

**WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD;
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!**

LABOR ACTION

AUGUST 16, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Moscow Parleys on Berlin Crisis Aim at

BARGAIN OVER REDIVISION OF EUROPE

Worst Session of "Worst Congress" Dribbles To Its Close; Real Needs of People Ignored

By WILLIAM BARTON

The pre-election special session of Congress has adjourned as expected. The sum total of enacted legislation included controls on consumer credit, regulation of bank loans, provision for government guarantees of low-

price control, rationing and increase of minimum wages was ignored—which surprised no one. Similarly, plans for liberalizing the previously-passed legislation on admittance of DPs, which apparently had some hope of passage, was ignored.

Truman's maneuver in calling the session with the full realization that it would accomplish so little may turn out to be politically successful. The Republican leadership in both houses behaved as was to be expected. They assured the outcome of the session by putting the poll-tax question first on the agenda, knowing that the Southern Democrats would institute an immediate filibuster. They hoped thus to place the blame on the President's party. They then cleverly avoided a vote of "closure" to limit debate. From there they found it easy to push through their few tidbits of legislation and call it a day.

Cagey—As Usual



THOMAS E. DEWEY

cost private housing, and a loan to the United Nations for reconstruction of its New York headquarters.

Nothing whatsoever was done about civil rights, except for talk. Even the hoped-for compromise Constitutional Amendment on the poll tax was laid aside. President Truman's call for

DEWEY PLAYS "SAFE"

The vote on housing legislation was the most revealing. The Senate had passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill, providing for some public construction of low-cost housing at the last session. It had lain dormant ever since in a House Committee. At this session, Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin (whose claim to fame seems to be his status as a "World War II vet") offered his "compromise" bill which removed all mention of public housing. Taft, co-author of the original bill and one of

the most powerful leaders of the upper house in many decades, made a gesture of throwing up his hands, declaring he could not control his House colleagues, and supported the McCarthy Act. This was even too much for some of his Republican colleagues, led by Senator Tobey of New Hampshire, who futilely attempted to pass the original Senate-adopted public housing bill again. Despite the support of several other Republicans, the Ohio Senate leader was able easily to control his cohorts this time in voting against his own proposal.

The two minor anti-inflation acts are actually being advertised by Republican spokesmen as the items that will bring prices down, unless they

"come down of their own accord." The housewives of the country, organizing meat boycotts everywhere, apparently do not agree. The Republican standard bearers, Dewey and Warren, stay safely away from the whole affair, preparing a careful avoidance of all responsibility. Many voters, however, will well remember the speech of House Majority Leader Halleck in seconding Dewey's nomination at the Republican convention; he explicitly stated that the Republican Party should be judged by the record of the 80th Congress. The remarkable performance of the past two weeks is part of that record.

The danger is that the party of Harry Truman, which had a Congressional majority, as well as the ad-

ministration at the time OPA was effectively scuttled—many of whose members have helped considerably in sabotaging housing, an important section of which is responsible for the absence of civil rights legislation, the majority of whose Congressional delegation voted for the Taft-Hartley Act—that this party will now gain prestige. The political operation has worked better than expected, thanks to the strategy of the opposition, which believes it cannot be beaten.

The people of the country have been given nothing but a spectacle. The weird spy investigations were part of the act. Commentators claim that everything "revealed" was

(Continued on page 2)

Grants Audience



Four-Power Deal Is on the Block; Berlin Is Pawn

By STAN GREY

One day last week, the envoys of England, France and the U. S. walked hurriedly out of the Kremlin. The international news of the week was the fact that they were smiling. The question of the week was: What were they smiling about?

Some said they were smiling because they had managed to get into the Kremlin and have a long talk with the Generalissimo himself. Others, more cynical, thought the smile was due to the fact that they were permitted to leave the Kremlin. In any case, everyone asked: What was there to smile about?

The grimaces of pleasure on the faces of the three envoys was due to the fact that they had finally gotten to talk to the Boss himself and he hadn't kicked them out. This sounds crude but nothing more was involved than that. So little is now expected from Moscow on the question of Berlin and of Europe that the mere fact of having a two hour and fifteen minute talk with Stalin is registered as an enormous stride forward. But that is only a pathetic reflection of the dead end in which imperialist diplomacy finds itself.

EUROPE IS ISSUE

The subject of this unprecedented talk in the Kremlin was, of course, Berlin. But if Berlin was spoken about, what was in the minds of all was not Berlin, but Germany, and not even Germany, but all of Europe. For actually that is what is involved in the crisis of Berlin today.

Stalin's position was that he favored a four-power conference on the question of Germany. The U. S., England and France (we will refer to them as the U. S., for short) are willing to go along with a four-power conference, but it is impossible for the great powers even to agree to an agenda for such a conference. They cannot even agree to the order of subjects on which they will inevitably disagree.

Russia wants to maintain its blockade while the conference discusses the over-all German question which, for Russia, means primarily two things: the setting up of a separate western German state under U. S. control, to which it is opposed, and control over the Ruhr industrial region, of which it wants a part. The U. S. on the other hand insists upon the end of the blockade first before proceeding with any other questions.

What is talk compared with Berlin! This must be the attitude of the Kremlin, which is anxious to have a four-power conference while the

(Continued on page 2)

On Civil Rights and GPU Spies

Parallel Dangers in the Spy Hearings

One of the central conclusions that can be drawn from the current "spy" investigation in Washington is that the net political result will be advantageous only to either the reactionaries or the Stalinists, or both. Those concerned with protecting the civil rights of radical minorities while simultaneously opposing the totalitarian politics of Stalinism have good reason to fear that they, and they above all, will be the eventual sufferers of the present investigation.

The mere existence of the Congressional committees is a menace to civil liberties. Insofar as these committees persecute people for their political opinions—no matter what those opinions are, even if they are Stalinist—we oppose such actions. To persecute dissident groups for political opinions, even if those groups are reprehensible to everything for which socialism stands, is to create the total atmosphere, the intolerance and hysteria and indiscriminate witch-hunting, in which the genuine radicals and socialists of all varieties are likely to be victimized. Nor is this a mere speculation; there is plenty of evidence in the recent past history of this country (the Palmer raids, the persecution of the SWP leaders in Minneapolis) to warrant such a statement.

Furthermore, the very methods which these Congressional committees use is dangerous to civil liberties. Indiscriminate accusations, often without proof; tremendous publicity for accusations and subordinate notice of denials; the lumping together of Stalinists and genuine radicals or even liberals; the assumption that mere belief of any ideas is a crime of some sort—these methods of the Congressional committee can clearly result only in a shrinkage of already threatened liberties.

INDIFFERENT TO FATE OF GPU

At the same time, we are aware that there are spies of the Stalinist regime working in this country—just as there were spies of the Nazi regime or just as, for that matter, the American government may be assumed to maintain an espionage service in various foreign countries. For such spies of Stalinism we have not the faintest sympathy nor the faintest interest in defending.

As far as we are concerned, they have placed themselves outside the jurisdiction or interest of the labor movement, and there is no more reason for the labor movement to come to the defense of Gerhart Eisler than there was for it to come to the defense of Fritz Kuhn—that is to say, none at all.

However, there are certain complicating factors: the Stalinist spy ring, the American section of the GPU, no doubt cuts through, even while it is independent of and not congruent with, the American Stalinist Party. We are against the suppression of the American CP on grounds that are by now well known; we are indifferent to the fate of the GPU. This raises certain difficult problems that cannot always be solved in advance. When Eisler is pinched as a Stalinist agent, that does not concern us. If a Stalinist is pinched as a union leader, we defend him because he is a union leader, we defend him as a union leader—and, above all, because we want him to remain in the union so that he can be deported by the ranks educated in the true meaning of Stalinism.

When the members of the UAW or NMU defeat the Stalinists, they do so on a certain understanding of what Stalinism means. If Harry Bridges had been deported by the government, his prestige in his union would probably have gone up rather than down. The struggle against Stalinism is primarily a POLITICAL struggle, and as such the particular task of the labor movement and the socialist movement.

Thus, to cite another example: when the American CP leaders are prosecuted on grounds of being "seditious" we oppose that prosecution. But if evidence could be adduced to show that William Foster is a Russian spy, we would not feel the slightest interest in his fate.

WORKING BOTH SIDES OF STREET?

There are still further complicating factors. It seems possible that some of those accused at the Washington hearings were not merely Russian spies, but that they had been pressed into service as American counter-spies. Otherwise, how explain the continued unwillingness of the

executive department to produce the dossiers on these people?

According to the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, former key GPU official in this country, he confessed all of his knowledge to the government in 1937. That means that the government knew about these "spies" for the past ten years. Why then were they permitted to remain in government service? Because the Roosevelt administration wished to appease Russia? Perhaps—but what about the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact? There was no interest in appeasement then. Because the "spies" were effectively isolated and could not gain access to vital information? Perhaps. But is it not also possible that some were working both sides of the street? And in such a situation, why should any socialist feel the slightest desire to defend such creatures?

Again, our major formula on this matter: against prosecution for political opinions; indifference to cases where genuine espionage is involved.

Now we want to warn against the opposite danger arising from these hearings. One may become so obsessed with anti-Stalinism as to take anything done by the Thomas Committee as gospel. But on the other hand, one may become so incensed with it on perfectly legitimate grounds as to whitewash the Stalinists. Among many "liberals" the latter danger is by far the greater. The Stalinists ARE totalitarian. They are wreckers of the labor movement and of all freedoms. And there's no doubt that within their movement, though without the knowledge of many of their members, there exists at least part of the GPU apparatus which has sections in every part of the world and in America too.

