

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE SUPPRESSED UN REPORT
ON THE WORLD OIL CARTEL**

... page 6

Compulsory Stooling in New York

... page 5

Bevan Scores in the First Round

... page 4

MARCH 28, 1955

FIVE CENTS

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

H-Bomb Politics

One meaning of the present crisis in the British Labor Party is brilliantly floodlighted by recent news from—France. Let's make the connection.

On March 16 French Premier Faure told a press conference why France too must build an H-bomb:

"As matters are now going there will be a sort of line of demarcation between the powerful nations having thermonuclear equipment and the inferior nations that do not have it—inferior . . . in terms of power. . . .

"France cannot take a place among 'second-class great powers.' . . ."

A *Times* dispatch from Paris underlines the French government's understanding of Churchill's argument that only if it too has the Bomb will England be able to affect U. S. policy. The French also want to have a say around the table.

Nobody really pretends, or anyway no one really can pretend, that the U. S. can't build enough of the Bombs to go around. It possibly already has enough to blow up most of the habitable world, and, unlike hand grenades, you don't need many more after you get to that point.

Why then are Britain and France anxious to get in the act? The plain answer: not to build up their strength against Russia, but to build up their strength vis-à-vis the U. S. It is strictly within the framework of the inter-imperialist rivalry inside the capitalist-imperialist world, of the competitive interests of the respective national groups of capitalists who are allied.

Thus the British decision to build the H-bomb, which so plainly flouted the interests of fighting Stalinism politically, drew a line among the British people, and therefore also among the ranks of the Labor Party: those who, when the chips are down, line up with their "own" imperialism, versus those who want a genuinely internationalist-socialist policy, though they may be vague as to its exact form.

This means: the most fundamental division between left wing and right wing among British socialists.

It is no accident, therefore, that the anti-H-bomb tendency springs among the Bevanites. For, not because of the foreign-policy ideas of Bevan himself but often in spite of them, all that is left-wing in the BLP is channelized through the so-called Bevanite tendency, including its left-wing of militant Third Camp socialists who have no use for the fuzzy neutralist and sometimes-Stalinoid notions that too often afflict Bevan himself.

Ah, the Democrats!

Excuse us, please, for being a bore about it, but we are unexpectedly compelled to come back to the question of the Socialist International and the Djilas case.

Only last week, we commented on a letter to us from the Norwegian social-democratic youth, in which they crudely display the bureaucratic mentality of social-democrats with regard to this issue. We mentioned that, far from speaking up for Djilas, the Socialist International's *Bulletin* had confined itself to reprinting Titoist hatchetmen.

(Continued on page 7)

UAW CONVENTION: You Can Be the Rallying Center for All Progressives in the New Labor Federation

By BEN HALL

The convention of the United Auto Workers (CIO) opens on March 27 in Cleveland on the eve of events of decisive significance to the labor movement. Because of its unique position—largest union in the CIO and leading progressive union in the country—UAW conventions always command close attention.

This year, even more than usual. In a few months, contracts with the Big Three expire: General Motors, Ford and Chrysler; and the fight for the Guaranteed Annual Wage, chief union demand, begins. Before the year's end, AFL and CIO will merge into a single trade-union center and a realignment of forces within the labor movement begins.

The convention faces two main problems: (1) To prepare to confront the auto employers; (2) to orient the UAW inside the united labor movement.

The first test in 1955 negotiation comes on June 1 when the GM contract expires. This much is certain: either General Motors will grant the Guaranteed Annual Wage or the union will strike.

For perhaps five years, the UAW administration has been stirring up the

**MORE
on UAW and CIO**
—see pages 2 and 3.

membership in preparation for the fight. Now convention delegates will be asked to create a \$25,000,000 strike fund financed by a periodic increase in dues.

When the fund goes below \$15,000,000 according to the proposal, dues will be increased by \$5 a month. When the fund hits \$25,000,000 the dues increase would be suspended. For once, a request for higher dues is clearly and unquestionably linked to a fighting fund and most union militants are ready to support it. No union has won the GAW in a mass

production industry. In fact, none has done more than make a gesture on its behalf. The Steel Workers Union, second largest in the CIO, mildly requested in its latest negotiations that the steel companies investigate the matter, but when its gingerly suggestion was rejected out of hand the steel union promptly dropped it. The International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) has placed it on its list of demands but has never had the strength to fight for it.

It remains now for the UAW to lead the way.

When the Guaranteed Wage was presented as a fighting demand at the 1953 convention, critics of the Reuther administration, notably Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, insisted that the demand for a 30-hour week take precedence. In their haste to demolish critics, Reuther and other UAW leaders lost all sense of proportion. While vowing themselves ceremonially to the lofty ultimate goal of a shorter work-week, they insisted that it had no immediate practical significance.

They insisted that the union faced a "choice between an immediate 30-hour week with a reduced living standard and

(Turn to last page)

What the Yalta Papers Reveal No Traitors, No Heroes—A Peep at Imperialists with Hair Down

By BERNARD CRAMER

The secret documents reporting the 1945 Yalta conference of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, released this past week by the State Department, may not add much to our knowledge of the big decisions taken there—which were already pretty well known, as is being industriously pointed out by people anxious to play down the importance of the sensational documents—but something else is much more important for us to know:

There are few places, if any, where you will get a more candid look-in on frank imperialists at work; where you will get a sharper smell of the authentic imperialist atmosphere as peoples and nations are sold and swapped over the bargaining-counter; where you can see and hear cynical rulers letting their hair down about their real interests and aims apart from festive speeches.

To get this you've got to plow through acres of official prose, however, and it is not likely that many will do so. Readers of LABOR ACTION will get the equivalent in next week's special section (see accompanying announcement).

The analysis will, of course, show no evidence for the McCarthyite-GOP slander of "treason" at Yalta (not even by Alger Hiss). It will also explode, perhaps even more cruelly, the current liberal-apologies for Yalta. Both trade in myths.

What the analysis will bring out is a picture that recalls the scene in Charlie Chaplin's "The Great Dictator" in which

**NEXT WEEK'S ISSUE
SPECIAL SECTION
on YALTA**

At least four pages of a full digest and organized presentation of the material in the Yalta papers which is of lasting importance, correlating this also with previously published accounts and books, designed for permanent reference.

Schickelgruber does a dance with the globe of the world. Here there were three Schickelgrubers, two of them very "democratic" Schickelgrubers, the other the totalitarian ex-partner of the authentic Schickelgruber himself. You will see them setting themselves up as uncontrolled, unchecked overlords of the world.

• You will see them laughing in merriment at the very idea that small nations should decide their own fate.

• You will see them getting down to the practical task of squabbling over Iranian oil.

• You will see them knifing each other in the back in private talks (FDR's stiletto work being particularly fine).

• You will see them, democrats and dic-

tator together, planning slave labor for Russia.

• You will see them smacking their lips over anticipated millions of corpses (conversational speaking, of course).

• You will see the "democrats" pleading with Stalin to let them save face before their people.

And you will see what it is that underlies, and explains, all of these apparently startling antics.

Next in importance to the content of the Yalta papers themselves is the manner of their release. We are certainly not complaining, for any reason which brings such treasures to light is to be welcomed. But the fact is that, for the very reason that we socialists have reason to be delighted, the pitiful Eisenhower-Dulles regime has brought on itself the contempt as well as the anger of its colleagues in Europe and its supporters in this country.

For the sake of a dirty blow against the Democrats—and not even against the Democratic Party as such but against its legendary saint Roosevelt—the GOP jaybirds have fouled their own nest too. Certainly no one can predict how far the sheer stupidity and narrowminded blindness of the Republican administration will lead this country into adventures, if they can pull this self-damaging stunt.

But we can't cavil: the result is a windfall to be made use of in the interests of teaching the truth about the rulers of the world on both sides of the cold war.

ISSUES FACING UAW CONVENTION: Vital Questions Will Be Decided in Cleveland

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Mar. 19—As more than 3000 delegates converge on Cleveland this week to attend the 15th constitutional convention of the United Auto Workers (CIO), one thought is uppermost in their minds:

Will the UAW win the Guaranteed Annual Wage fight with the Big Three, General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, this year?

And many, if not all, the delegates, as well as the leadership of the UAW, are conscious of the fact that the answer to that crucial question depends considerably on the deliberations and actions of this convention.

The American labor movement, and the nation as a whole, also are keeping their eyes focused on the Cleveland convention for a clue to the forthcoming negotiations at Ford and General Motors. Everyone wants to know how serious the UAW fight for the GAW is going to be. Walter Reuther, president of the union, has often taken a flat, uncompromising position that the GAW will be won in 1955. Is the union ready for that kind of fight against the richest and most powerful corporations in America?

The appearance of George Meany, president of the AFL and of the coming united labor movement, to pledge support to the UAW fight gives much added weight and influence to Walter Reuther's determination to obtain a victory package in 1955.

For the secondary leaders among the delegates, a key question to show how they stand is their response to the demand for a special assessment via a temporary dues increase to build a \$25,000,000 strike fund in the next three months.

Contrasted with the millions and hundreds of millions that the corporations have at their disposal, the UAW proposed strike fund is not very big potatoes. But it is an excellent indication of just how far the secondary leaders and rank and file are willing to go in the coming struggle.

CONTRACT UP

For five years of marking time are now over. The contract at Ford expires on May 29 and at General Motors on June 1. Preliminary talks already have been held, and the public press has been loaded with vehement discussions on the

Guaranteed Annual Wage, largely, of course, in a light unfavorable to the union.

But as both Reuther and the corporations know, public opinion is important but bargaining strength is even more so. The UAW may be expected to hold its own on both fronts, if the convention really serves as a rallying point for the entire union and the rest of organized labor in America.

Understandably, the main preoccupation will be with the 1955 contract negotiations, for its results will affect the future course of the labor movement in the coming period. The impact of the bargaining in auto will be felt in all negotiations of all unions, no matter what this or that union leader may think of the guaranteed annual wage program.

Victory for the UAW assures it again of a front place in the united labor movement, as a vanguard and pioneer. It can serve to inspire gains for labor everywhere.

A LEAD IS NEEDED

But many other vital questions also will be decided at this convention, not the least of which will be the basic issue of civil liberties. The UAW faces not only the usual problems, but at the present has a special appeal from the young Stalinists who were fired at GM following vigilante violence against them in Flint, and the grievance in their behalf was dropped in higher stages. What will the convention say to their appeal?

A reactionary clique in one Flint union has also introduced a resolution calling on the UAW to bar from membership any individual who is a member of an organization listed as subversive. How the UAW leadership and ranks handle this vicious bit of McCarthyism should be interesting to watch.

