The long embittered steel strike, the passage of the "killer" labor Landrum-Griffin bill, strongly indicate the anti-labor climate prevailing in the nation. Capital, firmly entrenched here at home, seems intent now on erasing some of the innocuous political and economic reforms gained by labor during the social crises experienced by the capitalists in the past few decades.

Labor, on the other hand, while organized in large numbers, unconscious of its larger class interests and goal (in fact, supporting the policies of its enemy, capital), is on the defensive.

The passage of what George Meany, head of the American union movement, termed the "killer" bill, the Landrum-Griffin law, should (but probably won't) once and for all dispel the cultivated notion that labor in America is all-powerful, politically and economically. The propaganda that American labor is so powerful, that its strength needs to be balanced for the good of the nation, secured the way for the passage of the Taft-Hartley, slave-labor law and now the "killer" Landrum-Griffin law. The fact of the matter is that labor in this country never attained the stature even in name as its brothers across the seas. It never had a political party of its own with its friends. Its book membership, now of around 18 million, is no threat to the capitalist political parties extant, Republican and Democrats. Its numerical and organization force is dissipated in the search for friends amongst its enemies, capitalist politicians.

But labor's very "friends," liberals, elected last year to Congress, could not stop the "killer" bill and some even supported the restrictive measure. This new law, seemingly beneficial to labor with its "bill of rights" and financial accounting, establishes the right and duty of the capitalist government to intervene in the internal affairs of the unions.

Intervention in the internal affairs of unions, once breached could be extended, to the now imposed "bill of rights" and financial accounting. Candidates for union office, may, for example, have to get government approval, dictated by the mood of Congressional investigators. Once the government

has its foot in, the union's business is restricted, hampered and obstructed. Politically, American labor has rarely been so weak as now. The last two national reform legislative pieces, the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin laws are reforms aimed to weaken labor.

While the American trade union movement never watered its feet for independent political action, sticking to its threadbare policy of "keeping friends and punishing enemies," outside its own ranks, it was proud and boasted of its economic actions of pressing for immediate and minute demands; with the capitalists as rapacious as ever and the workers as defenseless as yesterday. That is inherent in the industrial jungle with an outdated and limited policy of "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work."

Today, with war and postwar labor shortages at an end, plus the coming-in-on-its-own of automation, the capitalists are in the driver's seat and are asserting their favorable position. The trade unions are floundering on the rocks of automation with its attendant technological unemployment. Their traditional policies are inadequate to meet the changing times. They appear hopelessly out of step and at a loss for constructive solutions, with their traditional, outdated, 19th century palliatives.

The stumbling block in the steel, waterfront and other industrial strife-ridden conflicts is primarily over work rules. It is more than a coffee break issue. It is over, mainly, "what constitutes a fair day's work for a fair day's pay." The capitalists charge the workers with " featherbedding"—the use of too many men to do the job. While the unions counter-charge, that the bosses are seeking unrestricted speed-up practices, a free hand to sweat and rob the workers their last ounce of energy.

While isolated cases of "featherbedding" may exist, the capitalist

During Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit to the U.S. in September he broke out with the surprise proposal of total disarmament. Some labelled it propaganda; others utopian. Whatever the motive, it must be recognized that it was a responsible man talking, representing a first-rate power, and he wasn't exactly talking through his hat. For no one better than Khrushchev is aware of its immediate impracticability and reasons for it. Yet in full knowledge thereof he advanced it; first, as an expression of the universal hope for peace; secondly, because of socialism's anticipation of a society in which war will have become an anachronism.

It is difficult for the bourgeois mind to conceive of a world without police and armies. An army force is just as natural to them as graft is to politics. Private ownership of property is also just as natural to them as eating. It is essential to all social systems based on exploitation, and the state or police force is equally necessary for the enforcement of their "law and order."

Any suggestion of a socialized property or a classless society is unthinkable to the bourgeois mind. Nevertheless, there is a growing recognition of the "evil" aspect of this so-called natural condition (capitalism), that it is rapidly getting out of hand. The enormously growing burden of modern armaments, through taxation, has become a directly threatening force to the profit structure, posing the following dilemma: that the force it is building to secure its existence is becoming the means of causing that very existence. This is the contradiction implicit in the present missile-armaments race, and we think both sides are aware of it.

