

and the economist who refuses to recognize it is playing into their hands. . . . If the economist truly represents society as a whole, he should strive to give the excluded classes a larger and more just legal share in government and industry."

B. H.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN REGULATORY STATE, by James F. Anderson. Introd. by Emmette S. Redford. Washington, D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1962. 172 pp. \$4.50. Index.

DR. ANDERSON has given us an historical sketch of how the regulatory commission became a prominent instrument of government during the period from 1887 (marked by the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act) to 1917 (when war conditions gave a new impetus to the device). While the book is definitely limited to this theme, behind it is the

larger question of the secular trend of the state to intervene in the economy. Dr. Anderson is plainly quite aware that he is providing a view of only one segment of a larger panorama, and within this framework has done a very useful job, within a relatively brief compass.

He traces the conflicts and debates over state regulation vs. laissez-faire, the measures taken by the federal and state governments moving in the direction of regulation, the decisions of the Supreme Court which affected the outcome, the anti-trust movement (briefly), and ends with the case for and against the commission device. "For all practical purposes, the question whether government should have a positive role in controlling the economy was affirmatively decided by 1917," he concludes.

The style and approach is that of the dissertation, but not oppressively so; the language is clear English and not academicese. The lay reader will read it with profit.

A. A.

OUR REVIEWERS—

JOSEPH CLARK was Foreign Editor of the *Daily Worker* and its correspondent in the Soviet Union from 1950-53. He broke with the paper and the Party in 1957.

MOSHE DECTER is director of Jewish Minorities Research. His articles have appeared in *Commentary*, *Midstream* and other publications.

ALBERT FRIED is a member of the *New Politics* editorial board. He is the editor of the recently published book, *A Day of Dedication: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Woodrow Wilson*.

BURTON HALL is an attorney who has represented insurgent reformers in several unions. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Workers Defense League.

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON is an attorney who has been active in the civil rights movement. She is on the legal staff of the American Civil Liberties Union.

FRANKLIN ROSEMONT is a poet and editor of the Chicago IWW journal, *The Rebel Worker*.

EDWARD SPEYER is a physicist and life long socialist. His articles have appeared in *Dissent* and *New Politics*.

COMMENT

ON HERBERT HILL'S ARTICLE

I HAVE READ with interest Mr. Hill's article on the "Racial Practices of Organized Labor" in the Spring, 1965 issue of *New Politics*. Much of what Mr. Hill writes does document the sorry picture of the attitudes and policies of most of organized labor and some of its leaders on the "Negro question" in decades gone by.

I am a bit puzzled as to the article's rather abrupt transition to the modern "period" and its almost quixotic treatment of developments in more recent decades. Since the article is about "Organized Labor" it is difficult to see why Mr. Hill can or should dismiss the enormous changes and developments of the thirties with one-half sentence as "With the growth of the CIO in the non-production sectors of the economy, with thousands of Negro organized workers organized workers organized for the first time in steel, auto, rubber, and packinghouse plants, . . ." and that's about it!

The era of mass unionism (which swept up some AFL unions as well as most CIO unions) did, after all, help advance Negro rights materially within the labor movement. Did it go far enough? Obviously not. Did it and does it continue to have repercussions that still operate on behalf of the advancement (admittedly still too slow) of the Negro toward full equality within the AFL-CIO and its constituent unions—obviously it does.

Anyone who has been close to this movement for a long period of time *must* see the changes that have occurred and are occurring. That such changes have occurred is attested to, I believe, by the very explicit and concrete assistance which the leading Negro organizations and their leaders gave to organized labor's struggle for passage of a higher minimum wage and repeal of the "right to work" (14b) provision of the national labor law in the recent Congress.

I take seriously Clarence Mitchell's statement on behalf of Roy Wilkins (NAACP), A. Philip Randolph (American Labor Council), Martin Luther King (Southern Christian Leadership Conference) and James Farmer (Congress of Racial Equality) supporting repeal of Section 14(b) as reported in the *New York Times* of May 28, 1965.

Mr. Mitchell is quoted as declaring of organized labor "'we are allies,'" and that organized labor had fought along with these same Negro organizations, successfully, according to the *Times*' report for that "section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that bans racial discrimination by employers and unions." And that this legislation "could not have been passed without labor's support, he said."

One can cite other instances of significant cooperation between the national AFL-CIO headquarters and leaders and the major Negro organizations, in pursuit of critical legislation in recent years.

Discrimination continues as a problem in important areas of union life. It can and should be exposed. But it serves no real purpose to ignore or minimize the changes which have occurred within the modern labor movement generally, and within the AFL-CIO specifically in recent years.

While the American labor movement may not be destined to become the kind of "social institution" Mr. Hill seems to be hoping for, significant change should be noted as it occurs within the movement in important areas of its activity. I think Mr. Hill's free-swinging helped to bring about some of these changes, and perhaps he should take a little time out to survey them!

EVERETT M. KASSALOW,
Professor of Economics,
University of Wisconsin.