Unlike many union leaderships, the top echelon of the UAW is very conscious

of international affairs and the dangers of a war erupting over the current Formosa crisis. While the AFL, for example, simply echoes the State Department, it remains to be seen if the UAW offers a different, more realistic and independent view on this matter. Will it call for free elections in Formosa to let the people there decide what they want? Will it confine itself to a demand that a United Nations trusteeship be imposed on Formosa? Will it dare criticize the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek as well as the totalitarian Mao Tse-tung?

Engrossed as it is in the big economic struggles just ahead, will the UAW also find time and willingness to offer some political leadership to a nation floundering in a morass of chauvinism, hysterical fear of Stalinism, and a jittery case of nerves over the economic picture?

INTERNAL SCRAPS

What about political action—always a focal point of good debate and controversy at UAW conventions?

For many of the delegates not from the Big Three, there are other questions of economic policy to settle. What about the wage cuts given at some plants? How does the GAW affect the small three and the other small shops? Does a GAW apply to the aircraft industry, which now includes more of the membership of the UAW than the auto shops themselves?

For the power-conscious delegates there are some internal matters that are going to occupy considerable caucus if not convention time. Surely the proposal for two more vice-presidents will carry, and Norman Mathews and Leonard Woodcock, the candidates of the Reuther caucus, will win, perhaps without opposition, as will the top officers of the UAW. No matter what faults they may have, one thing is certain: the opposition, whatever it may be, has less to offer.

Two new regional directors on the East Side of Detroit are to be chosen, and the expected decision is for Ken Morris, president of Local 212, and George Morelli, now assistant director, under the late Mike Lacey.

A couple of improvements elsewhere are also slated. In each case, the dominant role of Walter Reuther as leader of the UAW will be decisive in the selections.

PITTSBURGH

CIO Man Gets Kick in the Face From Demo Party

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Mar. 20 — Guerrilla warfare is still raging between Pittsburgh's Democratic Party machine and the labor movement.

Last week we reported that the president of the Pittsburgh CIO council, Anthony Federoff, had withdrawn from the primary race for a Democratic nomination to city council. Federoff announced that he had withdrawn only because the mayor, David Lawrence, had agreed to policies more favorable to labor.

The Democrats waited only one day after the deadline for filing petitions for the primaries and then gave Federoff a swift kick in the teeth. As soon as he was sure Federoff would not win, the mayor announced that he had "made no deal" with Federoff, and that he had promised Federoff nothing that he had not promised the public.

Patrick T. Fagan, one of the mayor's puppet councilmen, went even further. "He should have been allowed to run and get beat," Fagan declared.

Fagan, a former union bureaucrat put forward for council by the ADA as a liberal, has been an embarrassment to labor and liberals ever since. He voted against the wishes of the entire labor movement and for a wage tax. He has distinguished himself mainly by a campaign to make firemen remove pin-up pictures from the walls of fire stations.

In the meantime, it is apparent that the labor movement has been again outmaneuvered. There are strong indications that Federoff had been urged to run in the first place by the out-of-power wing of the Democrats in the city, the Musmanno-Roberts-McClelland wing. Apparently this group of hungry patronage-seekers took advantage of labor's disgust with the incumbents to push Federoff forward as a cat's paw that would embarrass the mayor.

DREARY RECORD

One thing is sure—the labor movement will get nowhere backing one wing of the Democrats against another, while staying within the confines of the Democratic Party. Although it seems to be the "easy" and "smart" and "practical" way to operate, this is the fifth time that the labor movement has tried it in Pittsburgh since 1948, and the fifth time that labor has been ignominiously worsted.

The record is dreary, but it is worth recalling.

- Six years ago, labor backed Eddie Leonard and a faction of the party which opposed smoke control (of all things). Labor lost.
- Five years ago, labor backed the demagogic Judge Michael Musmanno in the state primary in a move which alienated many liberals from labor's cause, as well as many workers.
- Four years ago, labor backed a racket-tainted candidate for district attorney.
- Last year, it was the conservative William McClelland in the gubernatorial primary.

The striking thing about this sorry record is that, every time, Pittsburgh labor has cooperated with the more reactionary wing of the party. This is the price of not being independent. Labor wants to punish the Democratic incumbents. Since supporting the Republicans is unthinkable, labor is stuck with the "out" faction of the Democrats, in Western Pennsylvania, the more reactionary faction.

You simply can't get out workers' votes that way.

federation of labor in Morocco can be expected to have far-reaching positive effects on the political situation in Morocco and within the nationalist movement in particular. It can also be expected to have positive effects within the ICFTU, where it would strengthen those elements which are uncommitted or hostile to both power blocs.

This influence, represented partly by the "colonial bloc," is needed today more than ever to maintain the independence of world labor, which is being compromised by the reformist leadership of the European ICFTU affiliates and especially by the leaders of the AFL-CIO, whose uncalled-for and reactionary plea to European labor in favor of ratification of the newly concocted Western European Union represents the American "labor statesmen" in their usual rôle of acting as agents for the State Department.

MOROCCO

Struggle for Free Unions Against French Rule

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Mar. 15—In recent months, the independent labor movement in Morocco has been able to make some headway against the French Administration of the Protectorate and its accomplice, the Stalinist leadership in the trade-union movement.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are aware that one of the main problems facing the Moroccan workers in their efforts to build a free trade-union movement has been the administration's prohibition of any unions except the French UGSCM (Union generale des syndicats confederes du Maroc). This federation is led by French Stalinists, and Moroccan workers have to join it if they want to be organized, even though they cannot be democratically represented in the leading bodies.

In January the leaders of the Moroccan workers affiliated to the UGSCM, in particular Taieb Bouazza and Mahjoub Ben Sedik who had been recently released from jail, created an "Organizing Committee for the Creation and the Development of Free Trade-Unionism in Morocco."

In a manifesto to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the Organizing Committee stated its demands for legislation "enabling all workers to form unions and union federations of their choice, and to freely elect their representatives in the leading bodies of these organizations, in conformity with the principles of the international conventions concerning free trade unions."

The manifesto concluded that "only a free and independent trade-union federation . . . can effectively fulfill the legitimate aspirations of Moroccan labor."

The ICFTU has given full support to the Organizing Committee from the beginning, playing a role which deserves credit and which contrasts favorably with its lack of militancy and subservi-

ence to bourgeois politics on other occasions.

In an internal bulletin of March 7, the leaders of the Organizing Committee present their organization as a basis for a future trade-union federation, to be affiliated to the ICFTU, that is, following in general the example of the Tunisian UGTT. On the other hand, ICFTU delegations have been keeping in constant touch with the Organizing Committee, although the first of them was unable to enter Morocco because one of its members, a Tunisian delegate, was refused admittance by the French authorities. On March 11, Oldenbroek and Bécu, respectively secretary-general and President of the ICFTU, who had just returned from Casablanca, expressed their disapproval of the trade-union situation in Morocco.

ICFTU THREATENS

In an interview to the press in Paris, Bécu complained of the "total lack of freedom of association" for the Moroccan workers, and demanded that they should benefit from the same rights as French workers in Morocco. He also declared that in government circles "a project exists on this matter, but we were able to obtain only very little precise information in our interview with Mr. Papou, secretary-general of the Protectorate."

Commenting on rumors according to which trade-union rights would be granted in stages, Bécu pointed out that freedom was an absolute right which had to be granted entirely to be meaningful. He concluded by declaring that if the ICFTU did not obtain satisfaction, it would "pose the question at its international congress, to be held in May."

The French government so far has not shown any inclination to meet the demands of the Moroccan workers and of

the ICFTU. The reforms mentioned last September by Francis Lacoste, newly appointed Resident General under Mendès-France, also included trade-union rights. However, nothing has been heard about these reforms since, neither concerning their content nor the conditions of their application.

At the present time, it seems that the French government is considering a plan for a trade-union law maintaining the administration's company unions called "djemaa d'entreprise," or shop-committees, maintaining the administration's control over the federations of labor, maintaining the exclusive recognition of European leadership in the trade-unions and maintaining the prohibition for any federation of labor to affiliate to an international body.

It goes without saying that, at this point, such measures can only give greater momentum to the offensive of the Moroccan trade-unionists of the Istiqlal Party, and sharpen the latent civil war in the Protectorate.

It may be that wiser councils will prevail in the French government under the influence of functionaries who do not want to see the French power forcibly expelled from North Africa. It may also be that the French government will once again be forced to hastily "legalize" rights which it will be compelled to grant by force. In one case or in the other, the trend toward the creation of a free trade-union movement in Morocco has become irreversible, and its outcome can only be a matter of months.

The establishment of an independent

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

UE Shopping for a Deal; UAW May Cut Out a Slice

By PETE JARMS

The "Communist Control Act" which was put through the last Congress under the leadership of "liberal" witch-hunters like Senators Humphrey and Morse also incorporated the anti-labor Butler bill, which gave the government power to destroy a trade union which was alleged to be "Communist-controlled." Like the rest of the act, this section is an anti-democratic atrocity, and puts legal weapons in the hands of a government to smash unions under the well-known pretext of fighting Communism.

At the same time the act included a specific statement of presumption that a union affiliated with the AFL or CIO is not Communist-dominated. (This was a slight concession to expressed trade-union fears of the effect of the law.) The aim of this provision was also to push the trade-union federations to act as the policemen to take bureaucratic action against suspected "infiltrators."

The result has been twofold. On the one hand, because of this law, the "independent" unions dominated or heavily influenced by the Stalinists have been flying for cover. Already the Fur Workers have sought a home in the AFL Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union. The AFL Executive Board declined to sanction the merger, but the Meat Cutters refused to abide by that decision.

Secondly, the CIO leadership has warned against such steps. CIO attorney Arthur Goldberg put out the warning against "the organized admission, by merger or other devices, of the Communist-dominated unions, with at least part of their leadership and organization intact, into legitimate AFL or CIO unions."

This warning has more or less been ignored by the United Auto Workers (CIO) in the Midwest, which has been concluding arrangements for bringing into the UAW the remaining plants of the International Harvester Company which are organized under the UE (United Electrical Workers).

When the UE is eliminated as a separate factor, International Harvester will be faced with a single union, and will no longer be able to follow its usual game of playing one union off against the other.

The UE leadership tried to get its In-

ternational Harvester section to wait until the International UE organization moved as a body into some union international, as did the Fur Workers. But the Harvester workers represented at the UE's National Conference refused to go along, and told the leadership in no uncertain terms that they wanted entry into the UAW.

