has been established that cows in the Harwell and Aldermaston area, where there are atomic stations, are slightly more radioactive than usual."