Marxism sees the question of the state and armaments in a different light, not as god-given or nature-imposed, but as an outcome of social conditions. Society in its development gives rise to certain institutions and forms suitable and necessary to its existence.

As society changes, old systems give way to new ones, corresponding changes take place in the entire social superstructure affecting its politics, philosophy, religion, art, etc. Everything, social, changes correspondingly to fit into the new way of economic existence, i.e., the new mode of producing the necessities of life.

The state as a social institution did not always exist. The pre-civilized societies, known as savagery and barbarism, knew no such organizing system. It was obvious, they had no need of such. In their primitiveness and simplicity they were self-governing. Unlike today, the entire people bore arms with no fear that it would lead to internal disorder. In times of peace these weapons were used for economic purposes, hunting, etc. In times of war whole tribes engaged in battle against rival tribes. Essentially there was no social cleavage, the economy was communistic, property owned in common. These, therefore, were classless societies, with neither poor nor rich, but all savages.

It is only with the development of private property that the late stages of barbarism, at the dawn of ancient civilization that the state arose. It was the answer to a social need begotten by new social and economic conditions. It had a function to perform? What was that new social condition? It was private ownership of property and the exploitation of labor.

Classes had developed, rich and poor, property owners and propertyless. Now society was no longer a homogenous unit. It was internally torn by civil strife born of economic differences. No longer could the whole people be trusted with arms. They might use them against their exploiters and masters. They had to be disarmed, which they were. Now a special and separate force was set up and with police power, to keep the slaves and the poor in their "proper place." That was the function of the state, as Engels said in his "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" (pp. 206, Kerr ed.), as follows:

"The state, then, is by no means a power forced on society from
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drive for speed-up is motivated by its thirst for greater profits. With the arrival of mass labor surpluses, the capitalists are now in a more favorable position to achieve their profit aspirations. For labor to resist push-button automation is futile, it is here to stay and go forward. To declaim against it, is reactionary.

The answer to rising automation and its resulting effects are beyond the scope of this article. The unions staunchly support the profit system. The union and its membership can talk about the anti-labor legislation all it wants; as long as they remain faithful to capitalism that breeds it, they'll have to endure it. Of course, it might be contended that labor can still resort to striking. But that too has its limitations. Capital's government is ever ready to force the strikers back to work with injunctions, e.g., as recently, by using the Taft-Hartley act against them.

One of Dr. Marx (Value, Price and Profit) pointed out that quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages question, "the working class ought not to be content to remain the ultimate working of these every-day struggles." That they are fighting with the effects and not by the cause of their exploitation. That the real solution lies in the complete abolishment of the capitalist system. That instead of the conspiracy of the working class, it is the conspiracy of the wages for a fair day's work!" They ought to inscribe on their banner the revolution... watchword, "Abolition of the wages system!"

L.B.
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outside, neither is it the realization of the ethical ideal, "on the image and realization of reason," as Hegel maintains. It is simply a product of society at a certain stage of development. It is the con- fession that this society has be- come hopelessly divided against itself, has entangled itself in irre- concilable contradictions, in which it is powerless to banish. In order that these contradictions, these classes with conflicting economic interests, may merge and unite themselves in a useless struggle, a power becomes neces- sary that stands apparently above society and has the function of keeping down the conflicts and maintaining 'order.' And this pow- er, the outgrowth of society, but assuming supremacy over it and becoming more and more divorced from it, is the state.

In the same work, Engels says: "We have seen that an essential mark consists in a public power of coercion divorced from the mass of the people." (p. 142) and further declared, to wit: "The state is the result of the desire to keep down class con- flicts. But having arisen amid these conflicts, it is as a rule the state of the most powerful eco- nomic class that by force of its economic supremacy becomes also the political ruling class and thus acquires new means of subduing and oppressing masses. The ancient state was, therefore, the state of the slave owners for the purpose of holding the slaves in check. The feudal state was the organ of the nobility for the oppression of the serfs and the dependent farmers. The modern central government is the tool of the capitalist exploiters of wage labor." (pp. 208-209)

There should be little ambiguity as to the origin and function of the state. It is essentially an instrument of class subjugation. It is seldom recog-
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The present attempts of the capi- talclass to curb union growth and activity with injunctions, and such reactionary legislation as the Taft-Hartley act, are only a con- tinuation of an anti-labor policy of those in power.

History proves the above analy- sis. When unions appeared in America in the late decade of the 18th century, employers made every action against them as long as they remained basically welfare organiza- tions; but more and more after the turn of the century they be- came combinations to raise wages. Employers realized that they could have the unions prosecuted for "conspiraacies in restraint of trade" under the U.S. and English common law doctrine. One of the first of these cases was the trial of the Phila- delphia Journeymen Cordwainers for criminal conspiracy for a strike for higher wages. The con- viction was for (1) combination to raise wages and (2) combination to injure others. The union was found guilty and fined. Bankrupt as a result, the union disbanded after 12 years of existence. The "Month- ly Review" and Boston Advertiser (Vol. 3, 1806, Article 64) stated, "In the correctness of the decision all sound lawyers, and all who wish for the eternal peace and industry, will acquiesce.

The legal fight against unions was carried on. However, 1809- 1815 was a period of prosperity during which the shoemakers and printers organized local unions in a number of cities, and carpenters in a few places. These trials, com- bined with a recent victory for the Napoleonic war in Europe, brought a low point in the early growth of labor unions by 1820.

All of the shoemakers' unions and most of the others were wiped out, although a few unions of printers survived by turning themselves into mutual benefit societies. Un- denominationalism and the absence that had occurred 1832-35. There was a revival in the 1833-36 boom period, the local unions in Massachusetts increased to more than 1,000. In New York it was 52, Baltimore 23, and Boston 16. The Commonwealth vs. Hunt (1842) decision which recog- nized the right of workers to join unions came during the depression which followed the complete in- dustrial collapse in 1837, though there was little economic or union recovery until the 1850's.

The period of 1863-73 was a pe- riod of war and postwar prosper- ity during and after which an organizing began. In 1872 it was estimated that total union membership was about 300,000. But again, 1873-74 was a depression during which the local unions and many of the na- tional organizations. Since then the union membership has grown mainly during pe- riods of rising employment: 1897- 1904, 1916-20, 1940-45.

Depression periods usually cause a decline in union membership, though after each current movement has come back stronger than before, due mainly to an in- creased consciousness on the part of the worker of the benefits of working class organization, and to more favorable legislative and judi- cial decisions.

Prospects of prosperity, however, have been periods of reaction. The Pullman strike of 1894 occurred after wage reductions of 25% for the workers at the Pullman Car Co. An American Railway union boycott came to their aid. President Cleveland sent troops to injure the workers, and an easy and convenient excuse to break the strike. The combination of Federal troops and a blanket injunction brought this strike to an end. When the United Mine workers struck in 1902 the operators of eight rail- roads in monopoly refused to arbi- trate the conflict, "We are Christians," said J. P. Morgan, and his infinite wisdom had given con- trol of the property interests of the country.

After 1902, following a period of rapid union growth, employer opposition became stronger. Prof- essor C. Daugherty in summariz- ing this trend in his book, "Labor Problems will find the necessary," wrote:

"Most of the powerful ones be- lieving that unionism was grow- ing too strong and finding further encroachments on their control of industry, decided to break off rela- tions, and the years from 1902 to World War I were character-
Soviet Power and World Peace

Soviet Premier Khrushchev’s offer of peaceful coexistence on behalf of the Soviet Union to the United States during his visit in September is emphasized in his final speech by this significant statement:

“There can be no stability or tranquility in the world so long as the two strongest powers are fighting."

He cited the analogy of two neighbors who did not like each other and built a fence between them, and abuse each other day and night. However, those neighbors still have a way out: One of them can sell his house and move elsewhere. But what can states do? They can’t move elsewhere. What is the way out of capitalism, we have socialism, well, are we to have a worldwide, shambles over this? Or are we to establish normal relations and live in peace, each his own way. In the Soviet Union everyone is in favor of peaceful coexistence.

“Have you ever pondered over this question: If we are not planning to fight, whatever for do you think will prevent these armaments? I am told that your country every year spends an average of over 40 billion dollars on armaments. As for us, I won’t conceal that we spend about 25 billion dollars a year for the same purpose. Surely a better use for the people’s money can be found.”

The above quoted remarks speak for themselves. The two biggest powers in the world are the United States and the Soviet Union, both armed with the most terrible means of destruction, nuclear bombs, and missiles to hurl at each other in the event of war. Between them was recently pointed out by President Eisenhower in an answer he gave at a press conference, namely, that it would be “mutually assured destruction.”

It is beginning to dawn upon a lot of people, even upon some of those in the U.S. who are painfully trying to swallow their belligerent hatred of communism, that the world, and least of all capitalism, can no longer afford another world war.

Soviet Power is here to stay. It cannot be defeated. It is far stronger power socially than capitalism, and possibly militarily as well. Yet it does not threaten any nation. Soviet Power is opposed to all force and violence, especially the wars that capitalist nations often resort to in their cut-throat competitive struggle for control of the markets and the resources of the world, e.g., such as World War One and Two.

In his speech, Khrushchev further pointed out that the Soviet people are grateful to Marx, Engels and Lenin who blazed the trail to socialism for them, which has been followed also by many nations of Europe and Asia, that “the working people, on taking over political power, put an end to the tendency to acquire wealth at the expense of others.” He aimed a barb at the capitalists and exposed the source of their wealth, as follows:

“Indeed human greed is a terrible thing. Has there ever been a case of a millionaire not wanting to become a multi-millionaire.”

“Clearly nobody, not even with his whole family and not even if he were to live several lives, could earn a million dollars, let alone a billion, by his own work. This can be accomplished only if one appropriates the labor of others.”

It was the struggle of the working people against being exploited, against the “human greed” of the ruling class, that caused the social revolution in Russia long ago and gave birth to Soviet Power. This has happened.

42 Years of Soviet Power

This year, on November 7th, finds the Russian people celebrating their 42nd anniversary of Soviet Power.

This is caused by the fact that the world over is rejoycing, as for Soviet Power, also known as the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, is the organized political might of the immense majority. If Karl Marx were living today, he would describe it like he did the Paris Commune of 1871, to wit:

“It’s true secret was this. It was essentially a working class government, the product of the struggle against the exploiting propertied class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor.”

In Russia, in 1917, Soviet Power overthrew the dictatorship of the landlords and capitalists. It abolished their system of private ownership and monopoly of the land and industry. In its stead, the Soviet system of “workers’ and “peasants’ power.” The Socialist system, the collective ownership of the means and instrument of production, thereby ending the exploitation of man by man. It wrote, and enforced the law of the Soviet Constitution, namely, “He who does not work, neither shall he eat.” It decreed that it is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen to perform national service—of course, on the principle: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.” This, of course, was only the first stage of socialism, but it did describe the entire ideology aristocratic riff-raff and the capitalist parasites.

One of the significant features of the Russian 1917 Revolution is that it occurred during the First World War, that imperial conflict that Marxists denounced as the “war of bandits.” He called upon the Russian masses to turn this imperial war into a civil war, to overthrow the Czarist ruling class and to take the nation into its own hands. In which case, he said, “Just before the masses heeded his advice. It was the mass slaughter of Russian soldiers at the front and poverty behind the lines, that caused the Russian masses to rebel and raise their demand: “Peace, land, and bread.”

Revolution erupted, the first phase, March 1917, when the Czar was forced to abdicate, and the capitalist Provisional Government was set up (later headed by Kerensky) which attempted to continue the war and to exploit the workers and peasants. But it too was overthrown, and the Russian masses led by the Bolshevik Party of Lenin, adopted the slogan of “All power to the Soviets,” on November 7, 1917, took the nation into their own hands.

The young Soviet nation, however, in order to survive, had to sign the “distressful” Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918 with Germany. But peace did not last long because the capitalist powers, Britain, France and America, through armed intervention tried to destroy the Soviet Government by precipitating a civil war (1918-20). However, the Soviet Union survived, thanks to the heroic defense of its class conscious army through internecine struggle, and work-and-self-denial they transformed Russia from a backward nation to one of the most highly industrial. Farmes were collectivized and mechanized with tractors, harvester-combines, etc. By 1939 the Soviet Union had reached such a stage of well being that she was able to go on the attack, when World War Two broke out with Hitler’s invasion of Russia in June 1941. But the valiant Red Army defended the nation and by 1945 had forced back the German military machine and buried it in the debris of the Reich.

The Soviet Union tried to stay out of World War Two, at first by advocating the policy of “collective security” which was rebuffed by Britain, France, and America. However, they were signing a “non-aggression pact” with Germany in August 1939, which was violated by the latter’s invasion of Russia.

At war’s end the Soviet Union emerged a strong world power along with the working class nations of Eastern Europe. Soviet Power grew also as the Chinese workers and peasants overthrew their exploiters, native and the foreign imperialists. This year, Peoples China celebrated the 10th Anniversary of its October 1949 Revolution. The workers world has increased to one-third of the world, with the approximately 1.5 billion of the imperialist people, all of them on the road to communism!

It is any wonder that the capitalists got fear-struck and furious, and in their frustration started the so-called “cold war” against the working class to attempt the destruction of the Soviet Union. The American “police action” in Korea (1950-53) tried that, but it was stalemated by the allied Chinese-North Korean working class armies. Today, the frustrated world is seeking a “modus vivendi” with communism.

Unsolved Problems

There are many unsolved world problems, e.g., like the question of Germany and the status of Berlin. The Soviet Union proposed the realistic approach of signing separate peace treaties with East and West Germany.

Overshadowing all is the question of disarmament. The arms race is a burden to all nations. However, capitalist nations are reluctant to disarm, not only because they fear the “communist menace” but also because they feel the need of arming themselves in their competitive struggle with each other.

Furthermore, arms production is “good business” and very profitable for those capitalists engaged in it. In America it props up “prosperity” and provides the funds for the armed force and closing of the arsenals, it would cause a business depression with consequent unemployment.

Furthermore, it is as it may, that the Soviet Union is sincere in proposing total disarmament. It feels the burden of the arms race most acutely. Total disarmament would result in a tremendous increase in the standard of living for the Russian people. They would arrive much sooner at their goal of the highest stage of communism: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.”

The question of world peace is everybody’s concern, for the obvious fact that life is the most precious thing on earth. Just recently the United Nations passed on the resolution “against the use of the atom bomb and other mass destruction weapons.” This resolution was received with mixed emotions by the gentlemen in the Pentagon who are now preparing the fate of the U.S. armed “earthly” bases.

In conclusion, we, of the Proletarian Party, point out that the only real solution for peace is the destruction of capitalism that best fits the world’s workers to unite and get rid of the cause of war, capitalism, completely.

Al Wysocki

PUBLISHED BY THE
Proletarian Party of America

PROLETARIAN NEWS

November, 1959

PROLETARIAN NEWS

A Journal for the Working Class
Devoted to the Education of Workers and Their Struggle for Power

333 W. North Avenue, Chicago, Illinois
THE ECONOMICS OF UNION GROWTH

(Continued from page 2)

ized by a definitely increasing anti-unionism.

"Scientific management and efficien-
cy systems were introduced in many plants, to the dis-
complished the skilled craft unions. A variety of union-smash-
tactics were adopted by employ-
ers. Vigilante groups and citi-
zens' committees were fostered to resist unionization activities."

Court decisions upheld as a rule most of the employers' anti-union practices, and as a result union membership fell considerably.

Labor shortages in the First World War gave unions an unprecedented boost, but at the close of the war manufacturers began a determined anti-union effort whose success gave this period its popular title, "the open shop era."

To weaken and disrupt union activity, management introduced a variety of welfare measures ranging from athletic fields to pension plans, as well as such repressive devices as "chilly weather" breaks and strikebreakers. Company unions dominated by employers were established, and "Yellow Dog" contracts, requiring a worker to promise as a condition of employment that he would not join a labor union.

The depression of the 1930's brought on the Wagner Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the La Follette Committee which uncovered many of the practices of capitalists, and a "no-union" record as a testimony to the per-
severance of capital. It uncovered the organization of independent unions controlled by management, by such companies as Remington Rand, Ford, Montgomery Ward and Douglas Aircraft. It uncovered the "Mohawk Valley Formula" which was a general effort to dis-
seminate propaganda to influence public opinion against unions and strikes with the effect described by the N.A.M. as, "The great court of public opinion has broken the strike and nothing could save it."

For espionage and "protection," G.M. was found to have spent (1934) $1,019,056; R.C.A., $2,
007,590; National Hardware, $721,451. In 1933-36 Pinkerton alone employed 1,200 labor spies. Over 100 held union offices of some importance.

The prosperous period of World War II gave birth to the first Fed- eral anti-strike bill in the coun-
try's history, the Smith-Connelly War Labor Disputes Bill. In the period of prosperity union activity has been carried on in the shadow of the restrictive Taft-Hartley act.

Today we are emerging from a new prosperous period in which unions have achieved great numerical strength. Present fig-
ures run as high as 18 million union-
ners, most of whom are organized in the AFL-CIO. Historically, we could expect anti-union legislation at this time. However, if labor can mobilize public opinion the reaction-
ary legislation may be effec-
tively avoided.

It must be remembered, how-
ever, that should a depression bring back "pro-labor" legislation, the labor reform bill is not really revolutionary in nature — unless a qualitative change occurs in the consciousness of the working class.

When in July 1934, H. G. Wells interviewed J. Stalin, he asked, "Is not a reform a small revolution?"

Stalin replied, "Owing to pressure from below, the pressure of the masses, he sometimes concedes partial reforms while remaining on the basis of the existing social economic sys-

An analysis indicates that these concessions are necessary in order to preserve class rule. This is the essence of reform Socialism. It means the transference of power from one class to another. That is why we cannot count on the change of social systems taking place by the transfer from one system to another by means of reforms, by the ruling class making concessions.

The potential strength of the working class — which depends on its numbers — is constant, and in
dependent of the strength of the unions which fluctuates. Class consciousness is the critical factor in mobilizing this powerful army of men. But to effectively put an end to the exploitation of labor, this class consciousness must lead the workers in the direction of organization, to a working class, revolutionary, political organization that has for its objective the abolition of capitalism.

A. St. Maur.

LUCKY HERNANDEZ: There's a fellow named Hernandez, re-
cently came to this Ford Motor Co. as a machine operator who some way or another got everyone to think he was pretty lucky. The only thing we can fig-
ture is the fact he was so darn unlucky before his "good fortune" fell from the blue, it made him seem he was pretty well off.

Hernandez was worried and wondered, so he was going to feed and clothe his family when his pay was cut from $380 a month to a meager $70 a month pension from Ford. Hernandez found for many years of hard work) plus the usual, $116 a month from security. He was especially worried because 8 of his 12 children were under 18 and still living at home.

Well, sir, it turned out that he had more social security coming than he thought. When all the noises were counted the authorities figured he would be eligible for a maximum benefit of $254 a month 'til the kids were all 18 years or over.

It was this good news that start-
ed everybody calling him lucky Hernandez. The newspaper article telling about the pot of gold, with pictures and all, said he should change his address to "Easy Street"

I guess it's all in the way you look at it, but after the shock of getting more than they bargained for has died away I would like to drop around to "Easy Street" and ask Hernandez or his wife — or even the kids — how lucky they feel wearing clothing and housing a family of 9 kids and two adults on less than $38.62 a week. That's $3.33 for each person for one week! 76 cents a day for each one! Like the old saying goes—with a little more luck they might just make it. (?)

BOOM OR BUST? West Ger-
many is enjoying a boom period which, if not checked, will lead to a bust according to some on-the-spot experts. The fear of overpro-
duction (with no market for goods produced) has some officials in a worried state of mind.

One of the suggested methods for reducing the production of the working force in West Germany (including all but 1% of available manpower) is to reduce the work week from 45 to 40 hours.

The union leaders are for it but, according to reports and surveys, the workers are rather cool to the idea unless their pay remains the same. Or better still—if anything over 40 hours can be considered "overtime" and payable as time-and-a-half. The taste of prosperity is still fresh in the minds of the once poor stricken German workers.

Along with this general discus-
sion of the merits of the 40 hour work-week is an opposition group headed by some of the large newspa-
pers. One argument claims that the existing 4 days and 6 hours a day-working the one day week-end — if it was good enough for him it should be good enough for everyone. And the other (and one of the major points we have ever heard) contends that medical surveys show a sharp rise in death from heart failure of late and most notably on Monday mornings, that this is due to a too
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