They want to get out from under the miserable contract that was forced upon them by the loss of their 1952 strike.

The Stalinist leadership, faced with the uncompromising position of the secondary ranks, has gone along, even attacking Ernest De Mayo, the UE Midwest leader. The UAW, on its part, has felt that it has an honorable opportunity to take in the six remaining Harvester plants without an expensive jurisdictional dispute. All signs point to conclusion of an agreement.

KNOCK ON IAM DOOR

The remaining UE plants are negotiating for merger into the International Association of Machinists. De Mayo spoke at the Bradley plant in Milwaukee and told the workers that they were going into the merged labor movement and were dealing with a huge "metal fabricating union." This, of course, refers to the IAM. (The Stalinist UE leaders would not consider entering the CIO Electrical Workers, IUE-CIO.) There have been conflicting rumors about the IAM's attitude.

It is also reported that the Teamsters have offered entry and a separate industrial division to the UE. Up to now the UE has refused to go into the Teamsters because they know the power of the administrators that Beck could set up.

Within the next month, all of the maneuvers now going on should be out in the open. Mergers like these will wipe out the outright control by the CP over a section of the labor movement. The Stalinists will still retain influence over sections within the labor movement, but if the unions function militantly and democratically the CP influence will wane.

The "hard" position taken by CIO Counsel Goldberg and by the AFL executive Board is foolish. The workers sincerely desire unity and entry into the united labor movement. The trade unions have nothing to lose by accepting them, unless the labor leaders are simply afraid of their ideas.

McDonald Runs Up Against Move Toward Opposition in Steel Union

By EMIL MODIC

PITTSBURGH, Mar. 19—The long-smoldering opposition to David J. McDonald in the United Steelworkers is finally out in the open. Indications are that the breach will widen. Behind the recently disclosed rift is a long story.

The struggle for power in the top circles of the union came to light following the death of Vice President James Thimmes last January. The executive board of the union has split over who should succeed him.

McDonald's candidate is Howard R. Hague, formerly McDonald's administrative assistant. Hague has been installed in the position temporarily until a union-wide referendum can be held this summer. Hague is a boyhood chum of McDonald's who is, if anything, even more reactionary than McDonald himself. Before becoming McDonald's assistant, Hague was credit manager for a jewelry company. If Hague ever saw a blast furnace up close, it was on a guided tour with Ben Fairless.

Joseph Moloney of Buffalo, district director of New York State, has announced that he will run in the coming referendum. Moloney is known to have the support of at least one-third of the district directors.

Among Moloney's supporters are probably numbered the district director's of Chicago-Gary, Allentown-Bethlehem, Youngstown and Canada. If these leaders are in opposition, as is suspected, and if they can deliver the votes of their districts, they may very well carry the day, as they head numerically large districts.

Moloney is no knight in shining armor, as his conduct in the Buffalo area will testify. Both sides in the struggle are conservative, by CIO standards. But the forces behind Moloney are certainly sounder trade-unionists than McDonald-Hague,

and they will have to attack McDonald from the left, if only because it would be impossible to get to the right of him and still be a trade-unionist.

With the opposition out in the open, McDonald has suddenly taken a more militant turn. He is suddenly buddy-buddy with the UAW and is supporting their Guaranteed Annual Wage demands. And he has announced plans to attempt to organize the scandalous open-shop companies still in the steel industry, Weirton and American Rolling Mills.

FIRST TIME?

Further, he has refused to state whether or not he will support Hague in the referendum this summer. It is entirely possible that Hague will decline to run, at McDonald's behest.

If Hague does run, his candidacy will give the rank and file the first chance they have had to vote on McDonald's conduct, and that should be interesting, indeed.

For that matter, it will give the steel workers their first chance to vote on anything within their union. There has never yet been a contested election for any of the top offices in the union!

Actually, there has long been bitter feeling about McDonald in the top councils of the union. It has been kept in check by only one thing—the desire to present a united front to Walter Reuther.

As opposed to the UAW, the IUE or the URW, most of the leaders of the Steelworkers are of an older generation—former Mineworker or AFL Ironworker officials. So long as Philip Murray and Alan Haywood were around, these bread-and-butter unionists considered the CIO as more or less their private orchard.

(Continued on page 7)

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

Dilemma for Chicago Liberals . . . Racist Housing in Levittown

By SCOTT ARDEN

In the Midwest Metropolis Negro liberals are squatting square on the horns of a full-grown dilemma.

A major bill is pending in the state legislature which would give Chicago greater control of its affairs, power to authorize bond issue referendums—in short, "home rule."

From many points of view, especially that of liberal supporters of the Democratic Party, this would be a progressive move since the vote in the "out-of-town," rural and small-town conservative communities is unduly heavily weighted against the city vote.

But there are strings attached—and hence the dilemma. Republican Governor Stratton has said that he will not approve a home rule charter for Chicago until the City Council has been "reorganized." This would involve a revision of the council to limit the number of Chicago wards to 25, with one alderman from each, and to elect 10 more aldermen "at large." Another provision would be the transfer of administrative functions now performed by the council to the mayor.

Here's the gimmick: the "at large" arrangement would dilute Negro voting strength and reduce the present percentage of representation.

At present there are four Negro council members (with another engaged in a run-off). There are, in addition, three more city wards where Negroes make up a majority of the population, which indicates that 15 per cent of the council can—and probably will—be Negro within a few years, under the present system.

Opponents of the bill have charged that no Negro would be elected "at large" for many years, if at all. They cite Detroit as an example. In that city there has been no Negro councilman since the system was adopted some 30 years ago—in a city where the Negro population is large enough to elect a representative to the U. S. Congress!

As opposed to the Stalinist notion of mechanical proportional representation of racial groups, socialists are working for a society in which racial lines will be completely eliminated in every area of life—social, economic and political—a society of complete equality and full integration.

In the context of today's society, however, it's this writer's opinion that we should recognize the legitimacy of the struggle of the Negro community to make its voice heard in its own way.

Many white liberals also support, lip-wise, the right of the Negro community to representation if it so desires, but this now conflicts with their more serious concern for home rule.

The Republican "liberal" candidate for mayor, Merriam, has already gone on record in favor of junking Negro representation. Daley, the "liberal" Democratic machine hack, also has lined up, but with more reservations, since he must hang onto the almost solid Negro vote—which is becoming, to put it mildly, "restless."

RACIST LEVITTOWN

In the housing field a lot is happening fast.

The Levitt case we discussed not so many weeks ago is beginning to come to a head.

In what the housing trade might call a "package deal," two Philadelphia lawyers and the NAACP legal staff filed suit in the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The suit names as defendants not only one of the nation's biggest builders but also the FHA commissioner, the administrator of the Veterans Administration, the director of the Philadelphia FHA office, and the director of the Loan Guaranty Section of the VA's Philadelphia regional office.

The plaintiffs are six Negro couples who contend that Levitt and Sons, Inc. has a monopoly of the housing supply in Levittown, is a quasi-public corporation operating with government assistance and under governmental control and must apply uniform and reasonable standards to buyers.

They charged that the FHA and VA officials are acting beyond their authority and that all of the defendants have violated the due-process clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, as well as the law and policy of the state of Pennsylvania. Lastly, the plaintiffs sought a restraining order against the

defendants to prevent further discrimination.

The complaint must be answered by Levitt's own legal battery, plus the Department of Justice on behalf of the federal officials who are "party defendants."

The *Courier* reports that there is reliable information circulating in Washington to the effect that the Justice Department lawyers are of the opinion that there is no defense to the suit, in the light of the Supreme Court's decisions on segregation and restrictive covenants.

The local U. S. attorney general claimed, at a hearing in the U. S. District Court in Philadelphia, that FHA and the VA have no "contractual relationship with the buyers" and that as far as the government is concerned, "there are no injuries done to anybody by the government."

Mrs. C. B. Motley of the NAACP Legal Defense Staff, attorney for the six Negro couples, said that the government does much more than merely approve the land that Levitt builds on. It approves the site, helps him plan the development, advises on material and layout, and helps in many other ways. "If Levitt did not get this assistance from the FHA and VA the development could not have become a reality," she said.

This is borne out by the fact that Levittown provides 9,000 new houses, plus numerous community services, such as water and sewage, streets, schools, parks and playgrounds, etc. As the complaint points out, Levitt could not do all this without the liberal aid of the government—and the government officials responsible for issuing commitments under these programs, the *Courier* states, knew that Levitt would not sell to Negroes and that he refused renters on a race basis.

"Levitt is so involved with the government that Levitt's actions can be regarded as the actions of the government," is Mrs. Motley's contention, according to the *Defender*.

Lawyers for Levitt have asked the district court to dismiss the case and we are at present awaiting the court's decision. The Negro press is confident that the legal Levittites will be defeated.

IOWA, U. S. A.

Looking elsewhere on the housing front, we must report that Iowa has shown again how wrong they are who write it off as the seat of rural idiocy in America.

The latest demonstration occurred in February, in Waverly, Iowa.

Capt. Virgil A. Daniels, brother of Billy Daniels the singer, had been told by the manager of a federal housing project that "other people" in the project did not want him and his family to move in, and that the "others" would move out if he did.

Daniels decided not to press the issue, on this basis, but news of the rebuff got around to the tenants who immediately circulated a petition demanding the admittance of the Daniels family. The white tenants furthermore requested Daniels to accept the apartment he had been urged to turn down because he was a Negro.

Daniels, in view of this response, reconsidered and received the keys to his apartment at a meeting called by the tenants of the project.

Perhaps we would do better to switch the nation's capital to Iowa. Washington, D. C. is a big city but one in which the search for "rural idiots" can seldom go unrewarded.

Information, Please

WASHINGTON, Mar. 17 — The CIO charged today that the administration's security program requires workers in defense plants "to inform on all associates, including relatives."

Thomas E. Harris, CIO associate general counsel, asked:

"Is our government really in such grave danger of overthrow from within that we must become a nation of stool-pigeons?"

—N. Y. Post, Mar. 17

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

BRITAIN **Bevan Scores in the First Round Against Splitters**

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Mar. 16—A few hours ago the ax which has long been poised over the head of Aneurin Bevan descended and he now finds himself sitting in the House of Commons as an Independent for the second time within sixteen weeks.

By a majority of 29 votes the Parliamentary Labor Party decided to withdraw the Party Whip from Bevan—in other words, expel him from the parliamentary group of the Labor Party. The smallness of this majority is generally seen as a very hollow victory for the right wing in general and for Clement Attlee in particular.