Simply because one resents the Thomas Committee and its methods is no reason to parade the Stalinists as martyrs to freedom. They are nothing of the sort.

Perhaps it is now clear why we say that there are two parallel dangers in this situation. Socialists and labor militants should keep a clear head on this matter; we think the ideas expressed here will permit them to do that.

The Poor Got Poorer, And The Rich Got Richer . . .

The old saw that the poor get poorer and the rich get richer received confirmation from an unexpected source. The August 13 issue of U. S. News & World Report carries a detailed study of the effect of the 1948 tax reductions and price increases on various income groups.

The so-called tax reductions passed by the last Congress, effective last May, threw a bone to millions of small wage earners while serving porterhouse steak to the handful on top. These studies reveal just how juicy and meaty those servings were.

The little taxpayer received a paltry 3 per cent tax cut while the \$100,000-a-year man was generously handed a 43 per cent tax cut, and higher brackets were given still greater tax reductions. The theory was: the more you have, the more you'll get.

The magazine's researchers, taking 1939 as the base year, calculated what income would be necessary in 1947,

before the tax reductions, and in 1948, adjusting for the tax reductions and price increases, in order to maintain the 1939 pre-war standards. They reach the startling conclusion that "price rises have absorbed tax savings for most people, leaving them worse off than in 1947." That's for MOST people, but a few people in the top income brackets are sitting pretty.

Concretely, a \$2,500 man of 1939 would have to be earning \$4,664 today to maintain the same purchasing power. In 1947, before tax reductions, he could have held his own with \$4,511. Thus he now has \$150 less to buy groceries, even after his paltry tax cut, because prices rose so rapidly.

Let's jump to the income level ten times greater and see how this man is affected. A man making \$25,000 in 1939 required \$93,111 in 1947 to maintain himself in proper style. The tax bill came to his aid generously, for in 1948 he needed only \$61,764; the tax bill saved him \$31,347, a tidy sum, compared with 1947.

WORKS WELL FOR RICH

But still better and bigger savings were pocketed by those in the top income brackets. If you can stretch your imagination, consider the happy plight of a \$50,000 man in 1939. In 1947 it took \$302,362 to maintain his mansion and yachts properly. Congress took pity on him and with its plentiful tax cuts, our man of distinction requires only \$151,647 in 1948. Thus he requires only HALF of what he needed in 1947.

The above are but a few of the figures given to establish that the higher-income families received the biggest dollar savings under the 1948 tax reductions. An interesting consequence is that highly paid executives aren't too eager for salary increases. For them, the 1948 tax cuts meant substantial raises in pay. The man earning \$25,000 was satisfied with his \$3,000 tax cut while the \$50,000 man was contented with his \$7,500 tax cut.

The U. S. News charts reveal that as the income level increased, the tax savings were proportionately increased. The paltry tax cuts on the low incomes were more than offset by the price increases. With no further likelihood of a tax cut this year or next, the small taxpayer will continue to pay through his nose.

Sees Israeli Policy Trend Alienating Own Arab Masses

Arab Refugees Become Bargaining Pawn in Negotiations as Israeli Government Leans Toward Their Exclusion

By ED FINDLEY

The mass flight of Arabs from Palestine continues unabated. Most of these now head for Damascus and Bagdad because both Cairo and Amman are already bursting at the seams with refugees from the Palestine war.

The continued exodus across the borders testifies to the deep, intuitive conviction of the Palestine Arab masses that the present cessation of hostilities is far from permanent. That the truce is but a temporary interlude in the bitter fighting is a notion shared by the Jewish masses. This should not be surprising in view of the daily skirmishing on many fronts and the discouragingly little progress made toward arriving at a negotiated settlement between the two peoples of Palestine.

The Arab refugees come mainly from areas that were drawn into or threatened to be drawn into the arenas of military operations. They are driven by the natural, human desire to get themselves and their families out of the way of flying bullets. Others received orders from local Arab military commanders to evacuate

their homes with the political object of convincing world public opinion that it is impossible for Arabs to live peacefully under Israeli rule.

A much larger group, and in this correspondent's opinion the overwhelming majority, were driven by the fear of Israeli maltreatment and discrimination, engendered by the series of unpunished atrocities of the Irgun Zvai Leumi at Deir Yassin and the unprovoked barrel-bomb massacre at the oil refinery in Haifa. The genuine and sincere verbal guarantees of fair and equal treatment—particularly on the part of the labor movement—sounded feeble indeed when considered alongside the Irgun atrocity campaign (which went unpunished by the Jewish authorities). The Azzam Pashas sounded plausible when they warned the Arab masses of "Jewish terror."

At the start of the war, the authorities of the embryonic Israeli state and especially the labor parties, viewed the departure of the Arab masses as a first-rate political calamity. The Arabs were called upon to remain in their homes and to continue in their

peaceful pursuits with the assurance of all civil and national rights.

The political atmosphere in Israel seems to have changed. There are signs that most of the bourgeois parties and even sections of the labor movement are coming to view the war-induced flight of Arabs from Israel as an unexpected blessing and would like to make this development permanent.

The vision of a homogeneous Israeli state without a troublesome minority problem, intoxicates them.

Moshe Shertok, foreign minister of the Provisional Government of Israel, gave expression to this general mood on August 1, when he stated that "the Palestinian Arab exodus of 1948 is one of those cataclysmic phenomena which, according to the experience of other countries, changes the course of history."

Officially, Israeli government spokesmen have not gone as far as to deny, in principle, the right of the Arab refugees to return to their homes in Palestine. Nevertheless, despite the original promises, mere cessation of hostilities is no longer

enough for their return. Only when a stable peace is concluded and signed will the question of their coming home even be considered. There is no longer the same frank recognition of the right of the Arab peasant or worker to return to his home in Israeli territory.

The question is now admittedly the subject of deals with reactionary Arab League governments. Power politics reigns supreme over human politics. The atrocious pogroms against the Jews in Cairo and the crime of the concentration camp on Cyprus call for retribution, but can hardly justify this anti-democratic exclusion policy. The Israeli state cannot be built through the exclusion of its Arab population.

While legitimate considerations of military security and economic hardship do exist, they are being exploited beyond their justified limits. Judging from the absence of any trouble with the fifty to one hundred thousand Arabs who remained in Israeli territory, there is reason to assume that a safe way could have been found to take back, without much

danger of fifth column activities, most of the Arabs who fled, especially the aged, women and children.

As to the natural reluctance to accept the onerous burden of supporting these destitute masses, recent events demonstrate that the Israeli position would have been, morally and diplomatically, immeasurably stronger if the Israeli government had signified its readiness to accept the war refugees on condition that international economic aid was forthcoming.

There remains one consideration of great moral strength, the "position and fate of the Israeli communities in Arab countries." An attempt will be made to use the Palestine Arab refugee problem as a bargaining weapon to improve the conditions of these communities or if possible to effect an exchange of populations.

In this connection three aspects of the question should be kept in mind:

(1) It is highly improbable that the Iraqi and Egyptian governments are so genuinely concerned about the hardships endured by the dispo-

(Continued on page 3)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Leonard Launches New UAW Caucus

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—In case any autoworker hasn't heard, there is a "new caucus" formed in the UAW-CIO.

According to the publicity thus far given out, this caucus is against all "isms" against the Communist Party, against Walter P. Reuther, against Reuther's "peace at any price policy," and for better contracts, social security, pensions, justice, good fellowship, as well as better jobs for the members of the caucus, especially those who once held union posts and have been retired from them by the rank and file in the elections during the past year.

Among the great stalwarts who head this "new caucus," are Tracy Doll, for years the mouthpiece of the Stalinists in the Wayne County CIO Council, and a man about to lose his job. (He has broken with the Stalinist caucus recently—just by accident, to be sure, at a time when they appear to have lost control of the council, and power over his job.)

Kenneth Forbes, recently deposed as regional director, is another leader. Ditto Tom Cunningham, twice defeated candidate for president of Local 7. Some of the other members of the national steering committee are Ernie Mazey, John Anderson, and Gene Butler, of Detroit, and Joe Berry of Flint. Whitey Urban of Packard local is another.

FLOCK TO MURRAY

Just to list some of the leaders is to indicate what this caucus represents. All the non-Stalinists in the Stalinist caucus, have joined together to break with their Stalinist buddies because the CP is pretty much through in auto.

Indications of this break came recently in the Wayne County CIO Council, when all these forces deserted the CP in its fight to retain control

of the council, after Phil Murray, CIO president, put the heat on everyone. Murray demanded and obtained a postponement of the annual convention until non-affiliated locals could join and thus assure a sufficient majority to clean out the Stalinists.

Tracy Doll, as president of the council, made the motion to support Murray's telegram along those lines. Not to be outdone, Dick Leonard made a similar motion. But the final blow came when Erwin Bauer, of Local 306, also spoke for postponement of the convention (without acceding to Murray's demands on representation). The CP all but uttered, "Et Tu Brutus," at this display of independence. Until this meeting, the above mentioned people have been breathing fire and brimstone at the very mention of Murray's name.

SOMETHING TO BEHOLD

That meeting of the Wayne County CIO Council was truly a spectacle to behold. The Stalinists were sick-looking, and deservedly so, at how their allies were suddenly finding themselves to be CIO patriots after all.

The Reuther caucus sat through this meeting, enjoying themselves thoroughly, as they watched Doll, Leonard, and the others retreat to safer shores.

