monstration on January 15, 1963 of an estimated 25,000 union men in support of the striking newspaper printers in front of the N. Y. Times building was a stirring sight to see on TV newscasts.

THAT "PUBLIC INTEREST"

When workers go out on strike, newspaper editorials and slanted news columns condemn "callous" union men, who have no regard for the "public interest." Two notorious instances were seen recently in New York City. The flagrantly underpaid and greatly abused hospital workers and the school teachers, subjected to intolerable conditions and pressures, had the courage to go out on strike under the most harassing of circumstances, accompanied by the vicious denunciations of the press.

On the floor of the U. S. Senate, that "friend of labor," Senator Jacob K. Javitz, bemoaned that "the newspaper blackout had created an intolerable situation in New York with huge losses . . . The time has come to settle this strike . . . The public interest must be served." In a statement to the press on January 18th, Pierre Salinger, President Kennedy's press secretary went further: "Even in New York, where a distinguished ('impartial,' he calls them elsewhere in the same statement) board of public citizens studied the strike and rendered a report." This report, endorsed by Mr. Salinger, was rendered on January 11th and virtually held that the publishers were all but blameless and vitriolically condemned Big Six in unequivocal terms. Just who is this "public," so dear to the hearts of the spokesmen for capital? It is NOT the vast majority of the population, the workers.

THE ACTUAL FACTS

Local Six, ITU, called a strike against four of the nine New York newspapers: the New York Times, the Daily News, the World Telegram and Sun and the Journal-American, four of the wealthiest and most influential newspapers in the country. The other five newspaper locked out their workers. The unanswered question: "Why did certain publishers lock out their employees on the same day they went before TV cameras to tell the public that a long strike would bankrupt them?" It is NOT because of the printers that New York City is without newspapers. It is not a "public be damned" attitude by labor but a "workers be damned" attitude by professional moralists of the owning class who are concerned for profits, above all. This is why New York City's papers are shut down.

The Publishers Association of N.Y. City is determined to "exhaust the union financially" through a prolonged strike and force the printers back to work with a crippled union. The membership of the ITU throughout the United States and Canada, are voting to assess themselves 3% of their wages, in addition to their present 5½% union obligations, to support the strikers in New York, Cleveland, Portland and elsewhere. The newspaper publishers throughout the country are watching the New York strike, in particular, hoping that its defeat will trigger a general offensive against ITU locals everywhere.

Not a minor consideration for the pressure by the four major newspapers in New York on the other five papers to form a united front is the open secret that they anticipate that one or two of the "marginal" publishers will be driven out of business.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE ON POLITICAL FIELD

The highest expression of the class struggle takes place on the political field: the political battle to transfer the ownership of the means of living from a privileged class to society, as a whole, where it belongs. As soon as the mass of the workers wake up, politically, to their real interests, they will no longer support so-called "friends of labor" to do something for them. Frequent instances of support, by these "friends", of such anti-labor bills as Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin, and "Right to Work" is the usual result of such Labor political action. A politically awakened working class will vote, in its millions, for a society in which automation will be harnessed for the benefit of mankind, not—as it is today—for the elimination of the means of a livelihood for millions of workers. In other words, they will vote that goods be produced for the use and needs of the vast many instead of for the profits of the few.

AN ITU MEMBER

A RADIO BREAK-THROUGH

"The Facts and Fallacies of Socialism"

On Wednesday, January 2, 1963 socialism was given an airing over Radio Station WEEI (Columbia Broadcasting System), Boston. From 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. (with time out for two newscasts, commercials, and station breaks), producer Ralph Morse and interviewer Haywood Vincent present a five-day-per week, unrehearsed program in which "respected ideas are inspected and neglected controversies dissected." The program is popular, having a listening audience estimated at several hundred thousands. As stated on several spot announcements on the night before and throughout the morning of January 2, "Harry Morrison, of the World Socialist Party of the U. S., (would) present the facts and fallacies of socialism."

Unfortunately, space limitations prevent us from publishing the entire interview exactly as recorded. The best we can manage is to present a portion and reconstruct the remaining part.

Haywood Vincent: (after a few opening remarks): Let's start right now, Mr. Morrison, with a question that seems naively simple but I am sure has many complexities. What is world socialism?

Harry Morrison: I would say that socialism is a system of society which is based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing wealth. This means, in every day American, that under socialism every man, woman, and child in the world will have the free right of access to what is produced.

H.V.: Will this be, in effect, working for his government?

H.M.: In effect, he would not be working for his own government or for any other government because actually there will be no such thing as government in the sense that government presupposes somebody doing the governing and its consequences, other people who are being governed. There will be administration over things, over affairs, but there will be no class divisions in society at that time and therefore the world will be just one common sphere, so to speak, and not divided into nations with rival governments representing the business interests of those nations, such as exists today.

H.V.: Do I understand that we're all going to be chiefs and no Indians?

H.M.: There will be no chiefs, in the sense that chief is generally meant. If by chief you mean people with the right to govern over other people, to determine what other people will do so far as making their livelihood is concerned, there will be no chiefs whatsoever.

H.V.: Who pays this happy family so that the happy family may purchase clothing, television sets, flush toilets, etc.?

H.M.: Under socialism there is nobody in a position to pay and nobody in the position in which payment is required. Now this possibly requires some explanation and I know that some of my listeners are a little puzzled by it. Paying, in the sense of giving money—which is what I believe you mean — is a comparatively recent development in society. It may seem strange to you but it is a fact and just a cursory examination of history books will show you that money, itself, is a comparatively recent development in the sense of the age of man on this earth. That even as short a time ago as, say, 300 years—and 300 years may seem a long time to any one of us individually but in the sense of history it is not too long a time—just about 300 years ago there was little money in evidence anywhere throughout the world. If you take the period of feudalism which goes back possibly 300 years, the vast majority of the population never had occasion, from