There are 291 members of the Parliamentary Party, and the voting figures were 141 in favor of Bevan's expulsion and 112 against—which means that the right wing failed to carry the majority of the Parliamentary Party with it.

The meeting, which was held at the House of Commons this morning, was originally intended to meet a week ago to consider the situation arising from the abstention of over 60 members of the Labor Party during the voting on the Labor amendment on the Defense debate (which was fully reported in a previous issue of LA). The meeting was postponed because Bevan—against whom the wrath of the right wing was directed—was ill and could not attend.

This factor rather upset the calculations of those who wanted quickly to dispose of Bevan for it gave the local Labor organizations a chance to meet and exert pressure upon their MPs. This is in fact what happened, and during the past week local Labor parties all over the country have been meeting and passing resolutions urging that no disciplinary action be taken against Bevan.

Therefore many Labor members of Parliament who would have voted on the question of Bevan's expulsion and merely reported to their local parties afterwards were informed by their local organizations how they were expected to vote by those who were responsible for their election to Parliament.

Before the motion calling for Bevan's expulsion was moved, an attempt was made to reach a compromise when Fred Lee put forward a motion which censured Bevan for his attitude in the House during the Defense Debate and called for unity behind Attlee in order to defeat the Tory government. This amendment, which would not have meant the expulsion of Bevan, was defeated by only 14 votes.

SHOWDOWN

The voting was 124 in favor and 138 against; this shows that at least nine MPs who voted on the amendment deliberately abstained from voting on the main resolution calling for Bevan's expulsion. Altogether, 38 members either abstained from voting on the resolution or were absent from the meeting.

Read the

NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review



LABOR ACTION

March 28, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 13

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Bevan won this bout on Wednesday when the party NEC (14-13) failed to expel.

The spokesman for the right wing was Attlee who outlined the case against Bevan; it is believed that he pointed out in particular the three latest challenges which Bevan has made in Parliament to the right wing, these being on the Southeast Asia Pact, talks with Russia, and (a fortnight ago) on the use of the H-bomb. He said that Bevan's consistent attacks were placing him and the leadership of the party in an impossible position which could no longer be tolerated and informed the MPs that if they failed to back this move against Bevan it would be treated as a vote of no confidence by the leadership of the Parliamentary Party, which would resign as a consequence.

The issue was therefore presented by the right wing in the sharpest possible terms; it was, as you say in the States, to be the showdown.

Faced with this position many of the waverers within the Parliamentary Party cast their lot with the right wing, but even so the smallness of the majority now places the right-wing leadership in a very shaky position and will no doubt lead to further development.

NEC TO DECIDE

It has been widely rumored for some time that many of the leading right-wingers—such as Herbert Morrison, George Brown, Hugh Gaitskell, and Edith Summerskill—have long been dissatisfied with Attlee's leadership. They regard him as too passive and unduly tolerant of the left wing of the party, and they would much rather see him replaced by one of themselves who will take a much firmer line against the left and generally move the party line even further over to the right.

It is expected that these will now exert pressure either to replace Attlee or else force him into adopting their attitude. Should this be done, then even bigger rows can confidently be predicted within the party in the future.

The narrow majority of the right wing also hampers the next move against Bevan, for—although expelled from the Parliamentary Labor Party—he still remains a member of the national Labor Party. Under the procedure the Parliamentary Party must now report its expulsion of Bevan to the National Executive Committee of the party, which will

Idyll

We must not let go unrecorded for posterity the words in which the Stalinoid apologist, Alexander Werth, explained to the readers of the *Nation* (Feb. 26) why Malenkov resigned.

First he frowns on any suggestion that it had something to do with "personal rivalries" between the "Kremlin cliques" (the quote-marks being his). No need to think up "such hair-raising thrillers," he assures, "for a quite simple explanation is at hand." To begin with, trouble was Malenkov let the Western powers think they could treat Russia as weak and passive; and in the second place—hold your hat, we're going for a ride:

"... and under Malenkov, too, the general public in Russia tended to take the line that life was easier and no very special effort was called for. This attitude was particularly common among the peasants, who have always been inclined to 'take things easy' on the least excuse. Such a relatively easygoing 'way of life'... just did not fit the international situation...."

In short, they had it too good. But Khrushchev is going to get at least a dribble of work out of the idle masses....

decide whether Bevan shall be completely expelled from the party. The NEC meets exactly one week from today and it will have to decide then whether it can afford to take any further action against Bevan.

It will have to bear in mind the smallness of the majority in the Parliamentary Party and the fact that any expulsion of Bevan from the party as a whole would have to be confirmed by the annual conference in October. This would mean that the ball would have to be tossed into the hands of the rank and file at conference—and in the party locals prior to conference. The NEC may decide that its position is not strong enough to allow this to happen and may be content merely to note the decision to expel Bevan from the Parliamentary Party.

On the other hand, it is very likely that the right-wing trade-union leaders who sit on the NEC may force the issue and demand Bevan's head on a platter. This belief is strengthened by the fact that during the past week the leaders of the Transport and General Workers Union and the National Union of General and Municipal Workers have both made strong attacks upon Bevan and the left—and these two unions have a very large say within the Labor Party.

LEFT-WINGERS ACTIVE

The repercussions of Bevan's expulsion are already being felt within the local constituency parties and trade-union branches, and intense activity began immediately the intentions of the right wing became known. The left gen-

AUSTRALIA

Catholic Faction in LP Stirs Up a Ruckus Down Under

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Mar. 16—While rumbles of dissension within the British Labor Party are heard throughout the world, we hear that the Australian Labor Party is also having its difficulties.

This party was in power during the war. Although calling itself a Labor Party, it is considerably to the right of the British Labor Party. It did not oppose SEATO; it did not take a serious stand on the recent measures to outlaw the Communist Party of Australia; and it has accepted the exclusion of Asians from the shores of Australia.

Two other facts of importance are that it is somewhat to the left of the Conservative government. Perhaps uniquely among vaguely left-wing parties, it enjoys the patronage of the Catholic hierarchy. It is this fact which has produced dissension within it.

It really all started last year during the Royal Commission on Espionage at which evidence from Russian defector Petrov was heard about the activities of Russian espionage in Canberra and Adelaide. Dr. Evatt, the prominent Labor Party leader, had employed as one of his secretaries at a time when he was a United Nations delegate, a certain Mr. Lockwood, whom he did not know to be an alleged Stalinist spy. According to the latter man's confession, and the evidence of Petrov, the Russian Embassy had paid him sums of money to report on the political activities and personal lives of his journalistic colleagues.

SPLIT CONFERENCE

In order to protect himself, and indirectly the Labor Party, Dr. Evatt made charges that the evidence of Petrov was partly faked. On being challenged in open court, Evatt could not substantiate this, and it looked very much as if he had made the imputations against the Secret Service in order to protect Lockwood.

The Catholic lobby did not like the idea that the Labor Party leader whom it supported should be thought to be helping Stalinists. Furthermore, he was one of the few unreligious members of the Labor leadership, whom it could not influence.

Meanwhile the virtual destruction of the official Communist Party led to a political vacuum, particularly in the longshoremen's unions, the mineworkers and the railwaymen, with whom the CP had had some influence. During the past

erally feel that this move is merely a prelude to a full-scale attack upon all of those who are out of step with the right-wing leadership.

Bevan, and the parliamentary Bevanites, are generally to the right of the left sentiments of the rank-and-file party workers; if the Bevanites are distasteful to the right wing, then there are thousands of rank-and-file left-wingers who must be even more distasteful. With Bevan removed they would be much more vulnerable to the attacks of the right wing.

Because of this, many of those on the left who have wide disagreements with the Bevanite orientation—particularly in respect of its illusions concerning the role and character of Russia—are in the forefront of the fight in the party locals in defense of Bevan. They fully realize that an attack upon the Bevanites represents an attack upon the left in general, and that it is among the Bevanites that the main motive force for any leftward movement of the party is to be found.

The Third Camp Socialists within the Labor Party are in particular using the opportunity of defending Bevan to point, at the time being, at some of the weaknesses of the Bevanite line. Some of the first constituency parties to spring to the defense of Bevan, when it became known that the right wing intended to ax him, were those parties which contain a fairly strong and vocal Third Camp element. Reports indicate that they clearly posed before the local parties the issues involved, and left no doubts concerning the line of action which should be taken and the political position which should be adopted by the Bevanites.

During the coming months there is going to be a hard fight going on within the BLP and its outcome may settle the future perspectives of the party for a considerable period of time. The fight may center around the personality of Aneurin Bevan but the issues are much wider—a fact which is realized by everyone in Britain but, above all, by those of the Third Camp.

year, also, there has been evidence throughout the world of the Vatican's growing interest in industrial unions. The Catholics had been attempting to form a political caucus within the Labor Party.

The situation flared up yesterday at a meeting of the Australian Labor Party at Hobart, the capital of Tasmania. Delegates to the federal conference had to decide whether to admit newly elected members for the State of Victoria, or the old ones who had been expelled on the grounds that they had formed a "Roman Catholic secret society."

The 36 delegates had to decide which of the executives of the Victorian Party to recognize. However, the majority view was that a discussion should take place on the subject. Seventeen dissenters, all of whom happen to support the disbanded executive, suggested that deliberations on the subject should take place in the absence of both new and old delegates.

The dissenters held a separate meeting in another hall, and decided to boycott the majority meeting until their demand was met. The majority therefore reported them to their State Parties as absentees.

CHALLENGE BY CHURCH

Unfortunately, the minority includes Gair, the premier of Queensland, and delegates from the states of New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia. So powerful is the hold of the Catholic hierarchy on the representatives of the latter two states that they have pledged themselves to support the minority industrial lobby, against the instructions of the state parties which they represent.

This is a major challenge by the Catholic Church not only to the authority of the executive of the party—Socialists sometimes do not find such challenges unpalatable—but, much worse, to the party members whom they represent. Unless the religious element admits it has gone too far, meetings of the state parties due to take place within a month will find no confidence in their leadership, and may expel them. This may be a prelude to a split from top to bottom within the Australian Labor Party.

Meanwhile, an attempt today to continue the conference was frustrated by members of the disbanded Victorian State Executive physically blocking the entrance to the conference hall.

N. Y. Board Votes Teacher-Informer Rule: Stoolies Go to the Head of the Class

By MAX MARTIN

The New York City Board of Education struck a fresh blow against our dwindling civil liberties this past week by adopting a resolution which places teachers in the position of informing on others who "may be or may have been" members of "subversive" organizations. The ruling, adopted over the vigorous opposition of the New York Civil Liberties Union and the various teachers' unions, was carried by a vote of 7-1.