This was just one of the events that caused the formation of the "new caucus." Although the Leonard group hasn't announced its full program, certainly enough has been presented for a critical analysis of this tendency.

Take the matter of being against "isms." To whom will that point in the platform appeal, except to the 100 per cent "American" type; that is, the reactionary and backward elements in the union. How some of the people in that caucus swallowed such a plank is almost difficult to understand. But then if your thinking can get you in the position where you believe Russia is a state worth defending, you can believe anything.

Although we haven't seen the Stalinist comment on the section against the Communist Party, we are sure they'll denounce it as "red-baiting," and point out, with some justice, that these same people called Reuther a red-baiter because he said either identical or similar things about the CP. But then such a switch in position is a minor trifle, in the interests of a clever maneuver, no doubt.

SIZZLING MILITANCY

The payoff comes on the big issue, "militant trade union policy." And look who the speaker is: Dick Leonard, author of the company security clause in the Ford contract, the advocate of a lousy pension plan system which the Ford workers decisively rejected.

Leonard denounced the results of the recent strikes and negotiations. The UAW-CIO should have obtained adequate social security, and pensions! Yes sir. And why didn't brother Leonard say so during negotiations at Chrysler, for example, because, you see, he didn't want to upset the apple cart. So he went along, and made some speeches, along with his supporters, on how good the Chrysler contract was. And his supporters said Leonard deserves to be Chrysler director because of his outstanding work in Chrysler negotiations during the strike.

And besides, Leonard led the opposition to any escalator clause, that sell-out clause which only the corporations and the nasty "Trotskyites" want. Just in passing, we'd like to see Leonard and Ernie Mazey on the same negotiating committee, when the issue of an escalator clause came up. Or is agreement on this question just another trifle, not to interfere with the formation of a "progressive caucus."

As for the "peace at any price" policy which Reuther allegedly follows, it seems that only recently in Detroit the Reuther forces led a strike at

Chrysler which they organized. And prepared one at GM in event the corporation didn't come through. But then, autoworkers are supposed to be simpleminded, and not remember such things. So this clique of disgruntled ex-porkchoppers, political opportunists, and ex-fellow-travelers, tried to sell this song and dance to the autoworkers. The response is not likely to be good.

SILENCE NOT ALWAYS GOLDEN

There are a couple of other interesting points to bring up in preliminary discussion of this caucus. One of the burning issues before the autoworkers is the question of political action. Where does this caucus stand? Silence! Talk about militancy and bravery.

Everyone knows where Urban and Cunningham stand. They are strong Wallaceites. Leonard, it can be safely said, is going along with Murray policy. So why in Marx's sake should persons like Ernie Mazey take political responsibility for that kind of mish-mash tendency?

Walter Reuther dismissed the whole thing as "just another example of the kind of factionalism the UAW members won't stand for." He's a lucky fellow, for it would take a few political miracles to cause the Leonard caucus to make him lose any sleep.

The Leonard caucus has announced a big meeting in September, where it intends to present a complete program. This we'll watch with interest, and report our findings for LABOR ACTION.

HENRY WALLACE Man and Myth By DWIGHT MacDONALD \$2.50 Order your copy from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Sq., L. C. C. 1, N. Y. Price includes postage

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

12-33 RENEW NOW EXTEND YOUR SUB

Well, Brother Meany.

George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the AFL, at the New York State Federation of Labor convention:

"The issues between major political parties are fictitious. The secret issue is the ins want to stay in and the outs want to get in.

"What's our answer? Should we tie up the AFL to a political party? The Democratic Party? What of those 115 Democrats who put on labor the cross in the form of the Taft-Hartley Law? What about that part of the Democratic Party which bases human values on the color of a man's skin? Tie up with Wallace and go along with those who believe in the barbaric philosophy of Moscow? Tie up with the Republican Party because some people think that the Republican presidential candidate would repeal the obnoxious sections of the Taft-Hartley Law? I haven't heard the Republican candidate say anything about the Taft-Hartley Law."

Well, Brother Meany, what is your answer? Ours is a LABOR PARTY!

WALLACE LEAVES FISHER BODY WORKERS CLOSED

A practical demonstration of the effects of Stalinism on a local union was given to Fisher Body Local 45 of the United Auto Workers-CIO on Sunday, August 8. A membership meeting called for this date failed to draw the fifty members required for a quorum and caused the cancellation of the meeting.

With approximately 3,500 members in the local, such an obvious lack of interest can only reflect on the leadership of the union. This leadership has followed the Stalinist policy of subordinating all union activity to pushing the campaign for Henry Wallace. All meetings over the past period have been mainly pep rallies for the CP-inspired Progressive Party. The union newspaper devotes most of its space to promoting Henry and his pro-Stalinist line.

The agenda of this meeting had contained several important items; but the knowledge that the report of the local's delegates to the Wallace convention would dominate the meeting kept the disgusted members from organizing the new Euclid plant (where General Motors is cutting rates on line after line transferred from the Coit Road plant) and the question of an assessment to aid the cafeteria workers on strike for two months, failed to offset the coolness to the third party among the workers.

While LABOR ACTION believes that workers should attend their union meetings and see to it that policies of their locals are in their own interests and not footfalls for any clique, the responsibility for this complete lack of interest in union activity is squarely on the shoulders of the union leaders who place the Stalinist line above all else and thus drive the workers away.

EXPLANATION: Pages 2 and 4 were reversed last week on the press. The error was not discovered until the entire edition was run off. There was no time to run a new edition. Our apologies.

Univis Strike Ends; Company Had Aid of National Guard

For the first time in 10 years Ohio National Guardsmen were ordered to intervene in a strike last week. The three-month old strike of Local 768, United Electrical Workers - CIO,

who had been accused of picket line violence would not return, and that their cases would go to arbitration.

Since the story alongside was written, the Univis strike has formally ended with a vote by the strikers to accept the new company terms. The company offered to rehire all the strikers on their old jobs or at jobs with comparable rates of pay, except for 11 strikers, whom the company charges with "illegal picketing" and "excessive violence" and whose cases will go to arbitration.

The strike itself has a bitter and confusing history. It started May 5 with a demand for a 13-cent wage increase. On July 23 the UE lost a decertification election, 302 to 272. The union claims it is still the bargaining agent, as the NLRB has not yet certified the election. Just what caused the union to lose the election is not clear. Meanwhile an "independent" union of non-strikers has appeared.

against the Univis Lens Co. in Dayton was set back considerably by this action of Governor Thomas J. Herbert. Under the guns and tanks of 700 National Guardsmen, the plant was reopened Wednesday, August 4, and non-strikers went to work.

Under the guns of the Guard, management was able to resume production, and the strike was rendered ineffective. "With order restored" (read: strike broken) the governor has withdrawn the National Guard and has offered to intervene again for a settlement, if the union will absolutely agree in advance to abide by any settlement reached by its representatives.

The local union and other CIO unions in Dayton had been massing pickets to keep the Univis plant closed. This was done despite a court order limiting the number of pickets to six. The company, through Dayton's Mayor Louis W. Lohrey, had asked for the National Guard Friday, July 30. In the following few days the governor met with representatives of the union and management.

The latest news is that the union has agreed to this, but now that the plant is running, management has lost interest in meeting with the union. The governor has done his job for management, and the workers can see for themselves just how "impartial" the government can be.

Sunday, August 1, an agreement was reached with the union's leaders. Univis had just previously granted an 11 cent wage increase, in an attempt to take the sting out of the strike. The Sunday agreement was that the strikers would return to work, but that 11 leaders of the union

Congress Closes --

(Continued from page 1) known to both House and Senate committees doing the sleuthing some time ago. The special session was a perfect time to publicize the material and distract attention. Truman again made some political capital by his "red herring" charge against the committees. The charges of the committees were involving too many former members of the official family. Truman may have effectively parried, for the time being anyway, the Republicans' planned counter-campaign to his likely accusations of Republican inaction on vital issues. But the government prosecution of the leading Stalinists under the notorious Smith Act awaits continued action with the active collaboration of the administration's Justice Department.

Party will probably gain some support as a result of the antics of its leading rivals, but its true complexion has been too clearly revealed to justify its taking in too many unwary individuals. The sentiment for independent labor political action should increase daily. The time to begin organizing a genuine Labor Party is now. The candidates of both Republican and Democratic Parties, as well as those of the Stalinist-organized Progressive Party must be summarily rejected—one and all. Any one of the three candidates for president nominated by socialist groups, Farrell Dobbs of the Socialist Workers Party, Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party or Edward Teichert of the Socialist Labor Party, is an indicated choice. We do not entirely agree with any of them, and none represents a mass political movement. But a vote for any of them is a vote against the machinations of capitalist and Stalinist politicians. A socialist protest vote

NOW! OUT! The NEW INTERNATIONAL August 1948 TITO VS. THE KREMLIN Beginning of the End of Stalinism by Max Shachtman Roosevelt's Secret War by Theodore Enright Two Conventions: Challenge to Labor by The Editors TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

Israeli Policy on Arabs --

(Continued from page 1) sessed refugees that they would materially improve the conditions of their oppressed Jewish communities.

(2) Economically and vocationally these two populations are not interchangeable.

(3) In all likelihood, the overwhelming majority of the Arab refugees would refuse to remain in their countries of exile and would wish to return to their homes in Israel. One can conceive of obtaining the agreement of corrupt Arab League rulers to a transfer deal of sorts but what happens to the right of self-determination of these hundreds of thousands of Arab civilians who by general Israeli admission are, by and large, innocent of active collaboration in the war of the Mufti and Arab League states against Israel?

ocratic considerations, this exclusion policy—which is opposed by large sections of the Israeli labor movement—is utopian and suicidal.

It must be crystal clear to all who look ahead and are not overwhelmed by temporary military superiority that the Israeli state cannot remain in a PERMANENT state of conflict with the Arab world.

BUILDING ON QUICKSAND In a world of imperialist intrigues and shifting alliances, who can predict how long the backward Arab states will remain economically and MILITARILY weak?

Which of the big imperialist powers can a tiny, isolated Israeli state count upon as a trustworthy ally against a hostile Arab world?

Despite the very significant support given the Israeli state by Russia, who can assert with certainty

that tomorrow or the day after tomorrow Russia will not revert to its former pro-Arab policy?

To build on the support of foreign imperialist aid, whether it be Anglo-American or Russian, is to build on quicksand.

The survival and security of Israel depend, in the long run, on bridging the gap between the Arab and Jewish peoples of Palestine.

There is no better way to break the Mufti-spread fear of annihilation and degradation at the hands of the Jews than through a democratic and humane treatment of the Arab population of Israel. The advantages outweigh all disadvantages.

An indicated first step in this direction is a clear and frank statement on the part of the Israeli government that the Arabs of Israel will be welcomed home.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Concerning Policy on the China War

Editor:

The author of the recent article, "Behind North China's Unification," has characterized the Chinese "civil war" as merely a veiled contest between the U. S. and Russia. I believe such an interpretation is not only superficial, but incorrect as well. The civil war would be an imperialist war in effect only if Russia and the United States were actively supporting the Chinese Stalinists and the Kuomintang respectively. U. S. support to Nationalist China has been negligible, as we all know. The writer seeks to explain this fact by saying that American capitalism has not aided the Kuomintang because of the instability of the regime. This tells us nothing, however, because it is precisely the LACK of aid to the Kuomintang that has contributed greatly to that instability.

ever. Not only did Wall Street prefer to maintain "friendly" relations with Russia, but it considered it far more necessary to spend its money rebuilding Japan, Germany, and Western Europe. The short run interests of Wall Street demanded peace in China under an imperialist-dictated coalition government.

Through General Marshall, America strove to force Chiang Kai-shek to submit to a coalition with the Stalinists. Had Chiang done so, China would have been literally partitioned between the U. S. and Russia. In the spring of 1946, strong mass nationalist and anti-Soviet sentiment in China helped wreck the Marshall

mission. The Chinese bourgeoisie, knowing that a "coalition government" would be detrimental to their interests, finally began to revive the civil war against the wishes of General Marshall. The war was a direct blow against the interests of U. S. imperialism, which demanded peace.

As the war was stepped up in June-July, 1946, Marshall began to cut off military and economic aid to China. All military aid (excepting token support) was, shortly afterward, cut off. From then on, to the present date, the United States has, in effect, been applying economic sanctions to Nationalist China. American imperialism today plays only a minor and

subordinate role in China. The war, therefore, is a NATIONAL war against Stalinist imperialism. War conditions are driving U. S. capital OUT of China. The Chinese bourgeoisie, in the guise of state monopolies, is taking over, or driving from the field, American enterprises.

Because the war is being led by the bourgeoisie in an epoch in which capitalism is reactionary everywhere in the world, it cannot be supported by Marxists. But because it is a national war, nevertheless, the Chinese Republic must be DEFENDED FROM the Stalinists. The programmatic aim of the Chinese proletariat must be to TAKE OVER the defense of the

nation FROM the bourgeoisie. Only the workers can bring the national war to a successful conclusion.

Chiang Kai-shek is committed to a war to the finish. If he fails, it appears likely that T. V. Soong, the pro-American compradore-financier, will assume power in South China. T. V., who has the support of the U. S., will, with American backing, sue for peace with the Stalinists. Even now a part of the Chinese warlord and capitalist class is going over to the Stalinists. U. S. capitalism hopes for a new peace so it can trade with both sides.

Vincent P. TOROSSIAN Berkeley, Calif.

"Comrade" Tito: Or a Postscript on the SWP

Two weeks ago, LABOR ACTION dealt at length with the contortions of the Socialist Workers Party in its attempt to wriggle out of the theoretical difficulties in which the Tito-Stalin rift had involved it. Among its squirmings, we indicated the ambiguity of the SWP editorial on its attitude toward Tito. We said that the editorial seemed to support Tito and yet at the same time managed not to say so explicitly. We pointed out that the editorial practically identified Tito with the masses of Yugoslavia and had just about baptized the new Yugoslavia as a Workers' and Peasants' State. Just about... but not quite, we thought.

The SWP has now come out from under its bushel and it is only proper to record the fact. There can no longer be any question of ambiguity or vagueness about its attitude toward Tito. Two weeks after the editorial, there appeared in the Militant a letter written by the International Secretariat of the Fourth International to the "Central Committee and to all Members of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia."

Fittingly, it opens with the salutation of "Comrades." After pointing out to "Comrade" Tito and the rest how they have been insulted and slandered by the Kremlin and how they are now in a position to understand the real meaning of the Moscow trials, the letter says: "You hold in your hands a mighty power if only you summon enough strength to persevere on the road of the socialist revolution and its program." The letter urges Tito to "Keep up your fight!" It advises: "Establish a regime of genuine workers' democracy in your party and in your country!" Since this is "our first message to you" (apparently, a long and rich correspondence is being initiated) the letter does not choose to be critical of the past of Tito. "We wish rather to take note of the promise in your resistance—the promise of victorious resistancy by a revolutionary workers party...."

In this note, we wish only to record the fact of the SWP position, not to dwell on it. Tito is now a "comrade" to the secretariat of the Fourth International, his party is a "revolutionary workers party," he is on the "road of the socialist revolution" and need only "persevere" in it, and

since even these zealots recognize the undemocratic character of Tito's party, he is advised to change that forthwith. Clearly history has wasted its time on the secretariat of the Fourth International. It is as if the last twenty years did not happen and a left opposition to Stalinism was still trying to change it from inside the party, as loyal members, critical of the leadership and full of sound advice. That is the SWP today, moving fast on the treadmill of its own program which has been carefully immunized from contamination by history.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL One year (52 issues) at \$1.00 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents NAME (please print) ADDRESS APT. CITY ZONE STATE Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

SWP Feigns Shock Over Election Policy of WP

By HAL DRAPER

The Socialist Workers Party's *Militant* has been stung to the quick. It complains in an August 9 editorial that the Workers Party (those durned "Shachtmanites") has refused to give sole, single and undivided support to its own presidential candidate, Dobbs.

It is horrified to discover that the WP thinks pink Norman Thomas is no less and no more a socialist than the Cannonite Dobbs (a "compliment," we shall point out, which cuts both ways) and that the same goes for the Socialist Labor Party's Teichert. In other words, it is griping about the fact that the WP has put Dobbs, Thomas and Teichert—the three socialist candidates for the presidency—on the same footing and advises workers to cast a socialist protest vote by voting for any one of them.

This simple proposition the *Militant* editorial calls "shameful," "without precedent," and "bizarre," in that order. The middle term will be worth discussing after we have disposed of a few other features of the *Militant* diatribe that cannot be left unnoticed. Suffice to say immediately that we plead guilty to the charge of breaking precedent. In fact we insist upon it. To the monolithic SWP mind, we are aware, this closes the case: for them the possibility of new departures in the Marxist movement ended with Trotsky's death. Trotsky himself, to be sure, was a great Marxist precisely because of the many precedents he so brilliantly shattered, because of his unwillingness to substitute a thumb index for a brain. Sad to say, however, if the latter is lacking, the former unsuccessfully replaces it.

THE LOGIC OF HYPOCRISY

But first, the few necessary terse comments on the unsavory portions of the *Militant* editorial. No Cannonite polemic would be complete without such.

Right off, we call our readers' attention to the hypocritical note of shock and disappointment in their remarks. Why hypocritical? Because no one would ever suspect from merely reading this piece of chicanery that it comes from the mouth of a party which has consistently refused, in every case that has come up in the past eight years, to support a single candidate of the Workers Party in any part of the country! In every case without exception, from New York to Los Angeles, with no candidate of their own running, their line was to advocate abstention—that is, tell workers there was no one to vote for, and certainly not to vote for the WP.

Now logic also cuts both ways. On what ground can they pretend shocked surprise at our refusal to support Dobbs against the field? There is only one ground possible and that a political one: on the ground of the similarity of our political line with theirs, on the ground that our policies are sufficiently close to theirs to make it mandatory that we favor them above Norman Thomas and Teichert. Unless they claim this is so, and are writing to convince the well-known "honest workers" that this is so, they are hypocrites and dodgers with whom one cannot even enjoy useful discussion.

But they do not believe this is so. They shout from their houseposts that this is not so. And for eight years they have acted on this belief. For if our lines were that close, then they would have been as thoroughly obliged to support OUR candidates as they now feign pained surprise that we refuse to support theirs.

Indeed it is this political question which is at the heart of the matter. And the second piece of blatant hypocrisy is that they deliberately conceal from their readers our own forthright statement on the matter, made by the same National Committee meeting (in its resolution on the SWP's international faction, the Fourth International majority) which adopted the election statement.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SWP

As anyone interested in our movement knows, up to recently we did indeed follow the policy of giving support to SWP candidates in every case where we ourselves had no competing candidate. We did so precisely because we were following the criterion stated above: we believed there was a close enough political affinity between our two movements to justify this policy. The SWP has worked hard at the task of convincing us that no such affinity exists. They have succeeded, not by force of their content-less screams of anger and abuse, but by the hair-raising development of their political line, their ever more rapid degeneration toward a "left" critical appendage of the Stalinists.

We have noted this degeneration as we have gone along and there is no need to repeat the acrid details here. It happens, however, that even as this is written, we learn of a latest development which puts all others in the shade. It is an eleven-page open letter addressed to the Yugoslav Communist Party, the totalitarian tyrants of the Yugoslav people who have fallen out with the totalitarian tyrants of the Kremlin; it is signed by the secretariat of the Fourth International.

Addressing the Titos of Belgrade as "comrades," written throughout in the gentle cooling terms that one might use only toward honest revolutionary rank-and-file workers breaking with Stalinism, this astounding letter ends with the slogan: "Yugoslav Communists, Let Us Unite Our Forces for a New Leninist International! For the World Victory of Communism!" It asks Tito "to permit a delegation of its [Fourth International's] leadership to attend your congress, to make contact with the Yugoslav Communist movement to knit close fraternal ties with you, which can only be of service to the world Communist movement." The Fourth International leadership

furthermore announces there "a vast campaign of protest against the bureaucratic measures which the Cominform has taken against you. . . Tomorrow it will make known your documents in twenty different languages, because a Communist cannot tolerate that a militant be judged without a hearing."

Perhaps this letter is addressed to the "honest" rank-and-file against Tito? Perish the thought! In a remarkable passage it specifically warns against those who may propose "to change your leadership," in the course of warning against capitulation to the Kremlin. While the language ties one up with the other, there is not a word which even hints that the Yugoslav CP might indeed benefit from a change in leadership or even distantly breathe of any difference in interest between the ruling bureaucracy and the rank-and-file cadres. On the contrary! The entire letter is an appeal to the LEADERSHIP to follow the "Leninist road," and when it speaks of the "very great obstacles" to this delightful consummation it points precisely to the ranks: "A complete re-education of your cadres in the spirit of true Leninism would be necessary." Needless to say after this, there is also not a word in the entire eleven pages of belly-crawling to hint that Yugoslavia under Tito is a totalitarian prison state. . . .

We will go into detail elsewhere on this monstrous development in the Fourth Internationalist movement. Though this document was not yet known at the time, the recent meeting of our National Committee already stated in precise political language a characterization of the leadership which gave birth to it, which that leadership only confirmed with unexpected rigor by producing it. Where before our characterization was a deduction from a political analysis, it has in one month become a simple description. The political line of Cannonism is that of a "left" critical appendage of Stalinism, a "democratic" wing of Stalinism, so to speak.

TEST OF REVOLUTIONARY POLICY

It is therefore with a supple pen that the *Militant* editorialist wrote: the WP "cannot distinguish between Thomas, a supporter of American imperialism, and Dobbs, a consistent opponent of Wall Street and its policies." Now being a "consistent opponent of Wall Street and its policies" is in itself no recommendation nowadays. SO IS FOSTER AND THE ENTIRE STALINIST BROOD. The SWP, clinging to its formula of "defense of the Soviet Union," is a supporter of Russian imperialism in exactly the same sense in which Norman Thomas is a supporter of American imperialism. That is the charge which our pro-Stalinist "Trotskyists" (God save the mark!) delicately ignore.

The mark of a revolutionary Marxist today is consistent opposition to BOTH the imperialism of Wall Street and the Kremlin, BOTH Washington and Moscow. Both great imperialist poles wreak their disorientation in the socialist movement: the SWP is drawn toward one pole where the reformists are drawn to the other. To paraphrase a well-known remark of Trotsky's: pro-Russian Cannonism and pro-American social-democracy "are symmetrical phenomena."

We wish to point out another "symmetrical phenomenon" inherent in the situation. The real supporters of Norman Thomas get just as indignant about our inclusion of the SWP's man Dobbs among the three socialist candidates we present for a vote without preference, as does the SWP about our inclusion of Norman Thomas. And for the same social-patriotic reasons (whether it be American social-patriotism or ersatz Russian). We cite, of course, the reaction of Albert Goldman, who recently resigned from the Workers Party with an outburst of indignation that bears in some respects an interesting similarity to that of the SWP editorialist. . . . the similarity of being symmetrical, not identical. Now, we can imagine an argument as to whether it is less "socialist" to support a totalitarian butcher in another country than to support one's "own" imperialist at home, but we politely decline to participate in it.

THINGS THEY CANNOT UNDERSTAND

Which brings us to a gem of our subject editorial: "This [the WP's] is the same kind of unprincipled politics which seeks to include in the same party those like Albert Goldman and others who acclaim the Marshall Plan, and those who opposed it." Writing of course before knowledge of Goldman's resignation, the totalitarian-minded minuscules of the SWP just cannot help showing the cloven hoof. As they know well enough, the Workers Party has adopted a position of uncompromising opposition to the Marshall Plan as the arm of American imperialism today. Exactly what then are they complaining about? That Goldman was not expelled for disagreeing with the party majority? No other conclusion is remotely possible, nor is any other consistent with the actual ideology of the Cannonites. Are they complaining that we permit comrades to be members of the Workers Party who favor the policy of supporting Thomas against the field? Quite apart from the fact that this is a legitimate difference of opinion for any but an outright Stalinist outfit, we beg to point out that in the Cannonite party and on the Cannonite National Committee are members who favor support of a party which is neither socialist nor working-class, a party which the SWP itself denigrates as a "third capitalist party," a party which we consider to be essentially a Stalinist front—namely, the Wallace party.

Actually, the *Militant* rings in the name of Goldman in order to put forward the "theory" that our position on the elections was adopted as "an obvious (sic) attempt to overcome its internal differences and reconcile the conflicting tendencies within the organization." The Cannonites project their own spirit of internal party maneuvering onto our party. It is as if they had asked themselves: "What might we do in a similar situation?" Let us make this perfectly clear: *The Workers Party does not operate that way.*

We have made it clear that it is politically impossible, from OUR point of view, to express a preference as between the pro-Russianism of the SWP and the pro-Westernism of the reformist socialists. This is an inherent and integral part of our basic view of the other; it flows from that imperialist position and no other. There is indeed only one other position on the election campaign which is consistent with that approach: namely, refusal to support any candidate at all, (Continued in last column)

WORLD POLITICS

New U. S. Policy in Japan

A new labor policy has been announced by the Japanese cabinet which formalizes the new social policy of the occupation. This new decree, based on an order from MacArthur's headquarters, was issued almost on the anniversary of the third year of the occupation. It indicates the basic revision of American policy in Japan and in the Pacific.

The decree does the following: it ends collective bargaining for government workers, reduces the function of the government workers' unions to "advising" officials, prohibits strikes in government agencies and prohibits union functionaries on government premises, also withdrawing all physical and financial support to these unions.

This last point refers to a unique Japanese phenomenon which is a heritage of the paternalistic order in industry. Most Japanese unions hold meetings during working hours, in halls provided by the employers, and most union officials are paid directly by the employers as part of the regular payroll. Also, offices and office equipment, as well as most union expenses are paid by the employer. These subsidies are now ended for government workers' unions.

REACTION COMES OUT OF SHADOWS

About one and a half million workers are thus affected. Most of them are organized in the NCIU (Nippon Congress of Industrial Unions) and are under heavy Stalinist influence. In fact, these unions constitute the largest bloc in the NCIU and, through them, the most substantial bases for Stalinist trade union power. The Communist Party had concentrated these last three years on these government unions. The decree, in this sense, will most immediately seriously damage and weaken the CP formal position in the labor unions.

The largest unions involved are the Transport and Communications organizations. In Japan the government operates monopolies in a number of service and productive fields which in the U. S. are privately owned. Most of the railroads, telegraph and telephone, tobacco, many shipyards and electric power stations are government-owned. The workers in all these fields are affected. In effect, a huge bloc of workers are split off from the organized labor movement and put in a separate pale.

These government workers' unions were the most active organizers of the aborted general strike of February 1, 1947, which marked the high-water mark of union advancement, of labor unity and organization, and was the turning point in occupation policy from one of encouragement of workers' organization, then to tolerance, and during the past year to increasingly open attacks.

Class relations have been sharply altered by these changes. The working class operates in an increasingly hostile political and social milieu. The trend toward the right in politics parallels the resurgence of the Zaibatsu (financial clique). The governmental bureaucracy is regaining its old arrogance. The ruling class no longer is uncertain, confused and fearful. It now has powerful national parties and is openly forming a new center for rightist politics. Reaction has come out of the shadows to open alliance with the occupation, in support of the new social policy of struggle against labor.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IS DETERIORATING

The position of the labor movement has steadily deteriorated since MacArthur broke the February, 1947 general strike, even though the Social Democratic Party led the government for much of this time and now participates in a bourgeois coalition. The Social Democracy came to power last summer as a result of the political upsurge at the April elections, when labor, defeated on the union front, turned to strong parliamentary action. However, the Social Democracy did not carry through a single one of the reforms its program had promised. It was a do-nothing cabinet, while the economic and social situation continued to deteriorate sharply. Its sole important action was to fix wages and prices, enforcing only the former.

The present government of Ashida is a coalition of the Democratic, Cooperative and Social Democratic Parties. This government has proved itself to be a pliable tool for the occupation, initiating only what the occupation has demanded. It has maintained the wage freeze for government workers, has not been able to stabilize prices or control the black market, has reduced taxes on profits and raised profit ceilings.

Its worst aspect is the presence of Kanju Kato and M. Suzuki in the cabinet. These men are the leaders of the "left-wing" of the SDP, a centrist grouping which won control at the last Party Congress. These men, with reputations for militancy, have capitulated at every step, and by remaining in the cabinet now give acquiescence to the new anti-labor decrees. With their failure, the hopes which the masses placed in the SDP have been struck a serious blow. It can be expected that the CP will gain considerably in popularity as a consequence. The Social Democracy is rapidly deteriorating, under the regime of the Centrists, to its pre-war conservatism and to the open support of American imperialism.

Moscow Parleys on Berlin - -

(Continued from page 1)

blockade continues. For the mere continuation of the blockade, especially into the winter months, will make it increasingly difficult for the U. S. to sustain its airlift feeding and fueling of Berlin. On the other hand, conferences guaranteed in advance to be futile, are precisely what the U. S. does not want. If it cannot get the blockade lifted by diplomacy, and if it is not yet ready to start shooting, then the U. S. is anxious to proceed full speed in the setting up of Western Germany, the integration of the new unit into the Marshall Plan and the building of a strong West German state in preparation for the war against Russia.

Though there seems no way, short of war, out of this stalemate, it seems clear that neither side wants war immediately. Certainly, neither side can risk the onus of having started the war. And Russia, at least, is industrially not prepared to fight it. Time serves Russia well. While it continues to integrate the economies of Eastern Europe into the Russian economy, while it builds up its own industrial strength, it is now, less spectacularly but none the less sure-

Stalinism has had a difficult time in occupied Japan. Though it has not suffered any special disabilities and has operated with complete freedom, it has not won the confidence of the working masses. It has only about 30,000 members. Its relation to the NCIU is similar to its place in the American unions which it controls: that is, its dominance is from the top, by virtue of key positions rather than from mass membership support.

STALINISTS MAKE NATIONALIST APPEAL

The CPJ suffers from the popular hatred of Russia, which still holds 500,000 Japanese soldiers in forced labor camps, and from the tales of privation and terror which have come down from newly Russian-occupied Southern Sakhalin. Also dominating all thinking is the fear of war between Russia and the U. S. While the Japanese do not relish being a floating airfield for U. S. bankers, they prefer being an airfield than being a completely undefended atomic target for both powers.

Recently the CP has begun a serious campaign to achieve mass popularity. It has led the fight for an end to the wage freeze and other economic issues. It has opened a far-reaching struggle against the increasingly-hated Ashida regime, demanding its resignation. And now for the first time the CP declares, "war against fascism and third party interference." This is the most open opposition to the occupation that any party has uttered. Heretofore, all parties, from left to right, have supported the occupation.

The new CP line has so far developed along nationalist lines. If the centrists have become more pro-American, the Stalinists have become more chauvinistic. They have perverted the struggle for national independence by orienting their nationalist appeal along traditional jingoist lines. Thus, for example, they have revived the slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics," and their press talks of the "Yamato race," the chauvinistic master-race term of the militarists. This is the adaptation of Russian policy for Asia to Japan. The CP will increasingly attempt to organize a struggle against the occupation, and in all probability on a distorted nationalist and racist basis.

Nevertheless, the Stalinists may very well grow in the next period. Their nationalism, combined with critical opposition to occupation policies, may make them the center of popular tendencies which are moving toward a break with the occupation.

RECONSTRUCTING A ZAIBATSU JAPAN

The new anti-labor decrees were actually formulated by MacArthur's office. They were immediately understood by the reactionaries as constituting a green light for an all-sided anti-labor offensive led by the government and under the cry of anti-Communism. The attempted assassination of Tokuda, CP chieftain, arrest of strikers, use of U. S. Army units to break picket lines, as at the Yokasuka Arsenal last month—all these are the conditions of the new social offensive from the right. There must grow an increasing antagonism between the occupation and the masses as MacArthur further implements the new American policy. Unless a democratic, revolutionary alternative develops out of the SDP left-wing, Stalinism will gain.

The occupation has now taken a decisive turn toward reconstruction of a Zaibatsu Japan based on a subordinated ruling class and a subjugated laboring class. At the war's end, American Pacific policy was predicated on the transformation of a politically unified China into a continental political, economic and military stronghold for American imperialism. In such an Asiatic context, Japan was assigned the role of a passive, demilitarized base. The social policy which flowed from this was the weakening of the Zaibatsu, extensive deindustrialization and limitation of Japanese industry to a few consumers' items produced by handicraft production. The labor movement was encouraged as one of the instruments for undermining the Zaibatsu and providing a popular support for American policy.

But China is rapidly going Stalinist. The American imperialist dream has been shattered by the victories of its adversary. The China policy of the U. S. is bankrupt. In this new context of a narrowing American area in the Pacific, the U. S. has turned toward Japan. A Pacific demilitarized Japan is insufficient for U. S. imperialist needs now. The new policy based on the Draper-Johnson report of April 1947, calls for reconstruction of heavy industry with the aid of American loans amounting to a half billion dollars. It places emphasis on an expanded steel industry and puts an end to reparations or destruction of trusts. It looks toward a Zaibatsu Japan oriented toward heavy industry, with light industry serving as an auxiliary to the former supplied by export items, but not for internal distribution or raising living standards. Such an economic structure will base itself on low wages and increased exploitation of labor.

As the political weather-vane now moves to the right, the present government coalition—a Milquetoast third force—will fall. This present cabinet will probably fall this winter. The SDP will be driven out of the government. When the reaction has stabilized itself and proven its ability to implement American policy, the occupation may come to an end. Such is the trend of the moment.

JACK BRAD

Philadelphia Story

ANTI-UNION "PURGE" HIT BY UE PAMPHLET

By ANNE RUSSELL

This is another kind of Philadelphia story. It's a tale of two men, Frank Carner and Herb Lewin, union militants fired by the Westinghouse Electric Company early in July, and how they were reinstated by a stirring demonstration of workers' solidarity.

The story is told, simply but powerfully, in a pamphlet just issued by Local 107, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (CIO), entitled "Equal Justice Under Law."

Carner, an engineer, and Lewin, a sheet-metal worker, were summarily fired by the giant corporation on the advice of the navy that they were "poor security risks." No charges, no evidence, and no proof were presented either by the navy or the company.

The union officials exhausted the grievance procedure. The navy specified that the men had to be excluded from certain "classified areas," not from the entire plant. But the company was adamant: it welcomed this opportunity to slash out at the union.

The 6000 union members, veterans of many bitter struggles against the company, demonstrated their understanding of this kind of "loyalty purge." On July 12, when the second firing took place, an emergency meeting convened on company property. The members voted a sitdown strike—the first major sitdown in the last ten years. The workers from the other two shifts joined forces, and for 26 hours the plant was held by the strikers until the company agreed to meet with the union to resolve the cases.

The UE pamphlet places its finger on the threat contained in the firings: "This action not only places the job of every individual in jeopardy, but is the beginning of a potential blacklist in industry that will prevent those individuals on it from ever being employed anywhere." Carner and Lewin were but symbols for the Smiths and Jones who might suddenly be "purged" tomorrow.

CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, in Philadelphia at the time, came to the vigorous support of the embattled unionists. His strong letter to the secretary of the navy charged that the autocrat of the navy and the company displayed "an outrageous disregard of the sacred human rights of two American citizens" and engaged in "highly provocative procedures" and "star-chamber sessions."

Carey's letter pointed out: "It is highly possible, even probable, that Carner and Lewin are not in agreement with some of the policies of the Westinghouse concern or with those of the Department of Defense, or even with those of the U. S. government. I say quite frankly that I personally am in frequent disagreement with the policies of industrial management and with the policies of my government. I say so publicly. However, such disagreement . . . is evidence of vigorous loyalty to the democratic procedure under which we are presumed to live."

UE Local 107 did more than preserve the right of the labor movement to question and challenge. By its inspiring unity of action, it demonstrated to American labor how to repulse attacks on the union movement and on the vital liberties of members. In their words, "For the first time in a long time Americans have fought back . . . fought back and won! That's what makes this story different. Plain people in the face of much opposition stood up and were counted when they recognized their civil liberties being threatened. We haven't been hearing about this kind of thing lately, especially in the trade-union movement."

This hard-hitting pamphlet, which so clearly delineates the meaning of the events and points out the road for labor to follow, may be obtained from Local 107, United Electrical Workers, 345 Bartram Avenue, Essington, Penna.

Election Policy - -

(Continued from second column)

abstention in the campaign. Which brings us to the question of "precedents." As has so often been true in the United States, where the political backwardness of the labor movement is so evident and the socialist movement correspondingly weak, the revolutionary party is unable to run a candidate of its own—to raise its own banner on the electoral field. The sacred "precedent" to which the *Militant* refers so awesomely has been that, in such a case, you tell the working class not to vote, or at least, that it doesn't make any difference.

Now what gives pause about this advice is not that the working class is not going to take it; that, alas, is a blow which we are accustomed to withstand. What must give pause is that the advice is not justified from our own point of view.

We have touched upon our disagreements with the socialist groups running candidates. We disagree with them on important questions. We also disagree with the Democrats, Republicans and Wallaceites. The "precedent" has been that all these disagreements are put on the same footing and no distinctions drawn. This does not, however, correspond to the actual issues which are posed in the question of electoral choice. The differences between ourselves on the one hand and Thomas, Dobbs or Teichert on the other will not and cannot figure in the casting of a vote by any worker—it is a difference on WHICH socialist program to follow. But: the differences between Thomas, Dobbs, and Teichert on the one hand AND THE CAPITALIST CANDIDATES ON THE OTHER HAND will indeed figure in the casting of a vote by a worker—and it is a difference between casting a socialist protest vote or ENDORSING CAPITALISM.

This is the difference, and the ONLY difference, with which we are concerned in advising workers how to vote on the day in November when they are called upon to do so. For reasons which are inescapable precisely from our own political viewpoint, we consider a protest vote for Thomas as meaningful an act as a vote for Dobbs or Teichert, and vice versa.

When the AFL or CIO has (often) endorsed more than one candidate for the same office with the comment "no preference," it is also because from the viewpoint of THEIR politics, they see no distinction between the two sufficient to warrant a choice. We have not heard this procedure called "shameful," "bizarre," or blessed with any other epithets by the gentlemen of the SWP except insofar as the attack is leveled against the idea of endorsing ANY capitalist candidate, one or two or three. For us, we endorse the socialist candidates, "no preference."

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: IRonclides 6-5117
Vol. 12, No. 33 Aug. 16, 1948

Emanuel Garrett Gelman,
Editor

Editorial Board:
Hal Draper, Henry Judd
Business Manager: Paul Bern
Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24,
1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

**THE PERMANENT
REVOLUTION**
by
Leon Trotsky
\$3.50

Order Your Copy From
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

Chapters From a New Pamphlet by Jack Ranger

A Labor Party—A "Must" for American Workers

Chapter 2

What Has Happened?

THE truth is that something new has been added to American life, something that our grandfathers and great-grandfathers did not have to put up with: the growth of monopoly in all fields of life.

Beginning in 1900 with the organization of the first billion-dollar corporation, U. S. Steel, industry after industry has been captured by monopoly, until today there are more than forty billion-dollar corporations exercising a controlling interest in almost every important field—banking, insurance, railroading, steel, auto, rubber, aluminum, shipping, food, liquor, farm machinery, etc.

The system has grown old. Capitalism, which at one time permitted a progressive development of the nation's resources, has today turned into a fetter to further development.

Free land has disappeared. New inventions, unless they have a military value, are suppressed by the hundreds. The national debt has increased to more than \$250 billion. The nation is being more and more saddled with a military hierarchy. The fingers of the big banks are everywhere.

The federal police apparatus has grown enormously, together with repressive laws against the people. Transportation and distribution costs each year take a larger share of the nation's income, swallowing up 58 per cent of the consumer's dollar. The dollar itself becomes of less and less value as prices rise to the highest in history. Corporate profits in the opening months of 1948 are at an all-time high.

But there is no prosperity for the masses.

Monopoly Spreads

Liberal capitalism, based upon free trade and competition, has receded into the past, never to be recalled. It has been succeeded by monopoly capitalism, the rule of the banks, and by bureaucratic government "planning."

The United States, which from 1790 to 1890 appeared to the world as a great progressive force, the enemy of every tyrant and the friend of every free man, has turned into its opposite. The U. S. appears today in Europe and Asia and Latin America and Africa as a reactionary force. There is no anti-democratic gangster government anywhere on the earth outside the sphere of its Russian rival but cannot be assured of support from Washington—whether it be in China, Indonesia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Turkey, South Africa, Italy, France, Colombia or Brazil.

By all odds, the one most important factor bearing upon the lives of every person in the United States is the spread of monopoly. Steadily since 1900, monopoly has imprisoned segment after segment of the American economy, removing it from competition, lifting it above the people.

Under both Republican and Democratic administrations, monopoly has quietly advanced. Never did it grow

so swiftly as under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, from the days of the Blue Eagle to the war. With the post-war gift of the war factories to the monopolists, the latter may be said to have virtually completed their conquest of the United States. They have within their iron grasp all the most important industries of this nation, and can only grow further by gobbling up each other or by expanding their grip beyond the borders to other continents.

How hypocritical was big business in 1946 when it ordered its politicians to end price control, with the sly lie that "the play of natural supply-and-demand factors" would bring down prices!

Here is the point. Once monopoly controls an industry, that industry is lifted above "the play of natural supply-and-demand factors." Supply and demand, the old "law" of competitive capitalism under which our grandfathers lived, no longer operates in a monopolized economy. The monopoly, through its control of the supply, can charge any price it wishes, usually selecting that price at which its profits will be largest.

Monopoly pricing factors disregard the needs of the people. The monopoly takes its toll from the entire nation, forcing not only consumers but other less strongly organized industry to pay its ransom.

Giants of Capitalism

How much of our economy is now within the kingdom of monopoly?

In many industries (according to the government's Temporary National Economic Committee) concentration has reached the point where one or two companies control nine-tenths of the supply. A partial list of industries where there is only one dominant company (in 1937) would include: aluminum, shoe machinery, glass container machinery, optical glass, nickel, molybdenum, magnesium, magnesium alloys, telephone service, international communications, Pullman cars, transoceanic aviation, beryllium, etc.

Summaries of corporate income-tax returns for 1937 (the last "normal" year) showed that the 394 largest corporations in this country—less than one-tenth of one per cent of the total number reporting—owned about 45 per cent of the total corporate assets.

A special Securities and Exchange Commission study prepared for the TNEC showed the distribution of ownership in the 200 largest non-financial corporations in the United States. These 200 giants owned 40 per cent of the assets of all non-financial corporations, and accounted for nearly 45 per cent of the dividends distributed by such corporations. Their capital stock was valued at 65 per cent of the total of all non-financial corporations listed on the New York Stock and Curb Exchanges at the end of 1937. The SEC study showed that, in 1937, 75,000 persons owned fully half of all corporate stock held by individuals in this country.

Since the above figures were compiled, monopoly has walked in seven-league boots, impelled by the war dur-

ing which 100 large companies held 76 per cent of all war supplies contracts in excess of \$50,000.

Those industries not already controlled by monopoly achieve economic results similar to a monopoly through secret nation-wide price-fixing agreements by which all pledge not to cut prices below a certain figure. A tremendous extension of the price-fixing racket, covering even small items sold in drug and grocery stores, is the "Fair Trade Practice" law, whereby retailers are refused permission to handle an item unless they pledge, under penalty, not to sell it below a certain figure—that is, to hold up the public.

The monopolists today hold in their hands the threads that control the economy and the politics of this nation, and that determine the life of every person in America—what price we shall pay for the commodities we must have to live, whether we shall go to war, and where we shall go to war.

Where were the Republican and Democratic parties when the monopolists were taking over the economy?—the outraged "innocent" may ask.

The answer is simple: One of the fields where monopoly holds sway is the field of politics. The Republican and Democratic parties are the political servants of the monopolists, as we shall shortly show. These parties protect the monopolists and guard them from the charge of evading the law.

Oh, to be sure, the Department of Justice prosecutes the monopolists. It is forever filing anti-trust suits against the monopolists. But nothing happens.

The monopolists control the courts, from the Roosevelt-packed Supreme Court on down. Occasionally (and more and more seldom as the monopolists wax stronger) light fines are levied, which the monopolists pay as easily as you pay your carfare to work. For the monopolists can gouge the amount of the fine from the public in an hour of business.

How long has this been going on? Since 1900 and before, when U. S. Steel and Standard Oil were formed. Under Theodore Roosevelt, under Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, and Truman.

Time and again the parties of capitalism have investigated the trusts. The facts have been recorded. The most notable of these investigations were the Trust Investigation of 1900; the Armstrong Committee of 1906; the Stanley Committee of 1911; the Pujo Money Trust investigation of 1912; the Industrial Commission of 1916; the belated exposure of war profiteering by the Nye Committee in the 1930s; the O'Mahoney Monopoly Committee (Temporary National Economic Committee was its official title); and the Truman Committee of the Senate. But nothing has ever been done.

Monopoly and War

Just as the conquest of the American economy by monopoly has made for artificially high prices at home, so has it made for war abroad.

Most of the American trusts have large financial

stakes in other countries, in Latin America, Europe, Asia, Africa. They own factories abroad, obtain raw materials abroad, have large investments abroad, have markets abroad, and they all hope with good reason (under the bipartisan foreign policy of their political agents) to further enlarge their foreign holdings.

Whenever a war begins anywhere in the world—even such a "little" war as in Palestine—it immediately threatens the interests of American big business. The bankers go to work on the State Department, the State Department goes to work on the warring powers, and if the private investments abroad of U. S. capitalists are not protected, the State Department and the White House find means of provoking "incidents" which demand the intervention of the U. S. army and navy. The country is in the war. It was thus in 1917, it was thus in 1941, it will be thus tomorrow.

Why are American warships and marines in the Mediterranean today, why is President Truman giving hundreds of millions of dollars to the tyrannous rulers of Greece and Turkey, why is Washington pursuing a double game in Palestine and waging a "cold war" against its imperialist rival, Russia? It should be crystal-clear to anyone with an elementary knowledge of the world's resources that a large part of the answer lies in the fabulous oil reserves of the Near East, in the huge stakes in those reserves by U. S. oil companies, and in the threat to those investments from Russia and from the Palestinian hostilities.

Monopoly in Politics Too

Long before Marx saw the light of day, American political philosophers like James Madison and Alexander Hamilton understood very clearly that politics is but a reflection and extension of economic interests, and that the dominant economic interests in any nation dictate the policies of that nation.

So it has proved with the monopolists, as the next chapter will show. Just as the economic wealth of the nation has become concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer individuals commanding immense wealth, so have these same individuals extended their monopolist sway over the politics of the nation.

It is no exaggeration to say, for instance, that one corporation such as Standard Oil and its sister companies and subsidiaries swings a thousand times more weight in Washington than the 16 million members of organized labor.

Big business since 1900 has monopolized the politics of the nation, as it has monopolized the nation's economy.

This booklet presents a plan and a program to the workers and farmers of America to break the political monopoly of big business and to build a labor party which can take over the federal government and the state governments and place the political control of the nation in the hands of those who produce the nation's wealth, not in the hands of those who exploit the wealth and the people for their own narrow interests.

New Light on the Masaryk Suicide

By BEN HALL

In suicide, Jan Masaryk did not issue a heroic summons to the Czech people to begin the fight for their own liberty and independence. Quite the opposite. His death was a last futile appeal, obsequious as in life, to Stalin, and only Stalin begging for his intervention to preserve capitalist Czechoslovakia from Czech Stalinism in the interests of Russian Stalinism. Masaryk died without a word to the Czech people, for in fact he had nothing to tell them except the advice to remain quiescent and passive subjects of Russian imperialism. He killed himself not to ensure but to forestall all possible mass resistance to the Stalinist regime.

Silent in public, he spoke in secret to the real master. Several hours before committing suicide he addressed a letter to Stalin explaining the political significance of his act. This letter, of first rate importance in clarifying the development of the Czech events, appears in the July 17 issue of the New Leader, which reprints it from the French paper Combat.

BASIS OF POLICY

Discovered on Masaryk's desk after his suicide by Nosek, the Czech Stalinist Minister of Internal Affairs, and transmitted to Russia, it was seen by Captain Ivan Krylov, a Russian intelligence officer, who obtained a copy through a contact in the office of Marshal Bulganin, Russian Minister of War and a member of the Politburo. On April 24, Krylov, who had left Moscow on a special mission, decided to break with the Kremlin and take up residence in the West. Shortly thereafter, he turned the Masaryk letter over to the French press. Combat, before printing the letter, carefully investigated Krylov's claims and background. The letter provides documentary evidence not simply of the incapacity of the bourgeoisie to fight for the independence of Czechoslovakia from Russian imperialism, but of its deliberate and conscious policy

of undermining and preventing any such struggle.

(1) In Masaryk's view, the "independence" of Czechoslovakia was to be ensured by total and complete subservience to Russia. The Czech bourgeoisie was the best guardian of Russian interests and in return he expected Stalin to be the best guardian of its bourgeois regime. All of Masaryk's political acts, including the suicide itself, was based upon this policy.

"Even in the days of my youth," writes Masaryk in his secret letter to Stalin, "my father taught me that an independent Czechoslovakia could never exist without the direct and effective support of Russia against the waves of the German sea. This notion has been deeply rooted in me, as deeply as in the majority of Czech politicians. We, the Czechs, always thought that we could not rely on any country with the exception of Russia, to defend us against Germanism." And he goes on to record a long record of service by the Czech bourgeoisie to Russian imperialism even under the Czar. "I speeded up as much as I could the cession of the Bohemian uranium mines from Czechoslovakia to your country in order to show you clearly that in any armed conflict we would side with the USSR." And on the Marshall Plan he continues, "In refusing this aid I once more gave tangible proof that the foreign policy of my country aligned itself loyally with the interests of the USSR."

EXPECTED STALIN'S AID

(2) The February coup, pleads Masaryk, endangers the defense of . . . Russia. For, "there are thousands and thousands of intellectuals without whom you will never be able to erect your bastion of defense in Central Europe and render the Bohemian quadrilateral impregnable. Without this, all your precautionary measures will prove ineffectual, one day; for when the hour of mortal danger strikes for your country and all the Slavs, you will have here but a gov-

ernment hated by its country, despised by its ELITE, a government relying solely on the bayonets of its police and gendarmerie."

(3) Masaryk himself played a key role in legalizing the February Gottwald cabinet. "You know well," he reminds Stalin, "that my support played a decisive part and that after my intervention, President Benes gave his consent to the formation of the new Gottwald cabinet, thus forestalling civil war and a break between our country and the USSR."

(4) For services rendered, past, present and future, Masaryk expected Stalin's aid in preventing a Stalinist coup. "Right from the outset of the last government crisis, I wanted to know your personal opinion of the claims of the Czech Communist Party. . . . You explained to me that the USSR, as a measure of preventive security, needed in Prague a strong government, completely loyal both to the spirit and letter of the Russo-Czech alliance. . . . You had unlimited confidence in President Benes and above all in me. . . . Stalin maintained that the Czech National Assembly was "full of traitors and sworn enemies of the USSR" but Masaryk did not take this seriously. "In any case," continues Masaryk, "you clarified the question by indicating that the claims of the Communist Party by no means aimed at the sovietization of our country, but that the party simply wanted to fulfill its duties toward its native land and toward Slav solidarity. . . . He (Zorin, the Russian ambassador to Czechoslovakia) had given me a formal assurance in writing that the Communist Party would not take advantage of the situation by seizing the government and applying in our country political and economic principles completely foreign to our people and its entire history."

But all these assurances were worthless paper, Masaryk saw no way out except through a last and dramatic appeal to Stalin. His letter concludes as follows: "You still have time to stop the policy of sovietiza-

tion of my country. Make haste, for soon it will perhaps be too late."

TO DIE IN SILENCE

(5) Not for one second did Masaryk dream of organizing or inspiring a struggle against Russian domination. "At my last conversation with President Benes, he reproached me with having had confidence in the promises made to me by Mr. Zorin in your name. I could have openly acknowledged my mistake, could have demonstratively resigned and started fighting against the Gottwald government and its policy. But that would have been a struggle against the legitimate government of Russia! Never will the son of Masaryk be able to fight against the government that rules Russia, never will he be able to give the slightest pretext to the enemies of Russia who watch for your faults and delusions in order to utilize them better against the cradle of Slav peoples. . . . I am not the only one who renounces the fight for his ideal of freedom if this fight compels him to combat Russia." And further: "I cannot live without freedom, I cannot fight for it, because Jan Masaryk cannot fight even indirectly against Russia and her government."

(6) Masaryk dedicated himself to avoiding and preventing any struggle by the Czech people. His actions, he repeats many times, were designed to avoid "civil war." "There is but one thing left for me to do—to die, to die in silence in order to prevent my deed from serving as a pretext for those who would provoke civil war in Czechoslovakia."

Most significantly, the letter makes no reference of any kind to the role of the masses in the Czech events, except that the constant repudiation of civil war implies of course a policy of avoiding and preventing mass action. Masaryk does not threaten Stalin with the possibility of serious mass resistance, even in this secret letter. The people play no role at all in his thinking. He did not see them

as active opponents of Stalinism; nor did he see them as active supporters of the Stalinist coup. They simply did not exist as a factor that fitted into his political program; either FOR or AGAINST the Stalinist regime. Ev-

BLOCKED MASSES

The parliamentary regime and the democratic atmosphere for which Masaryk yearned served simply as a means whereby he could rally the people to VOTE for the Masaryks and Benes, who in turn could deliver the support received at the polls to Stalin, who in his turn would call off his Stalinist dogs. Masaryk under-

In the light of the Masaryk letter we can better understand the February coup. We see the Czech bourgeois democracy not as a force which desperately tried to organize a struggle for democratic rights and failed to gain mass support, but rather as a force which did everything possible to prevent mass resistance and succeeded . . . only to succumb in the long run because Stalin's aims did not correspond with their own.

From the end of the Hitler domination to the Stalinist coup in February, Czech political life was filled in by a unanimous drive to remove the masses from the social arena as an active political force. The Stalinists infiltrated into key state positions under the protection of Russian bayonets and built up their real apparatus, the military-police structure which serves as a substitute for active mass support. Masaryk-Benes substituted their deals with Stalin for mass action. Shielded by Russian military power, guaranteed against mass resistance by the policies of their enemies and provided a legal cover by Benes-Masaryk, the Stalinist apparatus resting upon a tiny minority completed its seizure of power and the establishment of its dictatorship. Not the entry of the masses into the struggle but their removal, consciously and deliberately planned by both the supporters and the opponents of Stalinism, is what explains the course of the Czech coup.

WP Ballot Campaign in New York East Side Hits Half-Way Mark

NEW YORK—The campaign to place Emanuel Geltman on the ballot as the Workers Party candidate for Congress on the East Side reached the half-way mark in its second week with 3,000 signatures, although several days of inclement weather hampered petition-circulating activities.

While continuing to solicit signatures and distribute copies of LABOR ACTION and the four-page folder containing the Workers Party election platform, campaign workers have been sounding out sentiment among the people of the district.

Already reported in LABOR ACTION is the unexpectedly high proportion of people who express willingness to sign despite the atmosphere of hostility, fear and suspicion produced by the current

drive of the press and government against all independent political thought, genuinely labor and socialist as well as Stalinist.

Also noteworthy is the percentage of people who consent to sign an independent nominating petition only after assurance that the candidate is not associated in any way with the Wallace movement. This indicates that a portion of the electorate in the 19th Congressional District is interested in having an independent candidate running as an alternative to the Republicans and Democrats, but does not consider Wallace party candidates an authentic third choice worthy of consideration.

A vigorous appeal to this group of voters on the independent labor and socialist platform of the Workers Party should result in substantial support for Emanuel Geltman.

HAVE
YOU
READ?

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS, by Anthony
Bimba (out of print) 1.75
THE IRON HEEL, by Jack London 1.98
A ROOM ON THE ROUTE, by Godfrey Blunden 1.75
THE SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF EUGENE V. DEBS 3.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

Name
Street
City Zone State