In its final form, the resolution "authorized" Superintendent of Schools Jansen to require teachers who are admitted ex-members of the Communist Party and presumably other "subversive" organizations, or who are suspected of being current members, to supply the names of other "subversive" teachers. It provides that those refusing to turn informer would be liable to dismissal on charges of insubordination and conduct unbecoming a teacher, subject to Jansen's discretion. To refuse to turn stoolpigeon is to be guilty of conduct unbecoming a teacher, these days.

The resolution is being presented to the public as a compromise; its final wording supposedly involves a concession to the civil-libertarian opponents of the witchhunt. Its "compromise" nature, however, is an illusion. The original resolution placed before the Board of Education "directed" Jansen to require teachers to inform and to bring charges if they fail to do so. The great concession to democracy was the change from "direct" to "authorize." Since Jansen has somewhat of a reputation as a liberal and since he opposed the resolution, the witchhunters can hope to weaken the hostility of defenders of democracy to the measure.

Thus it would appear that some teachers who refuse to inform might not have charges placed against them; the liberal Jansen could be counted upon for that. But what it gave with its left hand, the very illiberal Board of Education took back with its right. To guard against the possibility that Jansen would exercise the power it had just given him and actually let some teachers who refused to turn informer retain their jobs, it then passed a resolution which "direct-

ed" Jansen to report to them "forthwith" the names of any who refused to play stoolpigeon and against whom he had not preferred charges.

And as Jansen sadly remarked, in cases where he and the Board of Education might not agree about bringing charges against teachers, "the law gives the Board of Education final authority." And this is being hailed in some quarters as a compromise.

LATEST STEP

This new ruling is the latest step in the witchhunt against New York City elementary and secondary school teachers. That Stalinists do not have the right to teach, even though they are competent and have committed no misdeeds, has for some time been one of the principle planks of the domestic platform of the American Party Line. It is accepted by practically everyone in the country, including most liberals (including even Norman Thomas, except that he exempts college teachers from this edict). And so in line with this thinking, the Board of Education has been conducting its inquisition among those teachers who are, or who once were, or whom it suspects—on what basis nobody knows—of being or having been Stalinists.

Many, many teachers have been questioned during the past few years as to whether or not they are or were CP members; some have been dismissed for being Stalinists; many have been dismissed for refusing to say whether or not they are, or for pleading the Fifth Amendment; many have just quietly resigned.

The latest wrinkle occurred last year when 18 teachers admitted to the board's special investigator of "subversion" that they had been CP members in the past. They stated that they had broken with the CP some time ago, and had severed all connections with it. Each of them was asked to furnish the names of other teachers whom they had known as CPers in the days when they had been Stalinists. This they refused to do, pointing out that doing so would mean dragging the names of other teachers, many of whom had in the interim probably also left the Communist Party, through the mud.

Immediately the hue and cry against them arose. Not feeling that it had enough authority to bring charges against them for refusing to inform, under existing regulations, the Board of Education began consideration of its new ruling. The arguments presented for it are, needless to say, quite damaging—for its proponents. How do we know that these people are really no longer Stalinists, asked the witchhunters? If they had really broken with the CP, wouldn't they be willing to inform on others? Shouldn't

There can be no doubt that many of the witchhunters really believe in the validity of these arguments. But what a commentary it is on their thinking! Only Stalinists, they are saying, would refuse to be informers. That there can exist sincere democrats, sincere anti-Stalinists, honest and moral people, who refuse to stool on their fellows—this never occurs to the witchhunters.

There may very well be another reason for the desire of the anti-civil-libertarians to force teachers to inform. It may very well be that the investigators of "subversion" are running out of teachers to investigate, that the usual

sources of derogatory "information," paid stoolpigeons and spies like Matu-sow, the notorious FBI files, the files of the whole slew of investigating committees, etc., are beginning to run dry. Could someone have thought up this convenient scheme to replenish them?

PRESSURE TO SQUEAL

One of the most alarming aspects of the new ruling revolves around the question of whether all teachers will be required to "turn in names" or only those under investigation. Assistant Corporation Counsel Saul Moskoff, who is in charge of the witchhunt in the New York City schools, hastened to indignantly deny that there would be wholesale informing. He said that the "intent of this resolution" applies only to those involved in the investigation. But fear on this score is by no means unrealistic.

For one thing, the wording of the resolution is obviously none too clear. For another, there is no guarantee that the board will not at some future date decide to institute a campaign to make all teachers, those who were Stalinists and those who were not, turn in whatever information they may have or may think they have about the past or present CP affiliations of others.

And even if the board does not do so, pressures in this direction are obviously generated. Will there not be teachers who were once CP members, or even sympathizers, and who are not under investigation now because their past is not known, who will think to themselves: "Perhaps I had better go to the board and name some names, before they find out about me; thus I will be establishing my 'sincerity' as an anti-Communist in advance. Perhaps I had better name some before somebody names me."

And won't there be some others, perhaps, who were never Stalinists or Stalinist sympathizers, but who did in the past know that some other teacher was at that time a Stalinist, who will think: "Perhaps I ought to squeal on him; it will prove my real Americanism."

And what a field day the new regulation provides for unscrupulous persons to settle private scores!

One cannot say that all these things will definitely occur, but certainly a ten-

dency toward them will manifest itself. And meanwhile the 18 teachers who had previously refused to squeal will be called back for further questioning, this time facing the alternatives of informing or facing an almost certain loss of their positions. And after these 18...

The opposition of the AFL Teachers Guild and of the New York Civil Liberties Union and of other organizations and individuals to the latest device of the witchhunt is heartening. But it must also be recorded that others (whose private views may very well be in opposition also) such as Sidney Hook and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, emitted a deafening silence in public. Such individuals and organizations accept many of the basic premises of the witchhunt, while deploring its excesses.

But even from their point of view, here was an excess deserving loud and vigorous condemnation. Yet it was not forthcoming.

SMACKS OF NAZISM

That the struggle against turning teachers into informers must not end now that the board has passed the ruling is obvious. The New York Civil Liberties Union, which had opposed it during the hearings held by the board, issued a blast at it immediately after its adoption. Said George E. Rundquist, NYCLU executive director:

"Millions of people throughout the U. S. were horrified when totalitarian countries equated loyalty with informing.

"The decision of the board smacks of the same stuff we recently condemned in Nazi Germany and still condemn in Communist Russia."

The NYCLU pointed out that teachers and even students would be encouraged to report "what they consider to be activities indicative of Communist sympathies." It continued:

"Free exchange of ideas will be stifled and a criterion of caution will be adopted to avoid suspicion of 'dangerous thoughts.'

"Accusations may in many cases be based on hearsay and conjecture, and even when an employee is cleared of the charges his reputation and effectiveness will necessarily be impaired."

New YSL Unit

A Cleveland Area Unit of the Young Socialist League was organized this past week and has been chartered by the YSL National Action Committee. The new unit, composed of students and young workers, shows promise of performing considerable education and activity for socialism among students and young people generally in its locality. The unit has very good prospects for additional recruitment in the near future.

This is the third new YSL unit to be organized since the founding of the YSL a little over a year ago. The other two were in Pittsburgh and Seattle.

As a token of their seriousness, our new comrades immediately informed the YSL National Office that they wish to participate in the YSL Fund Drive now in process and they have accepted a quota of \$50 for the drive. They have done this despite the fact that the formation of the unit took place after the beginning of the drive and despite the fact that the unit will be busy getting itself under way in these next few months.

Our heartiest congratulations to our new comrades of the Cleveland area. We are certain that they will play a fruitful and significant role in the fight for socialist freedom. Our congratulations also to the Chicago YSL comrades who so ably assisted in the organization of our youngest unit.

New Issue of 'Anvil' Discusses Third Camp, Sartre, Demo Party

The Spring and Summer 1955 issue of the radical, anti-war student magazine, *Anvil and Student Partisan*, has just rolled off the press and will be in the hands of its distributors shortly. The issue, which contains many interesting articles and has an attractive cover, will undoubtedly enjoy a brisk sale and attain a wide popularity. It sells for 25 cents per copy.

The lead article, "Asia, Africa and Hope" by Fenner Brockway, British left-wing Laborite MP, discusses the rising tide of struggle by the colonial peoples for their national freedom, and the relationship between this struggle and the Third Camp. Brockway, a member of the Bevan group in the Labor Party, has a long history of identification with the aspirations of the colonial peoples and a fund of first hand information on colonial problems.

Two other articles will prove of great interest. One, by Abe Stein, entitled "Sartre—The Case Reopened," analyzes the relation between Sartre's existentialist philosophy and his current pro-Stalinist politics. The other, "A House Is Not A Home—Liberals and the Democratic

Party" was written by Jerry Philips, a Midwestern organizer for the CIO. It cogently presents the case for the formation of a new political party, a labor party, from the point of view of liberalism and the liberals.

The issue also contains articles on the British Labor Party and on "Gandhi and the New Asian Socialism," a discussion and advocacy of the influence of Gandhi's philosophy on Asian socialist thinking. These articles are respectively by Alan Ross, a British student, and Brijen K. Gupta, a member of the Indian Praja Socialist Party now studying in the United States.

The issue is rounded out with editorials on UMT and German Rearmament; correspondence on Kenya and the Mau Mau; and Michael Harrington's review of the book *McCarthy and the Communists* by Rorty and Dechter.

The YSL, which endorses and supports *Anvil*, urges all of its members and friends to make a real effort to promote and sell the magazine. Individual copies and bundles can be ordered from *Anvil*, 36 East 10 Street, N. Y. C., or from the YSL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL CONSPIRACY OF THE PROFITEERS

The SUPPRESSED REPORT On the WORLD OIL CARTEL

By ULYSSES JACKSON

It has long been known that the great oil companies of the United States operate on principles which have only the remotest connection with "free enterprise." This state of affairs has sometimes prodded the U. S. government into attempts at applying its anti-trust laws, and in the course of such attempts the principal aspects of the oil trusts' activities have been brought to light.

Nevertheless, effective action against the oil trust still remains to be taken. It is therefore a matter of general interest when the monopolistic practices of the oil industry are once again documented, this time in a thorough report of the UN's Economic Commission for Europe, entitled "The Price of Oil in Western Europe."

As may have been expected in such a case, the report ran into trouble. According to the London *Sunday Express*, the document was originally intended for publication as a part of the quarterly bulletin of ECE. As a result of pressures applied by the major American oil companies, the U. S. government is said to have pointed out to Dag Hammarskjöld, secretary general of the UN, that publication of the report at the present time would be "inopportune." Whereupon Hammarskjöld is said to have compelled Gunnar Myrdal, president of ECE, to stop publication of the document.

As the case may be, the report was not published, and has been distributed only to the governments of the nations participating in ECE and to their advisors in the UN.

The accuracy of this version of the events has not been seriously challenged. Although the oil companies deny having exerted any sort of pressure, reporters have been unable to get a clear statement of the UN, and the U. S. government has kept silent on the matter. Under these conditions, the independence of the UN, as well as the U. S. government's role, appears in a curious light.

What does the report contain to justify such a to-do? In short, it shows the world's major oil companies, in particular the American oil companies, to have created a trust enabling them to keep oil and refinery product prices in Western Europe on a much higher level than would be "consistent with underlying conditions of demand and supply."

In its four chapters, the report examines: (1) the place of Western Europe in the pattern of world production and trade in petroleum and its products; (2) the way in which prices paid by Western Europe for Middle East crude oil are determined; (3) the determination of prices of refined products; (4) the "strains to which the present pricing practices give rise."

EIGHT RULERS

The first chapter contains, among other things, a description of the structure of ownership in the oil industry which is worth quoting in full:

"Although the trade links between the two hemispheres are weak, and likely to become weaker, the corporate links are very strong. Specifically, the lion's share of crude oil production and refining is in the hands of eight major companies—five American and three European—most of which have interests in each of the main producing and refining centers."

The three European companies are: Royal Dutch Shell, Anglo-Iranian and Compagnie Française des Pétroles. The five American are: Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, Texas Company, Socony Vacuum, Gulf Oil Company.

The report goes on to say: "The high degree of vertical integration which the major companies have created with respect to production and refining is continued also in respect of transport and distribution. The position in these fields does not lend itself so readily to concise statistical summary. It seems, however, that in 1949 seven of the eight companies . . . owned or had on charter about two thirds of the world's privately owned tanker fleet, and a large part of this was directly owned by the companies. (Reference: *The International Petroleum Cartel*, Staff Report of the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, 1952.)

All the important pipelines outside the United States are owned by the same companies. In distribution also the major international companies occupy a commanding position in most markets. In fact, a pattern of distribution appears to have been evolved in most important consuming areas which is formed by outlets backed financially (mainly in respect of their investment in storage and retailing equipment) and enjoying sales assistance by the supplier; in return they use (and by using strengthen) the supplier's brand." (Reference: P. H. Fränkel, "Integration in the Oil Industry," *The Journal of Industrial Economists*, July 1953, page 210.)

MONOPOLY VS. CHAOS

The oil companies have been attempting to justify the high degree of concentration in the industry by claiming that the market cannot be adequately supplied otherwise. Conditions of adequate supplies at all times are a steady and continuous search for oil, so that known reserves should be equal to a considerable number of years' consumption. On the other hand, if output were determined by uncontrolled supply and demand, under conditions of "free enterprise," that is, "it is evident that . . . the result of the discovery of reserves significantly in excess of the current rate of consumption would be to drive down the price of oil to very low levels. . . . Under such conditions, it is clear that exploration and prospecting would also be extremely irregular, being suspended when the price of oil fell to such low levels and resumed when consequential fall in reserves and production sent prices soaring equally wildly upwards. A smooth rate of supply would, in short, be impossible in the conditions postulated."

Consequently, the oil companies have found it necessary to evolve a system of controlling output by mutual agreement and in cooperation with the governments. In the U. S. oil conservation statutes determine the quantity of oil that may be produced: the output is determined on the basis of monthly forecasts of demand by the Federal Bureau of Mines and is controlled by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

All this, however, only means that under conditions of "free enterprise," the oil industry would fall into a state of chaos, or that under capitalist conditions of production and distribution, the oil industry cannot operate effectively without constituting a cartel on a world scale.

FABULOUS PROFITS

Under a socialist system, it goes without saying that exploration and prospecting would not have to be dependent on the state of supply and demand, nor on the price of oil. Today, as the oil companies themselves admit, they cannot adequately supply the needs of the world in oil without monopolistic practices, while the function of governments appears to be administering the oil industry in the interests of the trusts.

However, the trust has not come into existence only to enable us to make a case for socialism, nor is ensuring exploration and prospecting the only function it fulfills. One of its functions in the recent past (and this is the main point of the ECE report) has been price-fixing.

The cost of producing oil is considerably greater in the U. S. than in the Middle East, owing mainly to the miserable wages of Arab oil workers and to the greater productivity of Middle Eastern oil wells. Profit margins are accordingly lower in the U. S. What they are like in the Middle East can be seen from an example quoted in the report.

Aramco (Arabian-American Oil Company), a joint enterprise of Socony Vacuum, Standard Oil of N. J., Standard Oil of California and Texas Com-

pany, holds the concession for exploiting oil in Saudi Arabia. In 1952, it paid the Saudi Arabian government \$212 million in royalties. Since Aramco's agreement with Saudi Arabia stipulates royalties of 50 per cent of the net profits, net profits can be assumed to have amounted to \$424 million in 1952.

Total production for that year was 300 million barrels, so profits must have been in the vicinity of \$1.40 a barrel. Sales price of a barrel was \$1.75, so the actual cost of producing a barrel amounted to 30 or 35 cents.

POWER OF OIL

Nevertheless, prices of Middle Eastern crude oil on the Western European market have not been different from American or Caribbean crude oil prices. What is more, they have regularly followed increases in American prices. In other words, the oil companies, who are in control of all major sources of supply, have linked the price of Middle Eastern oil to American oil prices, and are netting considerable profits as a result. Or, as the ECE concludes, "an essential feature of the present price is that it reflects a situation in which, effectively, only the interests of the producers are represented."

Prices of refinery products in Western Europe are equally unrelated to conditions of supply and demand, and are also linked to price variations in the U. S. Indeed, the price structure of refined products leads refiners "to move toward a pattern of output sharply different from the pattern of demand," and produces strains resulting from the tendency of independent refiners to sell certain products at lower prices in conformity with demand.

Another interesting aspect, on which the report does not dwell very much, probably because it is outside its scope, is the power of the oil trust over rambunctious governments that threaten it with insubordination.

After describing the way in which output is determined in the U. S., the experts of the ECE examine the determination of output internationally. On the one hand, a great oil company exploiting the resources of a given country, is under pressure from that country's government to capture a large

share of the market, in order to pay more royalties. On the other hand, the same company, alone or in partnership with others, also has interests in other countries, where it is subject to similar pressure. At the same time, its position as the major purchaser of the oil it produces—being a vertically integrated enterprise—gives it the power with which to "resist and reconcile competing pressures."

Or, also in the words of the report, "the power which flows from control over transport, refining and distribution facilities and from the ability of the major companies to recognize common interests, was illustrated by the failure of Iran to sell any appreciable quantities of oil as long as its dispute with the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company continued."

DOLLARS OVER IRAN

To be exact, Iran was able to sell, under the Mossadegh government, 62,000 tons of oil in two years, which is next to nothing, while "supplies of oil to Abadan's bereft customers throughout the world had been restored by considerable alterations in the pattern of world oil trade. These were carried out by agreement among the major oil companies (the American companies indeed obtaining special anti-trust dispensation to cooperate)." (*The Economist*, Aug. 29, 1953.)

Since March 1954, Iranian oil is exploited by a consortium where British interests are no longer dominant, but represent only 45 per cent, as opposed to 50 per cent American and 5 per cent Iranian capital. How come American capital is so strongly represented in a field where it had been non-existent before the fall of Dr. Mossadegh? Could this be the price of the American oil trust for its "ability to recognize common interests?"

And how is one to interpret, in the light of these facts, President Eisenhower's reply to Dr. Mossadegh's demand for U. S. financial assistance: it would not be fair to the American taxpayer, Eisenhower said, "for the U. S. government to finance Iran while Iran did nothing to help itself by coming to a reasonable agreement leading to world marketing of its oil?"

Today Iran is ruled by a bloody dictatorship, which reflects faithfully the composition of the consortium, General Zahedi representing the American 50 per cent, the Shah representing the British 45 per cent and the Iranian people counting for 5 per cent. Under this government, hundreds of executions have taken place, not to speak of exile, concentration camps, torture and prison for the Stalinist, socialist and liberal opponents of the regime. We must be grateful to the UN for documenting, even though involuntarily and in passing, where the responsibilities for this regime lie.

U.S. Foreign Legion in Spain?

The following editorial appeared in the Feb. 15 issue of the magazine *Iberica*. The board of this anti-Franco monthly is headed by Salvador de Madariaga and Norman Thomas.

Ever since the expatriation of those half-million Spanish men and women who crossed the French frontier on foot at the end of the Spanish Civil War, fortune, allied to circumstance—one never moves without the other—has provided smoother paths for some of the refugees from other oppressed countries. For example: the Polish, Roumanian, Yugoslavian and Hungarian refugees to whom the road to Spain has been facilitated.

Years ago the portals of Spain began quietly to swing open to refugees from these countries, that is, to those who were selected, not for their democratic sympathies to be sure, but rather for the suitability of their ideologies to the regime of Franco. Little by little they entered the country, quietly and without attracting undue attention—not like those Spaniards who clamored so noisily in France against the abuses and lootings of the concentration camps where they were interned. No, these refugees entered Spain under the benevolent wing of the Caudillo himself. Today the number of these eastern European exiles who live the life of tourists in Spain is legion.

Roumanian, Polish, Yugoslavian and Czechoslovakian embassies are still maintained in Madrid, as national centers for these groups.

In his recent report to the United States Senate, General Julius Klein apparently made a recommendation that these refugee aggregations in Spain be mobilized. Now it appears that this recommendation is to be realized, with General Franco's blessing: *international anti-communist brigades are to be installed in the interior of Spain*. They will operate under their own national colors and will be under the sole command of their own nationals. They will be armed by the United States. The chiefs and officers of the Spanish Army will have no command or authority whatsoever over these brigades to be established on Spanish territory. This is a far cry from the Flanders brigades that brought glory to Spain and honor to her king.

This is a serious matter, with dangerous implications. If these brigades are envisaged as an auxiliary force in the event of external communist aggression, then they would seem to us to constitute a potential source of provocation to the Spanish people, and an affront to the Spanish Army. A country that is as anti-communist as is Spain, with a people of such vigor and stamina as the Spaniard, should be sufficient to resist external aggression; the Army, if it is well-organized, should be adequate to confront the enemy without the aid of foreign manpower.

But if the plan is not based upon this proposition, then the alternative implication is that a communist menace exists within Spain, of which Franco has reason to be apprehensive. Otherwise it seems inexplicable that the Franco regime which bases its propaganda on extraterritorial claims in Morocco and Gibraltar, should, on the other hand, meekly turn over its own home territory to foreign brigades. In this way Franco will end up by converting his entire country into an international colony.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

"Black Power"

As Richard Wright Sees Africa

BLACK POWER, by Richard Wright.—Harper and Bros., N. Y., 358 pages, \$4.

By PRISCILLA CADY

Recent events in Africa and the interest arising from them have brought forth many books, some informative, some speculative, some pernicious, and some silly. They have by and large received commendation in the general press, which is always eager to welcome objective experts to its ranks, providing they are not too expert nor too objective.

But reviewers took a dim view of Richard Wright's *Black Power*. The accusation that some leveled against him, black chauvinism, is a shocking example of imperialist thinking in this country and, we trust, needs no rebuttal.

However, it is not too surprising that he was scored by many for his radicalism. In the introduction to this new work Wright points out that his renunciation of Stalinism does not automatically put him on the side of the "West" and further says that he has used "limited" Marxist methods in analyzing the Gold Coast situation:

"If anyone should object to my employment of Marxist methods to make meaningful the ebb and flow of commodities, human and otherwise, in the modern state, to make comprehensible the alignment of social classes in modern society, I have but to say that I'll willingly accept any other method on interpreting the facts; but I insist that any other method must not exclude the facts!" (Italics in original.)

Wright's utilization of Marxism is indeed "limited"; this is not the definitive work on the economics and politics of the Gold Coast, but its worth lies elsewhere—in the insights into the situation and the people that a perceptive writer can give us. He himself subtitles the work, "A Record of Reactions in a Land of Pathos," although the use of the pathos here may be somewhat misleading.

Certainly there are many things in the

country that one may call pathetic: the young urban African who wants to take a correspondence course in detection so that he can bring evidence against the British into court; the villages with their unhappy and fruitless conflict between the tribal customs that gave their lives meaning and the Christianity foisted upon them by bigots and fanatics; the physical innocence, in a world where such innocence is despised; and, in Accra, the capital city, the naive and wonderful faith of the crowds in Kwame Nkrumah and "Free-doooooom!"

But to characterize a country such as the Gold Coast—with its mass movement toward nationalism, with the gains it has made, and with the problems it has ahead of it to solve—as "a land of pathos" is contrary to the main content of the book, especially its ending, which speaks loudly against such an attitude.

IN CLOSE TOUCH

Richard Wright received what might be called a letter of introduction to the country by Kwame Nkrumah, the head of the Convention People's Party and the first African to be prime minister of the Gold Coast; and he was accorded many facilities for observing the country and its people. He was given accommodations in one of a group of luxurious bungalows which had been built by the British to house the new African ministers of state but which had been turned down by Nkrumah and his colleagues on the grounds that this privilege would separate them from their constituency. The bungalows are now used as guest houses. Wright too found them somewhat isolating, and moved into a hotel in town where he was in closer touch with those he had come to see; those who were his brothers and sisters in race and origin, but alien to him in circumstances.

This presents itself to him as an interesting problem and he ponders over the "Negro character" as he sees it in Africa and as he has seen it in the United States, evidencing itself in the physical expression of emotion and the utilization of music and rhythm to give

form to ideas and feelings. He comes to the conclusion that those who claim this as proof of immutable racial traits can easily be rebutted by pointing out that these are cultural characteristics carried over into the American scene to the extent that a strong new culture had not replaced the old, and that it is not necessarily in evidence in those whose background and education had been "upper class," whether American or African.

"STRONG STUFF"

Wright attended a meeting of the Women's Auxiliary of the Convention People's Party as a guest of Nkrumah (who told him that he was "in the words of Lenin, asking every cook to come out of her kitchen and learn to rule—women have been left out of the life of our country long enough") and he describes his astonishment at the proceedings. A minister opened with a Christian prayer; then a chief, with his linguists and umbrella-bearers (signs of office), poured a libation of corn wine on the ground and passed the gourd to three people to take therefrom three sips, in accordance with the Akan religious rites (this religion obtains throughout the Gold Coast area); secular political speeches were made and then Nkrumah read an oath which the audience repeated, to pledge their lives to him as their leader.

In view of the great significance of the oath in African life, this appeared to Wright to be somewhat strong stuff for Nkrumah to use, but, in discussing the matter with him afterward, felt that he understood. The leader of the CPP was filling the void in the lives of the Gold Coast people by directing their "cultural libido," so to speak, into direct political channels. But Wright does not convince one that this "strong stuff" is justifiable or necessary.

Wright comes into contact with many personalities and situations which he describes vividly, together with his reactions. He is shocked by the excessive labor that is necessary to unload ships, which lie far out from the harbor and must be reached by canoe; he is startled by the old village chief he visits who keeps his army in a box, the soldiers being bees; he is amazed at the complexity of the Akan religion, which postulates that the souls of the dead are ever-present and that there is a hierarchical chain of souls leading to a great omniscient spirit; he is horrified that human sacrifice still takes place and is winked at by the authorities; he is contemptuously understanding of those educated Africans who out-British the British in patriotism and arrogance toward the "natives"; he is bitterly angry at being treated as one like these by the Englishmen whom he meets.

He does a fine job of presenting to us a totally strange country with its primitive ways and attitudes and the problems attendant upon them, and then, in the final chapter, he comes out with a rather amazing solution.

In a letter to Kwame Nkrumah he says, in effect: You must break up all the backward ideas and ways of living which the English fostered because they helped to keep the people in subjugation; you must do it quickly and thoroughly; you must militarize the country!

In this chapter, Wright changes from a

perceptive observer of individuals and groups, in which role he excels, to a political adviser, one who gives naive and ambiguous advice at that. For precisely what he means by "militarization" is not clear. He points out that he doesn't mean totalitarianism, of course, but one gets only a vague idea of "strong" measures carried out by a rational and benevolent leader.

A DIFFERENT ROAD

We can make two comments. The first is that he has perhaps oversimplified the politics of the Gold Coast in his presentation. Because Nkrumah is in office as prime minister as a result of a national election one cannot necessarily assume that the problems of power are over or that the CPP can determine the country's fate, or, indeed, guarantee its own.

Nkrumah is now facing a political crisis with the formation of the National Liberation Movement in Ashanti, one of the three countries which make up the Gold Coast. This party was started as a protest against the prices (about half the world market price) that the farmers of Ashanti are receiving for their cocoa (cocoa, not gold; is the economic mainstay of the Gold Coast) and as agitation for recognition as an independent unit, against rule from Accra. The movement is reportedly very hostile to Nkrumah and has won a large following under Baffour Osei Akoto, a large cocoa farmer and chief linguist to the Asantehene, or King, of Ashanti. There also still exists the party led by Danqua out of which Nkrumah led the CPP in 1949.

A second comment is that while the persistence of backward tribal ways and ideas is admittedly a very real problem, Wright is advocating a harsh, undemocratic and unnecessary solution. The road to remedy lies in modernization and industrialization of the country, not repression, but Wright at this point does not consider an economic program at all. Industrialization is essential for all of the African countries; and the problem for socialists and democrats in underdeveloped countries is how to achieve it with the people, not over their backs.

McDonald—

(Continued from page 3)

Their conduct in the Steelworkers was not questioned. And the jobs of the CIO staff itself (as opposed to the staffs of member unions) were more or less their private property. Scores of old war-horses were pensioned off in CIO posts where they had little to do, and did even less. It was a comfortable existence.

Then came the shock of the death of Murray; the elevation of the much-feared Reuther to the presidency of the CIO, and then the death of Haywood. A whole conservative layer of the bureaucracy, centered around the Steelworkers, suddenly lost their protectors and their patronage. There was fear that Murray men would be replaced by Reuther men in CIO posts, or at least that Reuther would fire many of the chairwarmers that everyone in the CIO knew existed and were a drag on the organization.

CHANGES DUE

At this point, Dave McDonald's very real dislike for Walter Reuther came in handy for the district directors—the "barons" of the Steelworkers. With McDonald threatening to leave the CIO, openly insulting Reuther in the press, and meeting ostentatiously with John L. Lewis and Dave Beck, pressure was exerted on Reuther not to disturb the status quo.

For the time being, the district directors put up with McDonald as a counterweight to Reuther. Reuther, for his part, stayed in line after his initial attempt to streamline the CIO organization. Alarmed by McDonald's bluster, the UAW began "building up" Steelworker district directors wherever possible—in state and city CIO councils, for example.

Today, a number of factors have changed the situation. Reuther has demonstrated that he is not the militant of old, for one thing. But primarily the change is due to the merger agreement with the AFL. If that pact guarantees anything, it guarantees jobs for all present labor leaders. And in the generally more conservative atmosphere of a united labor movement, the Steelworkers will no longer have to fear Reuther.

Therefore, the executive board feels the time has come to bring the insufferable McDonald to heel. An anonymous Steelworker staff man has been quoted as saying that McDonald may try to make the election a vote of confidence in his administration; that he will back Hague to the hilt. If he does, the resulting struggle will bring only good to the union.

GUATEMALA

Compounding the Crime

Now that the landlords are back in power in Guatemala, due to the U. S.-engineered "revolution" led by Castillo Armas, they are riding high. Latest step in the process of turning back the clock is the announcement of a measure, submitted to the government by the Agrarian Office, to put a formal end to the land-reform program which benefited the peasants under the Arbenz regime.

"This would be done by declaring null all expropriations under Col. Arbenz' agrarian reform law, which anti-Communists call Communist-inspired. The law has already been repealed and substituted by a temporary statute that forbids new expropriations, but allowed for devolutions." (N. Y. Times, Mar. 20.)

The immediate problem before the reactionary regime that Washington's guns installed in power is simply: What date shall be set for the forcible eviction of thousands of peasants from the land they now "squat on"?

The new measure puts E-day ahead to January 1, instead of the March 1 deadline previously set. The Agrarian Affairs

for this wonderful concession: "He said he could have allowed mass evictions, as some wanted, but that the impact would have been such that we would have toppled the government." He pictured thousands of hungry peasants roaming the roads with nowhere to go."

That, of course, would automatically make them "Communists" subject to the police-state repressive laws of the Castillo Armas dictatorship.

As the regime for which the U. S. is responsible moves to throw the country back into the shadows of despotism and oppression, there has been no outcry from Washington about "human values," "defense of democracy," and "preservation of the free world" such as rent the air back then when it was a question of overthrowing the legal government by force and violence.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

Now we are in receipt of a new issue of this Bulletin (March 5) which is even more scandalous. The editors present an article (reprinted from the Norwegian social-democratic daily) which gives a positive whitewash of the persecution of Djilas and dumps a load of dirty slanders on his head, all repeated from his Titoist enemies without criticism.

The administrators of the Socialist International's central office no doubt knew what they wanted to do when they chose this particular article for international circulation.

The author, Torolf Elster, does not even know some elementary facts: for example he writes that "it was only when he [Djilas] started attacking the married life of leading Communists that the party decided to take action against him." This particular slander, which was no doubt pumped into social-democrat Elster in Belgrade in the hope that he had never read the report of the purge plenum, is refuted by the Titoists' documents themselves.

At the purge plenum, Djilas was accused of publishing the notorious article which Elster is referring to, his last one, precisely because he already knew he was slated for the chopping-block. (Also, it was not simply about "married life," etc. but was primarily an indictment of the closed-caste bureaucratization of the Titoist leadership; but this is a fine point that leaders of the social-democracy will find it hard to understand.)

The monstrous article is filled with sly thrusts at Djilas personally, and contains not a hint of expression of the slightest sympathy for his pro-democratic tendency as against the Titoist dictatorship. The author does allow himself to hope, however, that Tito's aim is "to accustom them [the party members] gradually to the idea that one day the one-party system in Yugoslavia will come to an end."

How much more do you want from social-democrats who are so all-fired-democratic that they can't sleep nights thinking of how the wicked Bolsheviks dissolved the Constituent Assembly . . . ?

Have You Read Labor Action's Pamphlet-Issues?

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.
 - No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.
 - No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.
 - No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.
 - No. 5—What Is Stalinism?
- 10 cents each

ISL FUND DRIVE

Here's What It'll Take to Make the Drive

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

After taking a week's breather, the Chicago area came through with a contribution of \$372 to help pick up ground on last week's poor showing. This contribution not only lifted Chicago up to the 70 per cent mark and third place in the standings, but contributed almost half of the week's total of \$804.

At this writing, the total contributions have passed the \$4500 mark, but it still leaves us short of the half-way mark and time is running fast.

St. Louis, however, is way ahead of everyone else in the drive. Taking advantage of Shachtman's stop-over on his national tour, the St. Louisians raised \$31.25 toward the drive, which gives them a total of \$456.25 or 221 per cent.

YOU, DEAR READER

are in this too. The ISL Fund Drive needs your dollars. Send a contribution in now, even a small one, if that's all your poverty can afford. Make checks payable to Albert Gates.

UAW and New Federation

(Continued from page 1)

the security and high living standards that will come from" a guaranteed annual wage. "The compelling need," they pontificated, "is not for more leisure but for more goods."

But times have changed. The rapid introduction of automation, sweeping technological innovations to eliminate labor, promises a long-range reduction of man-hours per unit production. The choice will be: either shorter hours or mass unemployment. And the reality of the choice was brought home by a long period of layoffs and short workweeks which only recently and perhaps temporarily have been ended by the auto production race of 1955.

Everyone wants the Guaranteed Annual Wage. The UAW leadership has argued that it will soften the impact of automation but no one thinks that the GAW by itself is a long-term solution. A national UAW economic conference in November voted to make the shorter work-week the next demand after winning the Guaranteed Wage.

The convention has to seal this decision. As the union goes to battle for a Guaranteed Wage it sets its sights for shorter hours.

CENTER FOR PROGRESS

Beyond the fight for the Guaranteed Wage looms the united labor movement.

The CIO was formed to organize mass production industries into industrial unions, to wipe out race discrimination in the labor movement, to stamp out racketeering. The merger agreement is a victory for the CIO on every count and is a new big step forward for the labor movement. It accepts industrial unionism, it illegalizes discrimination, it forbids racketeering.

But the agreement states general principles. They now must be carried out in practice. It is common knowledge that important AFL unions have tolerated racketeering and that racial discrimination has never been wholly wiped out within the old federation.

The rallying center for the right wing of racket-tolerating cliques is undoubtedly the Teamsters Union officialdom. It is now offering a haven for the gang-infested ILA which was expelled from the AFL for failure to clean house.

The Teamsters Union has done nothing to drive out the rackets that live within it. It has recently formed a joint committee for mutual protection with three other unions, the Hodcarriers, the Operating Engineers, and the Carpenters. This is a coalition of what is most backward in American unionism to preserve and defend their own backwardness.

The responsibility of the UAW to the labor movement becomes more imperative: it must become the organizing core of all that is progressive. The convention has the opportunity to state clearly where the UAW stands on all the issues that will arise in the unified federation.

This is a convenient moment to re-

It is going to take some doing to beat them out of first place.

The standings shifted somewhat in the week, but not substantially, since by and large the areas which contributed the greater sums continue their steady pace. Those who began the campaign slowly are just plodding along.

There are still five places we haven't heard from yet. Their quotas do not appear to be formidable, but those who have followed our campaigns over the years know that a fund drive is not a one-area show. Every individual quota contributes to the total goal and to complete the campaign successfully, a cooperative effort is essential.

There are now five official weeks left to the campaign as we draw this report. To repeat an old estimate, which remains true in all campaigns, we have to push for a higher weekly rate to close the drive successfully.

As it stands now, an average weekly contribution rate of \$1100 is required to make the national quota. Where is that to come from? From the box score, it is clear enough.

New York has to give its drive a big kick to make it possible for us to make it. It is still short of the 50 per cent mark. In cold figures, New York has to raise \$2,236. The toughest job falls upon its

shoulders and the next weeks will be crucial for it.

The National Office too has a big pull ahead. Los Angeles has to be coupled here, for it is way behind in its drive. Bay Area also has a large sum to make yet.

Over \$3000 has to come from these four. If they give the drive the push in the next month, then we can certainly make it!

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

Branch	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$10,050	\$4534.75	45.1
St. Louis	25	56.25	221
Streator	25	25	100
Chicago	2,000	1389	69.4
Pittsburgh	125	85	68
Cleveland	150	90	60
Detroit	200	115	57.5
Nat'l Office	1,500	850	56.6
N. Y. City	3,800	1564	41.1
Seattle	150	60	40
Philadelphia	250	92	36.8
Bay Area	500	140	29
Newark	400	48	12
Los Angeles	450	15	3.3
Buffalo	250	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

affirm what is considered elementary unionism in the UAW: that race discrimination has no place in the working-class movement; that Negroes must have full equality, the right to equal rights to jobs, equal rights to union membership, equal rights to union leadership. It is time, too, for the UAW to declare its intention to fight for these principles and practices in the united federation.

SPEAK OUT CLEARLY

The UAW has long realized that the fight against world Stalinism is doomed unless the peoples are inspired by great social goals: security, peace, independence, democracy. It has reiterated that the support of reactionary military dictators like Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee will undermine and destroy democracy and help Stalinism. The union has never consistently and thoroughly applied these principles; until it rejects root and branch the foreign policy common to both the Democrats and Republicans, until it speaks up clearly for a new labor party and for the democratic foreign policy that only such a party can espouse, its line will be fuzzy and faltering.

But with all its shortcomings, the UAW is far ahead of most other unions. When its representatives take their seats in the new federation, let them carry only UAW foreign policy.

Meanwhile there is the danger of stumbling into war in Formosa, led by an administration that neither knows what it will do nor can tell us honestly what it intends. Washington backs Chinese reaction and semi-feudalism, a regime which forced a desperate people into the arms of Stalinist totalitarianism.

Without for a moment modifying its unrelenting hostility to Stalinist despotism, the convention has the opportunity to say in public what Emil Mazey and Victor Reuther have hinted at before union committees: end all support to Chiang Kai-shek.

FOR A NEW PARTY

The distinctive contribution of the UAW to national politics was its championing of a political realignment through the formation of a new progressive political party. It is no less necessary now than when it was first proclaimed by the UAW Executive Board in 1948.

But now it is more possible and more practical. A united union movement can easily found a united labor party. Now is the time for the UAW to raise its old banner: for a new progressive party.

DEMOCRACY AT STAKE

If the UAW is to serve as the spearhead of everything progressive in the labor movement, it will place at the very top of its objectives: the struggle for democracy, for democracy inside and outside of the unions.

UAW members have established their

right to criticize, their right to elect or depose officials, their right to form groups and caucuses, to propagate policies and programs in their locals and international. This is the way it should be.

But it is worth calling to the attention of the world for one simple reason: democracy is either sharply restricted or utterly crushed in many unions.

A union like the Hodcarriers went without a single national convention from 1911 to 1941! In the Masters, Mates, and Pilots (AFL) a group that ran an opposition slate against the present leadership was summarily expelled for forming a caucus. In unions like the International Longshoremen's Association, men have been brutally murdered for daring to oppose ruling union officials.

A recent CIO convention passed a resolution calling for democratic practices inside the labor movement. The UAW convention can keep this alive by endorsing its sentiments and calling for its adoption by the united labor federation.

But the question of democracy may come before the UAW in a more immediate fashion. A group of locals in Flint are proposing to amend the UAW constitution in order to exclude and expel all "Communists" from the UAW.

Up to now, UAW militants could point proudly to the democratic record of their union; despite their hatred of Stalinism, despite the long struggle they conducted against it, they defended the democratic rights of those whom they opposed. The best UAW militants repudiated the use of dictatorial and totalitarian methods in the fight against even so hated an enemy as Stalinism.

It will be up to the convention to defend the present constitution against every attempt to change its democratic character.

When the Flint proposal is repudiated by the convention, as it properly will be, the delegates can mull over this fact: what is rejected by the UAW with repugnance is a common practice in many unions. The recently formed CIO Leather Workers Organizing Committee excludes "Communists" from membership. The Steel Workers Union expels not only Communists but socialists as well. It is the job of the UAW not only to defend its own democracy but to stimulate it everywhere in the labor movement.

Everywhere democracy is under attack. "Loyalty" programs, "security" regulations, screening, etc., are turned into instruments of intimidation. Smith Act, "subversive" control boards, Attorney General's List, Humphrey-Dies bill illegalizing the Communist Party—all contribute to the suffocating fog of subservience and fear. If the labor movement does not stand in opposition to the drift toward unthinking conformity, who will? And if the UAW does not take the lead in the labor movement, who will?

Not long ago, the UAW proclaimed itself "the vanguard in America and the architect of the future." Labor unity and the fight for a guaranteed wage remind the convention of the UAW's role.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Get Acquainted!

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

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

AT ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE