

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

LABOR ACTION

SEPTEMBER 13, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Delegates Smash Stalinist Grip in Wayne County CIO

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—The iron grip of the Stalinists over the Wayne County CIO Council was finally smashed, after one of the most hectic, turbulent and violent conventions ever seen in the CIO movement.

In spite of continual disruption, booing, heckling, bureaucratic rulings, sudden adjournments and every other trick in the Stalinist arsenal of "rule-or-ruin" tactics, the majority

of the delegates, aided by the national CIO, cleaned out the mess.

This convention was almost an incredible spectacle. The final touch was supplied by the Leonard caucus and its SWP supporters. This caucus distinguished itself from the Stalinists in only one respect: numbers. In every other respect, the friends of the SWP spoke, functioned, acted and conducted themselves as chief assistant hatchmen for the Stalinists.

The entire struggle at the convention was confined to the organizational plan, with one question predominating: Could the Stalinist leadership be ousted?

The anti-Stalinist forces, consisting mainly of a bloc of pro-Reuther and steel delegates, had a clearcut majority, even without any disputed delegates being seated. With the 90 or so disputed delegates seated, the anti-Stalinist forces, representing the vast bulk of the CIO membership in this area, was an overwhelming majority.

RULE-OR-RUIN IN ACTION

The essence of the Stalinist strategy was therefore to keep the contested delegates from being seated, and by means of complete control of all committees and the chairmanship, to prevent the majority of delegates from expressing their will on any question.

This could be accomplished best by preventing any serious debate, by creating a violent atmosphere which made any discussion impossible, and by filibustering the convention until enough anti-Stalinist delegates left to make a return of the Stalinist bloc to office possible. There is nothing new in these tactics. They are the hallmark of Stalinism in the labor movement.

What was the issue in dispute on seating the delegates? Over 90 delegates representing thousands of CIO members came to the convention after their local unions had paid four months per capita and they were denied entrance on the grounds they hadn't paid one year's back taxes.

It was on this issue that the SWP, repeating the CP, called a fight for "democracy versus bureaucracy." Before the last convention a similar arrangement had been approved by the national CIO at the request of the Stalinists—but that was last year. This year, fearing loss of control of the council, the Stalinists rejected such an arrangement.

More than that, the Stalinist clique was afraid to have the convention vote on this issue, for its defeat was assured by the democratic will of the majority. The issue in reality was just the opposite of that claimed by the Stalinists and the SWP. It was a case of a discredited minority, the Stalinists, seeking to keep bureaucratic control of an organization they had no political, organizational or any other kind of right to keep, because neither their policies nor leaders were acceptable to the majority of the delegates.

KEY REPORT STALLED

On Thursday night, when the convention opened, the usual trick stuff was begun. A special resolution endorsing the strike of the De Soto workers was introduced. Of course it was supported by everyone, even though it was just a stall to keep the credentials committee from making a report.

On Friday morning, in spite of many efforts to get a report from the credentials committee so that the issue could be debated and the Stalinists defeated, nothing happened. The noisy demonstrations, marked by a little scuffle now and then, made any action on the part of the anti-Stalinists impossible.

(Continued on page 4)

AN EDITORIAL STATEMENT

Protest Anti-Wallace Hooliganism in South!

The egging and other acts of hooliganism, in many places with the tacit if not open approval of the authorities, to which Henry Wallace was subjected last week on his Southern tour, call for the most vigorous protest. They reflect the poll-tax and lynch-law rule which terrorizes the millions of black and white people in the South. It is the same kind of attack as has been directed against every attempt by trade unions to organize the South, including the recent CIO Operation Dixie. Wallace was attacked because he refused to speak to segregated audiences and thus threatened the most repugnant aspect of Southern society, racialism.

Our differences with Wallace are too well known to need repeating here. But it is not these differences which are at issue in the attacks on Wallace by hoodlum gangs. Wallace has a right to speak. And in the South above all. It is not because he came as a representative of Stalinism that he was mobbed but because of his espousal of racial equality. Writing several months ago on the hooligan attacks to which Wallace was subjected in Indiana, we said that it was particularly incumbent on the labor movement to make protest. It is the job of labor and of every person concerned with the essentials of liberty to block this hooliganism wherever it appears.

Israeli Laborites Suffer Setback

U. S. Presses UN Assembly to Continue Uneasy Palestine Truce

By AL FINDLEY

The present truce in Jerusalem which was honored more in the breach, is showing signs of becoming an actuality. This has encouraged Britain and the U. S. to apply pressure to assure that the coming General Assembly of the UN does nothing on Palestine except extend the present truce, with its uneasy peace, and limitations on immigration, etc.

The U. S. is trying its best to present some concrete achievement to the Assembly in the form of direct Arab-Jewish negotiations. Some slight progress along this direction is being made. The Lebanese radio announced a tenuous pro-peace statement and Abdullah is reported to favor such a move. But complete success along these lines is far off, as is evidenced even from the Transjordan radio which alternates between caution and belligerence. The Palestinian press of the right-wing Revisionists and the left-wing (but Stalinist) Mapam, are accusing the government of secretly negotiating with Abdullah. It will take some time before the Arab rulers will be emboldened enough to enter into open negotiations.

Jerusalem continues to be the focal point of interest. It is reported that the Israeli government may confront the Assembly with a fait accompli by annexing the new city of Jerusalem in the next two weeks. The struggle between Abdullah on one hand and the Mufti, backed by Egypt, on the other, broke out in the open last week. The Mufti announced that unless the Arab League renewed the war, he would lead a force to capture Jerusalem. He was reported to have Egyptian support in the form of arms and supplies. An official spokesman of Abdullah openly warned the Mufti and his backers in the Arab League to keep out of Palestine entirely, since, according to the Transjordanian spokesman, the Mufti had lost all popular support among the Palestinian Arabs.

DEEP GOING STRUGGLE

All observers are agreed that the official propaganda hides the real issues, which involve: (1) a struggle for power between American bourgeois Zionists and Israeli labor Zionists; (2) whether to encourage free enterprise or the cooperative and

non-capitalist elements of the Israeli economy.

The struggle for power between European and Palestinian Zionist leaders on one hand and American Zionist leaders on the other, has been raging for sometime. The Americans feel that since they contribute most of the funds, they should control the organization. Until recently they made little headway. The existence of a large and culturally vibrant Jewish population in Europe prevented this. In addition, world politics centered in Europe, while the U. S. was isolationist. World War II changed the situation. Six million European Jews were wiped off the face of the earth by capitalism's anti-Semitic butcher, Hitler. In addition, the center of world politics shifted to Washington. Reflecting this development, a compromise was worked out several years ago, establishing a section of the Jewish Agency Executive in the U. S. The American leaders are still fighting for primacy. The leading contender is no longer the European Zionist movement, but the Israeli labor movement.

In addition to these questions, the Zionist Action Committee differed over related problems—whether to locate the Executive in Jerusalem or Washington, and the abolition of the "double vote" given to Palestine. These secondary problems are tied up with the main question, since a decision would affect the relative influence that the Palestinian labor movement would have over the World Zionist movement and the vital funds that it dispenses.

DEEP GOING STRUGGLE

All observers are agreed that the official propaganda hides the real issues, which involve: (1) a struggle for power between American bourgeois Zionists and Israeli labor Zionists; (2) whether to encourage free enterprise or the cooperative and

SECOND BIG BLOWUP HITS STALINLAND!

By PHILIP COBEN

The second major blowup in Stalin's new empire has taken place, this time in Poland. The effect, but not the significance, of the Gomulka affair is lessened by the fact of the capitulation. Unlike Tito, Gomulka was defeated inside the Stalinist machine of his country (called the Polish Workers Party).

The all-important outcome of the case, however, is confirmation of the fact that "Titoism" is not merely a Yugoslav phenomenon peculiar to one country but rather an internal and inherent disease of expansionist Stalinism—the thesis which LABOR ACTION has maintained since the Tito-Stalin break became known.

It has been revealed that the No. 1 Stalinist of Poland, Wladyslaw Gomulka, secretary general of the Stalinist party and vice-premier of the country, has for the last six months been in

opposition to the official line and in sympathy with Tito. During this time the Polish Stalinist press was vigorously denying that Gomulka's announced illness was really "political," and was pretending that there were no rifts in the leadership.

If the severe internal fight is now made public, it is not (as some reports have had it) because of the Stalinists' overweening confidence, but because the Gomulka tendency is so widespread that a public demonstration had to be made for the benefit of would-be imitators and Gomulka's capitulation broadcast in order to convince his followers that they cannot look to his leadership.

The basic issue is plainly the same as in Yugoslavia: opposition to slav-

ish domination by Russia on the part of elements among the new Polish Stalinist bureaucracy—partly under the pressure of the peasantry but more basically as a reflection of the desire of the native bureaucrats-rulers to be junior partners in exploitation rather than mere vassals of the Kremlin.

Gomulka is accused of the following "crimes":

- (1) Agreeing with the stand of Tito's Yugoslav Communist Party against the Cominform.
- (2) Failing to keep secret his opposition vote to the Polish Stalinist party's decision to back the Cominform.

(Continued on page 4)

New Evidence Links U.S. CP With Trotsky Assassin

By WYATT LEE

NEW YORK—The first evidence directly linking the assassin of Leon Trotsky with the Russian GPU and the American Stalinist machine came to light during the testimony in the J. Peters deportation hearing held here last week.

Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker and ex-Stalinist, testified that Peters (also known as Stevens) served as the link between American Stalinist functionaries and agents of the Russian secret police. Acting under Peters' orders, Budenz helped to prepare the groundwork for an attempt, finally successful, on the life of Leon Trotsky, last of the Bolshevik leaders who remained true to the Russian Revolution. It is not clear whether Budenz admits that he knew at the time the aim of the assignments he was given.

The former Stalinist editor, now an economics professor at Fordham University, admitted that he met with GPU agents several times in connection with his anti-Trotskyist work. The New York World-Telegram (September 1) reports:

"At their request, he brought them a number of persons, including a man named Jackson, who killed Trotsky," Mr. Budenz testified.

Trotsky's murderer spelled his name Jackson and also used the name Jacques Mornard. Budenz's revelation is the first direct evidence proving that Jackson-Mornard was an agent of

the Russian secret police, although that fact has long been well established by an accumulation of other data and evidence.

TRUTH COMING OUT

Though he has written a book about his Stalinist adventures and is fast becoming a standard "prop" at governmental investigations, Budenz has been extremely reluctant to discuss in specific detail his knowledge of the workings of the GPU murder gang. According to his past admissions, his role was merely to "gather information" about the Trotskyist movement and persons active in it. Now it appears that he was a full-fledged participant in the plot, knowingly or unknowingly, with a personal acquaintanceship with Trotsky's killer.

Eight years have passed since Trotsky was assassinated in the Coyoacan study and Mornard-Jacson, the man who wielded the pickaxe that pierced his brain, is serving a 30-year sentence in Mexico. From the first, there was never any doubt that the murder was the work of Stalin but to this day many of the details remain shrouded in mystery.

Walter Krivitsky, the former GPU agent, revealed a good deal of the European operations of the murder ring, but either did not know or remained silent about the plot that ended the life of Stalin's greatest opponent. Budenz, a functionary of American Stalinism, knows more, as he was confessedly engaged in the preliminary work. His latest revelation proves that he had not told all he knew.

The truth, piecemeal and obscured by the various governmental investigations, is slowly being revealed. Elizabeth T. Bentley, testifying at the Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Washington, also mentioned casually that she "received mail from the man who shot the chauffeur of Leon Trotsky in Mexico." No one bothered to ask who this man was—the murderer who shot young Sheldon Harte and left his body buried in a lime pit.

The current investigations, hearings and so forth are not concerned with the operations of Stalinist espionage agents within the revolutionary movement. In this arena, where the GPU is most ruthless and assassination a commonplace weapon, the spokesmen for our capitalist government remain completely indifferent.

Vet and Labor Committee to Defend Kutcher

A national committee of prominent World War II veterans and representatives of the labor movement has been set up to defend James Kutcher, legless combat veteran threatened with dismissal from his job in the Veterans Administration office in Newark, N. J., because of membership in the Socialist Workers Party. Chairman of the committee is Harold Russell, armless veteran who won the Academy Award for his role in the movie "Best Years of Our Lives." Other committee members are cartoonist Bill Mauldin, writer and active American Veterans Committee leader Merle Miller, and President of the New Jersey CIO Council Carl Holderman.

Kutcher, who does not deny his affiliation with the Socialist Workers Party, is charged with being a member of an organization on the attorney general's subversive list and therefore slated to be fired from his \$40 a week clerk's job. He is to be given a hearing before the Loyalty Board of Branch 3 of the VA in Philadelphia on September 10.

Despite the defendant's request for a public hearing, the Loyalty Board has insisted that it be private. Board Chairman Benjamin Hinden explained that the reason was the desire to "protect the individual from adverse publicity." Kutcher has insisted that the proceedings are "un-constitutional and undemocratic," but is prepared to attend the hearings with his legal counsel and witnesses.

Conspicuously quiet on this case have been the Stalinists and their leading Wallaceite colleagues, generally the loudest vocal defenders of "civil rights" for themselves. The threatened firing of Kutcher is one of the most flagrant examples of political persecution in government employment since the current hysterical "anti-red" drive began; that he is an amputee veteran makes his story that much more dramatic.

It is imperative that all progressive organizations, unions, civil rights defense bodies and veterans' organizations support the national movement for his defense.

Negro Families in "Restricted" Area Besieged by Jim Crow Mob

DETROIT—For five days, hundreds of misguided whites, reared in the American tradition of "white supremacy," milled around the homes of two Negro families on Harrison Avenue who had recently purchased dwellings in this so-called restricted, lily-white neighborhood. Vicious insults were shouted, stones were thrown, windows broken and property damaged.

When the crowd increased to several thousands on Saturday night, August 21, local police were sent to the scene to maintain "law and order," but were unsuccessful in persuading the mob to disperse.

This threatening situation continued for several days, yet not a word of it appeared in the daily papers. Only when the Negro press appeared on Thursday was the rest of the city aware of what had happened.

A picket line was thrown around the county building, where the former owner of the properties who sold them to the Negroes is employed. Signs carried by the pickets read: "Why should Brock sell to colored in a white neighborhood?" "God separated the race, why should Brock bring them together?" "We don't want our neighborhood mixed." The NAACP

responded promptly with a counter picket line demanding the abolition of Jim Crow. This line was joined afterward by a group of Youth for Wallace.

The situation was so tense that Mayor Van Antwerp, at the insistence of the NAACP and the Michigan Committee on Civil Rights, issued special orders to his police department that the Negro families must be given complete protection against the mob. It should be noted, however, that when three men were arrested on charges of "inciting to riot," the prosecutor's office refused warrants on this charge, changing it to "disturbing the peace."

The judge cooperated with the prosecutor, fining the men \$25 and putting them on probation for six months. Whenever there is trouble involving a group of Negroes, however, the charge has frequently been "inciting to riot."

Although there is no evidence that the demonstration was organized by any particular anti-Negro or fascist group, this is precisely the kind of development on which these groups thrive and it could easily have exploded into another riot like that of the summer of 1943.

LABOR ZIONISTS LOSE ROUND

In the Zionist movement the spotlight in the last two weeks was held by the meeting of the Zionist Action Committee, top committee of the Zionist movement, in which the American bourgeois Zionists scored a victory over the Israeli labor movement. Officially, the struggle centered around the apparently innocuous question of separating the Israeli government from the leadership of the Jewish Agency. The Zionist bourgeoisie, led by Dr. Silver of the American Zionist Organization, demanded that none of the Israeli cabinet officers be permitted to serve as officials of the Jewish Agency Executive, which controls immigration into and capital investment in Palestine.

Publicly, they justified their de-

cision to try John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, to determine whether he is to be expelled from the American Veterans Committee, has produced a sharp division among the supporters of the Independent Progressive Caucus in the AVC. This is the group which elected most of the members of the current National Planning Committee. The possibility of a national caucus meeting very soon is in the offing.

The charge against Gates, originally brought by two rank-and-file members, is based upon the alleged incompatibility of membership in AVC and avowed allegiance to the Communist Party. The resolution of the National Planning Committee in 1946 on "Communism" stated, in vague legal language, that "Communists" were not welcome. By signing his AVC application under these conditions, it is alleged, Gates performed an act "inimical to the interests of AVC" and was therefore constitutionally liable to expulsion.

The original indictment also contained reference to the AVC constitution's preamble which states belief in "free enterprise," implying that Gates' open disagreement with that plank prevented his honest membership. This charge has been considerably toned down in subsequent developments because of the obvious danger that it may be applied to real socialists as well as the Stalinists.

On Friday, August 27, the National Administration Committee, the governing body between sessions

Question, Mr. Tobin!

Maurice J. Tobin, secretary of labor, said in a Labor Day speech that the Taft-Hartley Act was "undemocratic and un-American."

Question to Mr. Tobin: Why don't you step across the hall to the office of a fellow cabinet member, Tom Clark, and ask him to put the names of the two parties that passed this legislation on the subversive list?

AVC Divided on Expulsion Move

Sees Ousting of Daily Worker Editor Injuring Anti-Stalinist Fight

By WILLIAM BARTON

The decision to try John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, to determine whether he is to be expelled from the American Veterans Committee, has produced a sharp division among the supporters of the Independent Progressive Caucus in the AVC. This is the group which elected most of the members of the current National Planning Committee. The possibility of a national caucus meeting very soon is in the offing.

The charge against Gates, originally brought by two rank-and-file members, is based upon the alleged incompatibility of membership in AVC and avowed allegiance to the Communist Party. The resolution of the National Planning Committee in 1946 on "Communism" stated, in vague legal language, that "Communists" were not welcome. By signing his AVC application under these conditions, it is alleged, Gates performed an act "inimical to the interests of AVC" and was therefore constitutionally liable to expulsion.

The original indictment also contained reference to the AVC constitution's preamble which states belief in "free enterprise," implying that Gates' open disagreement with that plank prevented his honest membership. This charge has been considerably toned down in subsequent developments because of the obvious danger that it may be applied to real socialists as well as the Stalinists.

On Friday, August 27, the National Administration Committee, the governing body between sessions

of the NPC, conducted a hearing on the case in New York. National Vice-Chairman Joseph Cloerty, presiding over the hearing, stated at the outset that its only purpose was to determine whether John Gates was a member of the Communist Party and to give him a chance to answer as he saw fit. Gates' counsel, NPC member Morris Pottish, responded with an over-all legal case in defense of Gates' "civil rights" and an all-out political attack against the NAC for staging a "frame-up."

Cloerty, doing nothing to answer Pottish's aggressive diatribes, merely reiterated that Gates' allegiance to the CP was the only issue. Pottish knew that the hearing was only the beginning of a political fight; Cloerty, in good old "liberal" fashion, seemed satisfied to stick to his legal grounds.

After two hours of political attacks and legal defense, Gates was given the floor. His membership in the CP had already been "proved" by a quotation from a speech to a New York Metropolitan AVC Area Council meeting in which he admitted the fact, and by the appearance of his name on the masthead of the Daily Worker. He took this opportunity to give a rounded analysis of his interpretation of Stalinism.

Of the five members of the hearing board, three had refused to deny that they had already made their decisions. One of the undecided members, Michael Straight, publisher of the New Republic, threw question after question at Gates, designed to learn whether he believed in "revolution." This was the per-

fect setup for the Daily Worker editor to make political hay.

The fifth member, Bernie Bellush, was the only one to counterattack politically. He asked Gates about Stalinist sabotage of earlier united-front activities in his experience. Gates refused to answer. Bellush then particularly pressed him on the attitude of the CP towards the removal of the Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers Party from the New York ballot last year. Gates replied that he did not consider the SWP a political organization, but a mob of "assassins." This was the only time that the anti-Stalinists in the audience were given a lift.

The hearing continued with extensive examination of Gates by Pottish. Further "testimony" will be submitted in writing to the NAC. The latter will then submit its recommendation to the NPC meeting in Washington, September 17-19. A two-thirds vote of this body is needed for expulsion. It is likely that the entire issue will go to the national convention in November.

Many leading anti-Stalinists throughout the country are up in arms against the expulsion proceedings. They hope that the expected national progressive caucus will compel dropping the entire affair and will concentrate on fighting the Stalinists openly and politically.

The AVC has shown, to some extent, how best to defeat them—by outwitting them and reducing them to an impotent minority. There are enough sensible people in the organization to continue the battle in that fruitful fashion.

ish domination by Russia on the part of elements among the new Polish Stalinist bureaucracy—partly under the pressure of the peasantry but more basically as a reflection of the desire of the native bureaucrats-rulers to be junior partners in exploitation rather than mere vassals of the Kremlin.

Gomulka is accused of the following "crimes":

- (1) Agreeing with the stand of Tito's Yugoslav Communist Party against the Cominform.
- (2) Failing to keep secret his opposition vote to the Polish Stalinist party's decision to back the Cominform.

(Continued on page 4)

Chapters From a New Pamphlet by Jack Ranger

A Labor Party—A "Must" for American Workers

Chapter 9

New Answers to Well-Worn Arguments

OPONENTS of the proposition that the labor movement of the United States should build its own labor party are not too inventive.

The arguments that one hears today from the union officialdom and the liberal do-gooders are the same (in many cases, word-for-word the same) as those that have been advanced by opponents of the labor-party idea in the past two generations. Here are the chief arguments, and here are the answers:

(1) *It is not the time to build a labor party.*

ANSWER: To the Republican-Democratic monopoly, and to its followers and beneficiaries in the leadership of the trade-union movement, 1948 was not the time for the unions to organize their own party and place a ticket in the field. Neither was 1946 the time, nor 1942, nor 1936, nor 1928, neither will 1950 be the time, nor 1952, nor 1956, nor 1960 (presuming that the atom bomb has not deposited radioactive dust over all people, and hence over all politics, by that time).

If these opponents of the labor party were to speak their true minds, or rather truly reflect the minds of their political superiors, they would say: "Never is too soon to build a labor party."

But why should we—who are paying in declining living standards and increasing insecurity for every month of delay in the building of a labor party—hearken to this argument?

(2) *A labor party in the field will weaken the Democratic Party and ensure the election of reactionary Republicans.*

ANSWER: The majority of trade-union leaders are affiliated with the Democratic Party and this is their stock argument. Naturally, such Republican union leaders as William Hutcheson of the Carpenters Union and (occasionally) John L. Lewis deny the validity of the argument, in favor of the Republicans.

We deny it in favor of the labor party.

Look! Is there such a measurable difference in the character of the two old parties as dictates to labor that it should continue to abstain from politics so as to throw its support to the Democratic Party? If there is such a difference, how is it revealed?

On the vote on the Taft-Hartley Act? But majorities of both parties voted for that act, and voted to pass it over Truman's veto.

But, after all, Truman vetoed it? Of course. It was politically expedient for him to do so. In his place, a Taft or a Stassen would have done the same thing—since he knew it would be passed over his veto.

Is one party less subservient to Wall Street than the other? No. The big banks and industrialists impartially support both parties. Henry Wallace and the Chicago Tribune are only speaking the truth when they enumerate the Wall Street characters who are breathing down Harry Truman's neck in the White House and setting policy for the Truman administration.

Is one party less war-minded than the other? If anything, the Democratic Party has the worst of this argument, if only because there are more isolationists in the Republican Party. Who is hottest for universal military training, if not Truman and his party? Whose diplomacy ensured that the U. S. would enter the Second World War, if not Roosevelt's? Do not both parties support the Marshall Plan, which proposes to organize Europe behind Wall Street for the Third World War, under the guise of aiding Europe?

Which party has more corruption? Isn't it a tossup between the Democrats' Flynn, Kelly, Pendergast, Curley, and Hague machines, and the Republicans' Dewey and Green machines, etc.?

Which party does most to foster Jim Crow and hatred of the Negro, and thus to weaken labor by fostering race prejudice based on ignorance and superstition? The Democratic Party, with its solid cracker section in the South, doesn't look too good here. Let's agree that both old parties are abhorrent in this respect.

There are differences between the two parties, but they are secondary differences. The intelligent worker understands that both old parties are used impartially by big business to suppress him, and that it is of no interest to him which old party retains or gains office.

The intelligent worker understands his only legitimate interest is to work to throw both old parties out of office, and to replace them with a party which will be in every respect their superior—more responsive to the needs of the people, more conscious of the ability of modern industry when properly organized to give a decent living and security to all the people, more interested in human than in property rights, more interested in planning and spending for peace than for war, more interested in getting along with and aiding the exploited peoples of other lands to throw off their exploiters than to strengthen their exploiters to stay in power.

(3) *If a labor party were organized with the support of the trade unions and failed in its first attempt to elect its candidates to office, then "labor would be without representation or standing in Washington, the state capitals, the city halls."*

ANSWER: Don't make me laugh, my lip is cracked. Labor, thanks to the treacherous political policy of the labor leaders, has been without representation in Washington and elsewhere for generations.

Labor's suggestions and prayers have been met with contempt by both Republican and Democratic officeholders. Labor's bloody struggles for higher wages have been opposed by Democratic Mayor Kelly's police and by Roosevelt and Truman's national guard no less than by Stassen's "slave-labor law" in Minnesota or by Taft-Hartley's national anti-labor law. The struggle of the unemployed for relief standards that would keep body and soul together was met with imprisonment at the hands of Roosevelt's Department of Justice as well as with criminally inadequate relief standards fostered by both old parties. The old parties quibbled about granting one billion dollars for relief in 1939—and spent hun-

dreds of times that amount in the next five years "relieving" workers in other lands of their lives and homes.

We are glad that was brought up—the one about labor's having no representation in Washington. If the Democratic-Republican setup is truly representative of the interests of all the people of this nation, as its supporters claim, how come there is not one single worker in Congress? There are, as Murray and Green and Whitney will admit, approximately 16 million organized workers and twice that number unorganized. Yet, far from being represented in Congress, the entire working class of the United States is disfranchised.

A cursory examination of the biographical section of the Official Congressional Directory reveals that, of 96 Senators, the following occupations are represented: lawyers 61, businessmen 10, bankers 6, publishers 7, broker 1, newspapermen 2, farmers 3, educators 1, embalmer 1, plain politicians 4, workers 0.

The social composition of the House is just as anti-labor. Of the 434 members of the House in the Eightieth Congress, the following occupations are represented: lawyers 241, businessmen 37, realtors 8, accountants 4, publishers 21, personnel managers 2, educators 22, bankers 17, newspapermen 17, farmers 3, preacher 1, stage star 1, plain politicians 48, pharmacist 1, brokers 5, ranchers 7, insurance men 7, contractors 2, military 3, doctors 4, architects 2, missionary 1, veterinary 1, public relations 1, ex-union official 1, workers 0.

It is this Congress which has removed federal price controls with the promise that prices would not thereafter rise; which dealt a staggering blow to unions through the Taft-Hartley Act; which put money in the hands of the real-estate operators through the easing of rent control; which approved a foreign policy which promotes monarchical reaction in Greece, semi-fascism in China, imperialism in Southeast Asia, and neo-fascism in Western Europe; which has placed the costs of the imperialist war largely upon the backs of the working class.

(Chapter 9 continued next week)

Strikers Rebuff Shipowner Strategy

West Coast Maritime Strike Solid

SEPTEMBER (San Francisco)—The long-delayed and only half-expected West Coast maritime strike is on as of 10:14 this morning, the expiration point of the Taft-Hartley injunction. All work actually ceased at midnight last night in preparation for this morning's stop-work meeting of the longshoremen, which unanimously supported the negotiating committee's strike recommendation.

Longshoremen filling the Coliseum Bowl and overflowing by hundreds out into the street, enthusiastically endorsed the defiance of the waterfront employers voiced by President Bridges, reporting for the negotiating committee. For the fourth time in fourteen years, West Coast maritime workers, led by the longshoremen, are out on strike, and to this writer it looks as though Bridges is correct in predicting a long strike and a bitter strike—perhaps the most bitter of the four.

For one not on the inside of negotiations, it is quite impossible to be certain just what brought about the blow-up of negotiations and the strike. Newspaper publicity of recent days—undoubtedly employer inspired and controlled—has generally given the impression that a settlement was in the cards. Besides this, it seems quite certain that a couple of days before the strike the union leadership expected to reach agreement.

Among the unions which exploded against the employers in the last hours of negotiations were not only those with Stalinist leaderships, as the longshoremen and the cooks and stewards, but also the marine firemen, where the last election returned not a single Stalinist or fellow traveler to office. It thus appears to the writer that the recent negotiations, including the last minute concessions offered by the ship owners, were only a grand maneuver by the employers to make out a good case before the public—and before some of their own members who are reluctant to face a strike.

SEPTEMBER 3—Longshore pickets appeared before every dock this morning at eight o'clock. Cooks and stewards had started picketing the night before. This morning firemen and radio operators also started picketing.

While the regular longshore gangs took up their picket stations promptly at eight, thousands of other longshoremen—"plug men"—lined up at the hiring hall for their picket assignments. Gradually order was brought out of the confusion and by afternoon substantial squads of men were quietly on duty in front of every pier on the widespread waterfront of San Francisco Bay.

The morning papers here carried news of a new "get tough" policy of the waterfront employers. The employers suddenly righteously proclaimed that from now on they will not bargain with any union whose

officials have not signed the non-communist affidavits. This move serves to confirm the view this writer expressed yesterday that the strike was from the outset maneuvered by the employers. First they gave the impression to the public of making concession. Then they became very righteously "tough." One purpose is undoubtedly to try to split the strictly non-Stalinist marine firemen's leadership and the various anti-Stalinist elements among the longshoremen from the Bridges group which is leading the strike. But the opposite effect is more probable. The employer offensive will consolidate the strike and may even strengthen Bridges as against his opponents within the unions.

SEPTEMBER 4—All is quiet on the San Francisco waterfront. Groups of pickets in front of each pier walk, talk, read or play pinocle. Ships, some high out of water waiting for a load, some heavily laden, drawing water to the Plimssoll line, lie idly at dock. The only work permitted is that of unloading the caskets of war dead at the army base and immediate unloading of baggage and mail as passenger ships come in. Already, in the papers, the employers are crying about the amount of money they are losing every day.

In finally determining to force the strike, the employers probably counted on, among other factors, some signs of lowered morale among waterfront workers. They had succeeded in bringing about a considerable feeling that the strike would not take place. This resulted in a confused attitude among the workers and a poor attendance at certain meetings. But if the employers took courage from these incidents, they deceived themselves. For once the battle is joined this uncertainty is gone. And as the employers get tough—so it becomes clearer that it is "us or them." After what they have been through in the past, West Coast longshoremen don't scare so easily and such a situation is a morale builder—a builder of a fighting attitude.

Some other factors have gone into building good morale for this strike. While a proposed slowdown in the face of the Taft-Hartley injunction, under the slogan "Keep Cool," was not very successful in this port, two other actions were eminently successful. Ever since '34—and no doubt before that—longshoremen have beefed against their long work shifts and against Sunday work. Since '34, overtime has been paid for work after six hours. Still, under the most recent contract, the regular work shift was ten hours, extended on occasion to 12 or even 14. Within this recent period, when prevented from striking by federal injunction, but with the contract expired, longshoremen in this port decided to take steps to put an end to these unhealthy and unpopular practices. The men decided that they just

would not go to work before eight o'clock in the morning, and, a little later, that they would not report for work when ordered on Sunday. The men decided, and they carried out their decision. For fourteen years after '34 these demands could not be won. The employers would never consider such demands. But suddenly, even while under a federal injunction, the men decided upon job action. Not only did they win the point in practice—the waterfront from 7-8 a.m. and on Sundays became as quiet as a graveyard—but suddenly the employers began to offer, in negotiations, a nine-hour shift and a day off a week. The "day off a week," originally the union demand, is no longer good enough in this port. The men have won SUNDAY off, and from all appearances they will not give it up.

An interesting sidelight on this point is that Bridges and the international officers opposed this job action for Sunday off, but the membership, under the leadership of the local president, Kearney, took the action on their own and refused to be budged from their position. This fact should make the employers think twice when they think that they can split the union away from Bridges in their favor.

There are union elements opposed to Bridges, of course. But the union is united in support of the strike, in support of militant demands, and especially in support of the conditions just won by job action. If Bridges were to propose acceptance of a bad settlement his leadership might be repudiated, but the chances of the kind of a defeat of Bridges that the employers want—that is, a defeat in the interest of a sell-out of the strike to the shipowners—those chances are slim, indeed.

S. R.

September NI Out

The September issue of The New Internationalist, leading magazine of Marxist politics, is now out with an array of interesting articles.

Leading off is a study by Henry Judd discussing "Can the Marshall Plan Succeed?" Valentin Toma, new contributor to the NI on the Eastern European scene, writes on "The Stalinist Purge in Rumania." Hal Draper takes up the new line of the "orthodox" Trotskyists in "Comrade Tito and the Fourth International." "The Mysterious Bruno R." by James M. Fenwick presents "A Footnote on the History of the Russian Question." Robert Stone on "The Pattern of Jim Crow in South Africa" and a discussion article on Italy by Andrzej Rudzinski complete the issue, plus the regular book-review section.

By EUGENE KELLER

The imperialist tug-of-war over Britain has obscured the militant and courageous struggle the Berlin workers, in their vast majority, have put up against the Stalinists.

Last June, the introduction by the Western powers of currency reform into their zones in Western Germany gave the Russians a pretext for shutting down all supply lines into Berlin. The unchallenged control of Berlin is, to them, a political objective whose capture is a necessary first step in the Stalinist political domination over the German masses. For Berlin remains the political heart of Germany, and more particularly the heart of the German working class with its rich socialist traditions. The best working class cadres in present-day Germany reside in Berlin.

MUCH AT STAKE

Furthermore, if the Stalinists gain possession of the city, if they are able to atomize its working class, they will have made a great step forward in their campaign (which is, for the present, somewhat abated) for their brand of German unity. As pointed out previously in these columns, unity and independence remain the fundamental political issues among the most decisive sectors of German society. The Anglo-Americans have, with their one-sided introduction of currency reform, consummated the division of Germany and thereby given conclusive evidence that, whatever their spokesmen may profess "officially," their actual policy does not allow for a reconstituted united Germany. (For example, it is no coincidence that the more reactionary and separatist elements of the Christian Democratic Union or Party are dominant in the deliberations preceding the convening of the "parliamentary assembly," scheduled for this fall and charged with creating a de facto Western German state and its basic law.)

The struggle for the city will decide questions far more important than matters of prestige. It is bound to affect Germany's and thereby, of course, Europe's future. Those sections of the various foreign organs of the West which favor withdrawal from Berlin on the superficially correct ground that the city is of no practical importance in any sense to the West, have not gained in influence up to now.

Undoubtedly, the position of the Western powers in Berlin would be nearly untenable if the population of the city were as eager to be rid of them (under the present specific circumstances) as the Stalinists make believe it is. The rallies which the Social Democratic Party (SPD) has been calling over the past two months have been attended by scores of thousands of workers who evidenced a stubborn militancy in defying the Stalinists and their Russian mentors. The Social Democratic leadership

German Workers and the Berlin Conflict

"It seems that the greatest strength, the greatest resolution, is in the working class sectors. Here are people with terribly little to lose, whichever way the political battle goes. But it is these people, in mean shattered streets, festooned with drying laundry, who speak out, who cheer the orators. It is among them that the realization of what they are doing in defying the Russians is fermenting new visions of the future. . . . In these districts you meet many who say: 'I am a Marxist but not a Communist. What is Communism today? Another kind of Russian imperialism, not a working class movement.' Or those who say: 'Yes, I am a Communist but not a Stalinist. Only stupid Germans believe that Russia today is a Communist state. Certainly, I still see hope in Communism, but not in Russian Stalinism.' . . . There is a current of hope running through these people today. . . ."—Drew Middleton in the New York Times Magazine, August 15.

has been the main spokesman of the Berlin workers in their struggle. In voicing the latter's protest against the blockade by which the Russians endanger the vital supplies of the city, as well as in their demands upon the Western powers that they continue to occupy the city, these spokesmen have, perhaps, distorted the spirit in which protests and demands have been made. Their reliance upon and subservience to the Western powers has often been evident.

RUSSIAN STRATEGY

In the Russian design, the blockade of the city was to be the prelude to its conquest—a rather obvious case of economically blackmailing the official city, labor and industrial bodies into the Soviet fold. The blockade remains the Russians' principle weapon, at least until the city's political situation is consolidated to their advantage. To this end they proceeded to split or force the split of such city agencies as the police and the food and coal allocations offices. They took full advantage of the currency dilemma the Western powers found themselves in. The latter obviously had no intention of tying their sectors of the city to the economy of Western Germany and what benefits it will derive from Marshall Plan aid. Failing to come to an agreement with the Russians on four-power issuance of Eastern Zone currency in the city, they had to issue their own currency, which, however, they restricted to 25 per cent of Eastern Zone currency circulation, for the simple reason stated above. This made their sectors dependent upon the Russians for 75 per cent of their currency.

The Russians made issuance of this currency, which includes both specie and credit instruments, contingent upon the affiliation of all industrial and commercial firms to the Greater Berlin Trade Commission, an economic body controlled by them and designed, to bring the city's economic life under their tutelage. Obviously, the power of extending or withholding credit is the power of life and death over any concern as well as, indirectly and under the specific circumstances, over the workers and their organizations. (It is this control over currency which in the past week has been reported as being the major subject of the Moscow negotiations.)

Meanwhile, the Berlin Stalinists, bearers of Russian policy among the population, have become somewhat more aggressive and have begun what appears like a series of mob actions, such as the recent storming of the City Hall (located in the Soviet sector where police gave "passive" support to the action) which forced the discontinuance of the City Assembly sessions. Since these actions are bound to be repeated, they forced the relocation of the Assembly in the Western sectors.

STALINIST STRENGTH

Needless to say, the Stalinists claim to be fighting for the population's "democratic rights." The degree of popular support they enjoy, however, may be judged by the October 1948 election returns. Out of an electorate of which 84 per cent (an enormous percentage) voted, 49 per cent of the ballots went to the Social Democrats and a mere 19 per cent to the Stalinist front, the Socialist Unity party. Moreover, the former have boldly demanded renewed elections to challenge the Stalinists' fake claims of popular support.

It may also be judged by the kind of response they get when they call for demonstrations as compared to the Social Democrats. The Stalinists must exert the same type of pressure and must offer the same bribes as the Nazis once did to get workers to attend a rally, whereas the Social Democrats can depend on almost spontaneous response.

The Stalinists do not, however, as a matter of practical politics, depend upon the politically advanced sections of the working class for a viable mass basis. The type of social layers they have succeeded and continue to attract is evidenced by incidents such as the brutal beating and Jew-baiting of Jeannette Wolf, a leader of the SPD who spent many years in concentration camps, by young Stalinist hoodlums. It is even more evident in the ominous threat made by Herman Schlimme, chief of those Berlin trade unions under Stalinist control, to the city assembly, that "it would have to deal with the 600,000 members of the Communist Youth Front."

STRENGTH INDICATED

The German Stalinists have large and well-disciplined youth organiza-

tions in the Eastern zone and Berlin. The youth has many special advantages. It has greatly expanded educational opportunities, so that, for example, at the universities, at which in the past only students of middle class origin were financially, etc., able to study, youth of working class antecedents is at par with or predominates over the former. The managerial personnel of the industries in the Soviet zone is to a large extent composed of former workers. (In individual plants they average 48 per cent of the total managerial personnel; in the administrative hierarchy—peak organizations, etc.,—27 per cent.) This is an extremely important consideration in giving a perspective to the energetic young worker.

In thus building a mass base among the youth of the Eastern zone, the Stalinists are creating a potential magnet for the youth and younger war veterans of the Western areas. Since these are the most vigorous of the discontented elements in Germany, they pose as a major threat to the German socialist movement unless the latter proves capable of giving them a worthwhile perspective for their future.

Such a perspective would have nothing in common with achieving Schumacher's and his fellow bureaucrats' pipe dreams of a German Social Democratic government along lines of the wonderful and well-fed British Labor Party. It would have something in common with a fight for the genuine unity of Germany to which the Social Democratic leadership has given no more than lip service; and with a fight for the socialization of the industries of Western Germany along lines truly beneficial to the rehabilitation of Europe, and not with a view to creating a gold mine of little functionary's posts for the purpose of better service to the "democratic" imperialists.

All the conditions of their existence dictate to the German workers that they must struggle, and they have thus far amply proved their will to do so under terribly adverse circumstances. Whether or not they will eventually fall victim to Stalinism depends to a large degree upon the speed with which they are able to create a capable leadership from their midst.

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.

12-37

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW
EXTEND YOUR SUB

Editorials

Expulsions In the NMU

The action of the National Maritime Union in expelling three leading Stalinists, all of whom were top officers of the union up to a couple of months ago when the Curran forces swept the election, deserves to be carefully scrutinized and understood by progressive and militant unionists everywhere. The issues in the case of Smith, McKenzie and Palazzi are not complex but they can easily be misinterpreted in the minds of anti-Stalinist workers in other unions who are also battling against the Stalinist incubus.

The United Auto Workers also cleaned the Stalinists out of the leadership of the union at its convention last year, but—despite accusations in the pre-election period that the Thomas-Adde-Stalinist leadership had committed various acts of malfeasance in office—no organizational steps were taken against the latter after the ouster. Was the NMU justified in going beyond this cleanup, to expulsion?

We believe it was, and that the action taken by the membership was justified. What can usefully stand some discussion is not so much the propriety of the action but some misconceptions possibly arising from it.

The September 3 issue of the NMU Pilot carries a two-page spread presenting the Trial Committee's report on the charges against the three. As reported in last week's LABOR ACTION (before the Pilot appeared with the full text) the charges were based on detailed and documented overt acts against the unions; these overt acts were proved; they added up to a case against the trio which fully merited expulsion; Smith, McKenzie and Palazzi made little or no attempt to disprove them, merely relying on raising a kind of red-herring-in-reverse cry.

Why then is any discussion at all required? In the first place, the NMU's expulsion of the CPers comes in the midst of the hue and cry of the government's "anti-red purges" and anti-CP witch hunting. There may be a feeling in the minds of some that the NMU expulsion is "part of the same pattern." We think it important to point out that the expulsion itself warrants no such qualms.

In condemning and denouncing the "anti-CP" activities of such witch-hunting agencies as the congressional Un-American Committee and the Kersten committee of the House, we have always stressed that (1) these reactionaries are eager to utilize the cry of "Communism" in order to attack the whole labor movement and all of labor's civil rights and not merely to get rid of Stalinists; and (2) even if their motives were not so obviously suspect as they are in the present campaign, labor cannot allow the government and its agents to meddle in the life of the trade-union movement and dictate or influence its course.

Against the government witch-hunters we have counterposed the need for the trade unions to clean house THEMSELVES, by appealing to the rank and file against the Stalinist wreckers—and that is exactly what has been done in the NMU. That is why the NMU expulsion is cut from an entirely different pattern—precisely that pattern which is the democratic and progressive alternative to the "purgers."

It is to qualms such as these that the expelled trio demagogically appealed, while refusing to defend themselves against the specific accusations. They had no other recourse in the NMU trial except to try to capitalize on the revulsion which every militant feels in the face of the Thomas-Rankin-Kersten drive. Once again it is shown that the government's "anti-CP purge" does not help but rather hinders the real anti-CP purge on the part of the rank-and-file militants themselves. The two patterns are not only different but contradictory.

We are opposed to expelling Stalinists from the union movement simply because they are proved to be Stalinists. This would be the witch-hunt pattern, sadly reflected in the case of the American Veterans Committee (as discussed below). What is significant about the NMU case is that the three were expelled for overt anti-union acts, as we have stressed. There are, however, some anti-Stalinists (and not the worst militants by a long shot!) who tend toward a diametrically opposite and equally wrong view: to refuse to expel proved union-wreckers simply because they are also Stalinists and because these militants are afraid of an act that superficially looks like the Thomas-Kersten brand of witch-hunting.

In a sense, in order to lean over backward, such brothers are willing to allow the CP stooges to get away with acts for which they would have no hesitation in expelling anyone else. At the NMU membership meeting there were in fact some abstentions on the basis of such qualms.

A unionist who thinks the matter through does not have to fall into either trap. The wise course, which at least thus far has been followed in the NMU, can be summarized in three sentences:

(1) Do not expel a member because he is a Stalinist. (2) Do not hold back from expelling a member because he is a Stalinist. (3) Expel any member, including Stalinists, on the basis of proved overt anti-union ACTS.

There is another thing to be added. We have been emphasizing that Smith, McKenzie and Palazzi were expelled for overt acts, not because they are Stalinists. But it is also true that they committed these acts because of their political allegiance to a reactionary anti-labor force, the CP. The NMU charges were justified, here too, in making this connection plain to the membership, as a matter of education.

It is here that a dangerous leap is possible in the thinking of some elements in Curran's leading

group within the NMU (or in other unions, for that matter). If Smith, McKenzie and Palazzi committed anti-union acts because they are Stalinists, why not ferret out and expel their political buddies before they have a chance to follow the same example? Why not preventive expulsion, if one is convinced that Stalinism per se is reactionary and anti-labor? It is here that the line is drawn between witch-hunting and cleaning house.

The answer is easy. It amounts to this: Once a union (or any other organization) sets about expelling proponents of any set of ideas on the ground that those ideas must inevitably lead to anti-union action sooner later, there is no end to that line of reasoning. From the point of view of any individual with convictions, the ideas of the other fellow are wrong and harmful, and wrong and harmful ideas (it can be argued) must inevitably lead sooner or later to wrong and harmful actions. So nip the evil in the bud and expel on the ground of the ideas held.

This is precisely the approach of totalitarianism, in fact, precisely the approach of the Stalinists themselves. It has nothing in common with democracy. It is witch-hunting, by definition. It is this kind of development in the NMU that the members must carefully guard against.

We have no doubt that, for at least a section of the Curran group, the factual evidence of malfeasance against the three Stalinists was only a handy weapon by means of which to "get" political opponents or to settle scores, and that such elements may not scruple to use witch-hunting tactics against the Stalinists if need be. It is up to the militants who voted for the expulsions to stop any such attempted "purge" cold.

What it means in an organization which aspires to be progressive may be seen through the problem posed at the present moment in the American Veterans Committee. Will there be an—

AVC Purge?

The American Veterans Committee is again at a critical point of its brief, stormy existence. The expulsion charges against John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, have opened up another crisis stage in the history of this progressive organization of World War II vets. The disposition of this case may have a large bearing upon its immediate future life.

LABOR ACTION is second to no one in its militant opposition to Stalinism and the Stalinists. We regard them as the reactionary agents of the Russian totalitarian state, and strive for their defeat by the membership in all trade unions and mass organizations. Particularly in AVC we have urged from the beginning an all-out struggle against their influence, often in wide disagreement with a variety of compromisers who are now in favor of the Gates expulsion.

We are against the proposed expulsion. It will help neither AVC nor the over-all campaign against Stalinism.

Gates himself is not a very important member of AVC. To have an effect, a similar drive will have to be made to "get" more important but less open Stalinists. This can only be accomplished by a series of "investigations" that will tend to degenerate into witch hunts. Despite protestations to the contrary and the best intentions in the world, this will fit snugly into the pattern set by the congressional Un-American Committee hearings and the Grand Jury indictment against leading American Stalinists, including Gates.

The expulsion of Gates would greatly assist a movement to the right in the orientation of AVC, an ever-present dangerous possibility that would destroy that organization's effectiveness. On the other hand, it would, ironically, allow the Stalinist totalitarians to become "defenders of democracy" and secure support from good people in AVC. Such a fantastic turn must be prevented by those who have effectively fought the CP as the anti-democratic force in our midst which it is today.

Comparison with hypothetical action against totalitarians of the right is academic. The danger of any but a few individual fascists getting into AVC, the possibility of their becoming a significant element, is obviously far-fetched. The program and behavior of the organization automatically excludes them. The Stalinists offer a different problem that must be deftly handled.

These totalitarians try to appear as defenders of democracy and gain support. They can advertise as "progressive militants" and get themselves believed. They must not be allowed to get away with that sham, but they must also not be given a chance to seem like persecuted martyrs.

We are not opposed to organizational blows against Stalinists. For instance, we are in just about every instance against their election to higher bodies in AVC. We believe they should be eliminated from all responsible posts by vote of the membership.

But expulsion is a serious act that should be based on charges of overt acts. To make mere political affiliation a condition for barring members is a two-edged sword that can be used against others tomorrow. It can lead to a form of thought control which is diametrically opposed to what AVCers want.

Paraphrasing the original charge against Gates stated that he should be ousted because he cannot support the preamble pledge to support private enterprise. Because of the large number of socialists in AVC, including some of the leading anti-Stalinists, this accusation has been shunted aside. Nevertheless, this feature of the preamble is still there and it is dangerous; it should be eliminated.

Several trade unions have recently demonstrated how effectively to annihilate the Stalinists. The National Maritime Union elections overwhelmingly defeated their candidates for office. Three of these have been expelled for overt acts opposed to the welfare of the union.

Let the AVC fulfill its original promise, and there will be no difficulty in reducing the Stalinists to a weak minority incapable of obtaining significant support. If they THEN carry out any overt acts inimical to the welfare of AVC, they can be readily handled through normal channels by an aroused membership.

Read and Subscribe to LABOR ACTION and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Dollars Can't Cure Chaos Under Chiang Kai-shek

The Shambles in Kuomintang China

By JACK BRAD

(Concluded from last issue)

Production and normal commerce are impossible under these conditions and tend to cease. Highest profits are in speculation. And at every stage of every transaction the ubiquitous KMT officialdom gets its huge rake-off in gangster fashion. Compounding the monetary problem is the constant administrative intervention of the state. Taxes are raised, materials and bank withdrawals are controlled and limited.

CP FEEDS ON CHAOS

The result has been the alienation of large sections of the Chinese and even the American bourgeoisie from Chiang Kai-shek. Many of them now talk of the hopelessness of Kuomintang China and are beginning to look to the CP as a possible alternative.

The CP has directed a heavy propaganda barrage to these capitalists, offering all kinds of guarantees of lower taxes, freedom of trade and production and no expropriation. To the Chinese bourgeoisie the CP offers an all-out fight against competing U. S. and Japanese goods, and to foreign capital it offers welcome and protection.

The Stalinists give as evidence of good faith the policies in their areas. Mao Tse-tung denounces "encroaching on industry and commerce—and hitting at industry and commerce in the field of tax policy" as "leftist tendencies" which must be corrected.

Under these circumstances the U. S. has not found an instrument to effectuate its China policy. The U. S. has poured into China from four to five billions since the end of the war. It has supplied the Kuomintang with several hundred ships and planes and has armed its divisions.

At the war's end the U. S. navy ferried nine entire Kuomintang armies into Manchuria by ship and plane. Its intervention has been constant. General Marshall directed this intervention for over a year as special envoy. Ambassador Stuart has his fingers deep in Kuomintang politics. The U. S. obtained a treaty from China which gives it free transport and practical control of inland navigation. The American ECA determines the distribution of 370 millions in aid and thereby determines the orientation of a large section of the economy.

But U. S. policy is a failure because it cannot find a substantial political faction which is dependable enough and capable enough to resist the disintegrating forces.

The pseudo-bureaucratic cliques of the Kuomintang cannot serve this function. Their venality, their incompetence and their landlord connections make of them a corrupt class. They are incapable of serious concessions even to the bourgeoisie, on which the U. S. would like to base itself. The Chinese bourgeoisie has shown itself incapable of organizing a resistance inside the Kuomintang. The failure of American policy is linked to the inner rot of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

A new vigorous political group is essential to U. S. policy. But such a group could only be erected outside of the Kuomintang arena and in opposition to it. It would have to undertake such sweeping reforms as would be tantamount to revolt against these entrenched powers. In such a situation the way would be opened to quick Stalinist victory. The dilemma of American policy is that it must support Chiang, out of fear of the alternative to his defeat, and yet this support is squandered and dissipated into unproductive channels, which in turn undermines Chiang's regime.

U. S. UP A TREE

There are indications that at Yalta the Big Three divided Asia as follows: Russia to get Manchuria, Southern Sakhalin, the Kuriles and Darrien; U. S. to get the rest of China, Japan and the Northern Pacific; Britain and her satellite empires to keep Southeast Asia and India. In the inter-imperial antagonisms which have become dominant since then, the U. S. has been unable to take and consolidate its share.

The Russians have given far, far less support to the Chinese Stalinists than the U. S. has to the Kuomintang. Harold Isaacs writes: "... the Russians have meanwhile played a passive game, and they have been amply rewarded for doing so. Every American policy, every American act has so far served the Russian rather than the American interest in Asia. Thus Russia has held itself largely aloof from the developing civil war in China, although not so aloof that its influence is wholly unfelt."

America is hated in China today as never before because of its failures and interventions and continued support to a despotic regime. America has failed to bring either unity or peace to China, although it desired both in order best to effectuate its economic domination.

Israeli Laborites Lose —

(Continued from page 1)

posed by the liberals, left only one Israeli cabinet representative in the Jewish Agency Executive. In the horse-trade, Mapam won two seats for itself, in return for one seat to the pro-fascist Revisionists. This was agreed to by all parties. To make this palatable to the rank and file of the labor movement, the Revisionists were induced to issue a statement denouncing all ties with dissident military formations or groups which fail to obey Zionist or Israeli government discipline.

The position of all bourgeois parties was in line with their interests. The Revisionists (semi-fascists), Misrachi (clericalists) and the majority of General Zionists (bourgeois) favored the American proposal and only a small section of the liberal General Zionists in Israel (organized into the new Progressive Zionist Party) favored a compromise.

MAPAM MAKES CONCESSIONS

The attitude of the Mapam (United Workers Party), if one is to accept the fragmentary reports of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, was a betrayal of the interests of the Israeli Labor Movement, in return for a horse trade giving Mapam representation on the Executive.

At first the Mapam announced that it would vote for the American Zionist proposal of complete separation. Then, when Israeli liberals proposed a compromise allowing for three Israeli cabinet officials in the executive (which was rejected by the conservatives), the Mapam still supported the bourgeois demand, but this time only by abstaining from voting. This gave the conservatives sufficient voting strength to carry their proposal. The final compromise, much more disadvantageous to the Israeli labor movement than the one pro-

The failure in China is a major historic blow at American capitalism. It may well prove fatal. The century-long lure of the Chinese market, the fabulous possibilities and potentials of that continent are almost lost. The possibility comes daily closer to realization that in place of this great hope of American imperialism is rising a bastion of Stalinism which would create a base from which the U. S. could be driven from the Western Pacific and Asia, economically and militarily.

WORKING CLASS THE KEY

Stalinism's southward march has reached a decisive stage. The Northern provinces have been consolidated. Manchuria is the arsenal for the CP armies. A stable regime based on moderate land reform and on the support of the middle and rich peasants and landlords has been established. Recent events indicate that the Stalinists intend to expand to an all-national power.

Recently a conference was called in Harbin of trade unionists for the purpose of launching a national labor organization. The working class of the big coastal cities like Shanghai, Tientsin and Canton, and in the interior in Nanking and Hankow, is not under Stalinist influence. Memory of the betrayals of 1927-28, though dimming, is still present.

However, in the absence of an independent alternative of substantial power, the CP exerts an enormous attraction as against the terroristic gangsterism of the Kuomintang. The Stalinists know that China can never be conquered, nor can any conquest be made secure without the urban working masses. That is the explanation of the Harbin Conference. This conference laid the basis for the first national labor federation. The Stalinists have never attempted this before. Such a federation would have as its object the organization of the working class under Stalinist leadership. It is part of the plan of Stalinist expansion. The working class has not yet yielded to Stalinist blandishments. Therein lies a hope.

The second event is the Stalinist wooing of dissident and dissatisfied bourgeois elements. The May Day call of the CP stated: "All democratic parties and groups, people's organizations and social luminaries speedily convene a political conference, discuss and carry out the convoking of a people's representative assembly to establish a democratic coalition government."

There has been considerable response to this call. The Kuomintang Revolutionary Committee (a dissident group), the Chinese Democratic League, the Farmers and Workers Democratic Party and others have replied favorably. Scores of Kuomintang exiles living in Hong Kong have taken up the call. The outstanding figure among these exiles is Marshall Li Chai-sum, Chiang's former chief of staff. General Feng, the "Christian general," supports the call. Hong Kong seethes with intrigue and negotiations.

The basis is being laid for a "coalition" of these groups with the CP. Not one of these groups has a mass following. However, that is not what the CP needs at this time. Such a "coalition" would enhance the threat to Chiang's regime and would give a semi-legal cover to the Stalinist conquests which could be organized as a "national government."

The great student demonstrations which have swept the cities for months have a spontaneous character and are an immense force of protest. They are not coordinated nor politically channeled. They are movements of protest against Kuomintang tyranny and American intervention. This is the most important active popular upsurge since the end of the war. The government has been unable to suppress it fully. It gathers support from the intellectuals and professors. Its weaknesses are political and social. The latter above all, because it is not linked to the working masses. In the specific context of the current political arena these students, especially those in the Southern cities, that is, those who have not suffered direct contact with it, are drawn to Stalinism.

The Chinese civil war is the curtain raiser on World War III. However, it is more analogous to 1936 Spain than to 1948 Greece, in the sense that the imperialist powers operate indirectly through national forces. It is a civil war between Stalinist totalitarianism and feudal-bourgeois despotism. In this civil war the Chinese working class remains as yet uncommitted.

Hope lies with the uncommitted working masses of the cities, that these voiceless millions will find in themselves the power to wrest the defense of the nation against Stalinism from the bloodied hands of the Kuomintang. The first problem and duty of revolutionists is that of survival under conditions of political terror in both sections of China. This problem alone will require all the ingenuity and political wisdom and heroism that can be mustered.

posed by the liberals, left only one Israeli cabinet representative in the Jewish Agency Executive.

In the horse-trade, Mapam won two seats for itself, in return for one seat to the pro-fascist Revisionists. This was agreed to by all parties. To make this palatable to the rank and file of the labor movement, the Revisionists were induced to issue a statement denouncing all ties with dissident military formations or groups which fail to obey Zionist or Israeli government discipline.

This statement, hailed as a significant victory, is an empty victory since, in the last week, the Israeli government, in its growing strength, succeeded in forcing the Irgun and Stern groups in Jerusalem to give up their independent formations, and accept its discipline of the "Zva Haganah." Details are still to be arranged. The Irgun's acceptance of this arrangement was very grudging. They blamed it on "imperialist pressure" in the government of Israel.



By JACK RANGER

The weekly rail unions' newspaper Labor in its "Canadian" column of the August 28 issue headlines a story: "Socialism seems far off in Canada, except to the CCF." The story declared that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation [Canada's socialist party] at its recent national convention approved a platform proposing more socialism than ever before and more than the socialist labor government in England had tried to put into effect; and Labor mentioned Canadian newspaper opinion that "there is no sign the CCF will get a chance to govern Canada and carry out its program."

The Canadian newspapers are wrong. The Canadian economy is due to enter a crisis of the most far-reaching proportions. Socialism is bound to appear as an increasingly attractive program to the people of that nation.

Canada's economic dilemma and foreign-exchange crisis are dealt with in a 28-page report just released by the National Foreign Trade Council. Though the council's economists, like good capitalist employees, do not draw the necessary conclusions, they are all implicit in the statistics presented.

Canada's industrial growth in the last two decades has been phenomenal. By 1944, manufacturing accounted for almost 60 per cent of the national economic product, as contrasted with 7.5 per cent for the forest industries, 7 per cent for mining and mineral production, and approximately 23 per cent for agriculture. Between 1939 and 1947, 5000 new companies were added to Canadian industry; the volume of machinery and related capital equipment built in 1947 was almost four times that of 1939.

CONDITIONS NOW DIFFERENT

Most of this development of Canadian industry has been financed by U. S. big business. By 1945, American capital invested in Canada amounted to \$4,982 million, accounting for about 70 per cent of total foreign investments in the country. Of the income from American direct investments abroad, U. S. business derived about 27 per cent from Canada in the period from 1940-1946.

Since 1946, however, the amount of annual new U. S. investments in Canadian enterprises has sharply declined because the conditions under which earlier investments were made no longer prevail.

What has happened is that the imperial preference system, under the hammer blows of the recent war and the ruin of England and Europe, has broken down.

Big business in the U. S. launched subsidiaries in Canada for one main reason, the assumption that the commonwealth and imperial market would require increasing quantities of goods of Canadian manufacture. Expanded industrial investment by U. S. banks and industries in Canada has rested on the British preferential system and on the convertibility of sterling obtained from exports to other British countries.

Today sterling is no longer freely convertible. A vital market for Canadian goods is fast disappearing.

FOREIGN TRADE DIFFICULTIES

As the NPTC study reports: "A further complication in this situation has been that under the protection of the imperial preference system, much of the industrial development of the country has resulted in duplication of manufacturing facilities in the United States. Often subsidiaries are competitors of the parent companies in this country (the U. S.) developed because of tariff protection advantages. . . . Relatively heavy capital investment has been made necessary in many cases, where a small expansion of a plant in the U. S. would have been sufficient to fill Canadian requirements. . . ."

"A fundamental change has occurred in the Canadian industrial economy. Exports to imperial markets on which many industries have relied historically have declined relatively, at a time that much the greater part of required imports have had to come from hard currency areas [i.e., the U. S.—J. R.] necessary for the continued functioning of the industrial plant."

Canada is neck-deep in foreign exchange difficulties. "With a total foreign trade of \$74 billion in the period 1918-1947, exports to the U. S. were valued at \$16 billion, about 38 per cent of all Canadian shipments." But 71 per cent of Canadian imports, or roughly \$23 billion, were of American origin. "The most distinctive feature of the post-war years has been the marked accentuation in imports from the U. S., the inability of the British economy to supply needed industrial goods, and the non-convertibility of sterling. Despite an export balance of \$237,800,000 in Canada's visible foreign trade in 1947, a debit balance of \$918,100,000 was registered in trade with the U. S."

ROUGH TIME AHEAD

Thanks in part to the extremely high prices charged Canada by U. S. big business, Canadian holdings of gold and U. S. dollars declined \$743 million in 1947. Dividend payments from Canada to the U. S. were \$182 million in 1947 alone. In a desperate attempt to stem the tide, the Canadian government, last November imposed severe restrictions on imports from the U. S. This has hardly solved the problem, but instead has created two more problems. The restrictions "reduce the volume of American exports and thereby lower the quantity of products available to the Canadian consumer. Inflationary pressures are increased and the pace of industrial development retarded."

What does it all boil down to? This: For decades U. S. business, by launching subsidiaries in Canada, has smuggled under the umbrella of Britain's preference system. But the umbrella no longer protects. Currencies throughout the empire are no longer freely convertible, and progressively lose ground to the U. S. dollar. The barriers to the conduct of multilateral trade both within and outside the imperial market grow more numerous. The market for Canadian industry is fast drying up. Capital has ceased to flow into the country and, indeed, is flowing outward. The Canadian market itself can absorb but a fraction of the goods which the Canadian economy can produce. Canada's industrial structure faces ruin.

World capitalism is like a man doomed with cancer extending throughout the organism.

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: IRONIDES 6-5117
Vol. 12, No. 37 Sept. 13, 1948
Emanuel Garrett Gelman,
Editor
Editorial Board:
Hal Draper, Henry Judd
Business Manager: Paul Bern
Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 60¢ 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

Welcome Home, Everybody!

The Manhattan Branches of the Workers Party
invite you to a
POST-VACATION REUNION

HEAR: Reports from Hollywood, Provincetown, Monticello, et al.
MEET: The bigger and tanner versions of your old friends.
SEE: The world premier of a surprise skit done by our talented young theater group.

Dancing and refreshments . . . all you can take.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11 — 9 P.M.
At Workers Party Hall 114 West 14th Street, Third Floor

Bureaucracy Launches an Economic Offensive

Cracks Appear in the Polish Stalinist Party

By ANDRZEJ RUDZIENSKI

The aggressive course in Russian foreign policy represented by Zhdanov has been imposed on all Eastern Europe.

After the liquidation of the peasant opposition in Poland, the Polish Stalinist bureaucracy considered that the incorporation of the pseudo-Socialist Party into the Stalinist Party was the most urgent task. At the conference of the pseudo-Socialist Party "activists," the present puppet premier of Poland, Cyrankiewicz, proclaimed that "the workers' party, whether it be Left Socialist or Communist, cannot bring its development to a halt; similarly, popular democracy is a transitory creation, a stop on the road." (Polish Worker in Great Britain, No. 8, August.)

The unfortunate Oscar Lange, known to the American public as the puppet ambassador of Poland, has also declared that "We Socialists consider popular democracy as only a point of departure on the road toward socialism and not a definitive and final regime." (Ibid.)

"Left to its own fate," he said, "popular democracy can slide back toward capitalism, which is why it requires the leadership of the working class, the most politically conscious class of the nation (?), which consciously tends toward the realization of socialism." Lange repeats all the inspiration and wisdom of Stalinism.

As Adam Ciolkosz (leading theoretician of the genuine Socialist Party-in-Exile) quite correctly points out, these declarations signify the "end of a phase begun in 1944 at Lublin," and the liquidation of the fake Socialist Party in order to create a monolithic Stalinist Party.

How do the puppet leaders think they are going to realize their "socialism" via the path of Stalinism? It is better to seek the answer in the

statements of the leaders of the Polish Workers Party (Stalinist party) than in the declarations of their followers.

ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

At the meeting of the Stalinist activists, Zambrowski, member of the political bureau, declared that today in Poland there exist three elements, three economic formations: socialist, capitalist and petty-bourgeois. The socialist sector consists of the nationalized industries, banks and means of transportation, penetrating wholesale commerce and in part retail commerce, but without influence in the rural economy.

The capitalist sector consists of 18,000 private enterprises, private wholesale commercial enterprises, retail commercial establishments, artisan enterprises in part, and capitalist farms. The petty-bourgeois sector rests on the 140,000 artisan shops, retail commercial establishments and 90 per cent of the rural production and economy.

Zambrowski declares war on the capitalist and petty-bourgeois sector, recalling that small-scale individual production "gives birth to capitalism and the bourgeoisie, daily, hourly, spontaneously." In order to arrest this tendency, the bureaucratic state must increase its control over the capitalist enterprises which from now on are to receive their raw materials from the state and deliver their products to the state as well.

As for the artisan sector, Zambrowski proclaims the need for a cooperative system which will completely control the artisan shops, reducing their owners to the role of wage earners who work at home. The capitalist enterprises are to be subordinated to the state by means of contracts and completely isolated from the market. In addition, private wholesale commerce is to be liquidated and incorporated into state-

owned commercial enterprises.

The most difficult task consists in eliminating the petty-bourgeois system in the countryside. It appears that the offensive is to begin against those farms having more than about 50 acres of land, of which there are less than 10 per cent in Poland. The Stalinist rural paper, Chlopska Droga (Peasants' Paper), proclaims the tendency toward "socialism, that is, communal economy in the countryside and the city." And "the peasants will achieve wellbeing only through the collective farm system," declares this organ.

TO GREATER EXPLOITATION

It would therefore seem that the Polish Stalinists intend to proceed against the peasants in the same barbarous and reactionary manner that was followed in Russia and the Ukraine. They are going to collectivize the peasants' poverty and misery in order to increase their inhuman and more-than-capitalist exploitation in favor of the bureaucracy.

In contemporary Poland, the greatest rural proprietor is the bureaucratic state and the Russian army. The state employs 160,000 day laborers on about 6,000 big farms with an area of almost five million acres that in no way differs from the capitalist-landlord system, and goes far beyond it in the cynical exploitation of the rural proletariat. The state industries also administer their own farms, the sugar industry controlling 104 large farms, the coal industry 60 farms, etc. The Russian army administrators 200 large estates with an area of almost two and a half million acres. Finally, there are the cooperative monopolized by the Stalinist bureaucracy, which dispose of 130 large farms and about 3,000 "remains" of the old estates which have not been parcelled out.

The so-called agrarian reform has been realized under the totalitarian-

bureaucratic sign, a thesis which has been presented in my work on the agrarian question. "The collective system" in agriculture signifies the expropriation and spoliation of the peasant masses in favor of the bureaucracy. The "socialist offensive" in the urban economy signifies the spoliation of the poor artisans in favor of the bureaucracy.

In order to justify this bureaucratic-totalitarian policy, the Stalinists draw from the archives the forgotten and dust-covered theories which Lenin elaborated in the period of the New Economic Policy when the problem of liquidating capitalism in favor of socialism was at issue. Lenin's theories were directed toward the abolition of the exploitation of the proletariat and semi-proletarian classes by capitalism; Stalin's theory serves to increase this exploitation by the bureaucratic monopoly of the means of production.

This economic offensive finds its main source in the expansionism and greed of bureaucratic imperialism, and its preparations for the Third World War. The exhausted Russian economy, having reached the ultimate limit of exploitation of the impoverished worker and peasant masses, no longer offers major possibilities for increasing the primitive accumulation of capital by the bureaucracy. Consequently, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Germany constitute a field of colonial exploitation for the Stalinist imperialists.

The prior condition for exhausting these resources and of liquidating the higher standard of living of the proletariat in these countries is the complete economic and political incorporation of these countries into the USSR. Only from this point of view can we really understand the events in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Poland.

Only by thoroughly analyzing the

Stalinist economy can we comprehend the rebellion of the impoverished and exploited masses against Russian Stalinism and the rifts in the bureaucratic Stalinist camp. That is why the economic offensive in Poland, whose imperialist and colonial character is undeniable, has its Tito-like consequences within the Polish Stalinist party.

No one less than Gomulka—secretary general of the Stalinist party, leader of the "popular democracy," the vice-premier and the real leader of the government until 1948—is the representative of this tendency and now appears to be a victim less fortunate than Tito.

At the last meeting of the party Central Committee, Gomulka was "absent" due to "reasons of health." This meeting condemned Tito and the "Yugoslavian nationalist deviation." But it was not so long ago that the Polish press was praising Tito to the skies.

Gomulka represented the tendency of "introducing communism in Poland under the white and red banner" (Poland's national colors). It is an open secret that two factions existed inside the Polish Stalinist party: that of Gomulka and that of Berman-Minc-Zambrowski, who argued for the immediate incorporation of the country into the USSR. When faced with the underground resistance and peasant movement in 1945, Stalin chose Gomulka as the realizer of his imperialist and colonial policies in Poland.

But times have changed: "Communism under the white and red flag" represents a danger for Russia. The Polish Tito-Gomulka has had luck. Poland is too near Russia, is too firmly held in the grasp of the Russian army.

RESISTANCE GROWS

The rifts in the Stalinist regime constitute a new phenomenon. The more the totalitarian offensive increases and the more its reactionary character, directed against the proletariat and semi-proletarian masses, that is, against socialism, becomes evident—so much the more does the rebellion of the oppressed and exploited masses increase. This social antagonism, this war of the classes, finds its expression in the rifts within the regime, in Tito's rebellion, in the rebellion of the Czech Social Democracy and of the Polish Stalinists. The police regime, the regime of the prison and the concentration camp, does not permit any other manifestation of this permanent social war of the masses against the exploiting bureaucracy.

The resistance of the working-class masses, the artisans and peasants against the Stalinist economic offensive has a progressive, democratic character in the new meaning of this word, a socialist meaning, because it defends human labor against the exploiters, because it defends human liberty against the oppressors. The transformation of this spontaneous rebellion of the exploited and resisting masses into a broad and popular political tendency, headed by the Marxists, leads over the corpse of Stalinism toward real socialism.

But if, in the absence of Marxist leadership, the spontaneous struggle of the masses is utilized by the reactionary and bourgeois political tendencies, it can lead backward toward capitalist restoration. So much the greater, therefore, is our historic and political responsibility before the proletariat. We are witnessing a new phenomenon in the Stalinist regimes, which are incapable of completely dominating popular resistance. We are witnessing the first signs of the decomposition of the Stalinist regime in Europe, outside of Russia.

The mysterious death of Andrei Zhdanov, considered the boss of the Stalinist offensive in Europe and of the "left turn" of the war, against Tito and Benes, is very significant for the process of decomposition which is also beginning in Russia itself.

Wild Talk

The innocent little muskrats, hitherto safe in the wilds of Louisiana, were recently ensnared in the trap of the Taft-Hartley Law. It started when a fur-trapping company refused to bargain with a union of trappers, claiming that since their workers had to breed and raise the beasts, they were actually agricultural workers. As such, their right to organize would not be protected by federal law. The NLRB had to resolve this riddle: Are muskrats wild animals or are they a kind of domesticated livestock? An exhaustive 102-page study of the habits, habitats and sex life of the muskrats by the board conclusively established that muskrats were wild creatures. The employer was ordered to recognize the union and deal with it. It's reported that the International Union of Free Muskrats is being organized to preserve their right to stay wild.

Second Big Blowup Hits Stalin Empire

(Continued from page 1)

(3) Opposing the pace of the Stalinists' plans for putting peasant production under more complete state control—what the Stalinists call "socialization" of agriculture.

(4) In general, refusing to recognize Russia's right to completely dominate and control Poland.

(5) Opposing the formation of the Cominform in the first place.

With regard to this last point, it is interesting to note that Gomulka, who is now accused of having been against setting up the Cominform, sat as co-chairman of the first Cominform meeting with the late Zhdanov as the other chairman—naturally a great honor. It may well be considered, in view of the Russians' well-known disinclination to heap honors on political dissidents, that this was a concession at that time to the Gomulka-Tito tendencies in the satellites.

In addition to Gomulka, other leaders of the Polish Stalinists are also denounced by name. They are: Wladyslaw Bienkowski, formerly vice-minister of education and still a member of the party Central Committee; Wladyslaw Kowalski, speaker of Parliament; Zenon Kliszko, chairman of the Stalinist parliamentary group; and one Loga-Sowinski.

OPPOSITION WIDESPREAD

Boleslaw Bierut, president of the country, had to be recalled to party work to take over Gomulka's post as head of the party. An interesting passage in New York Times correspondent Sydney Gruson's report (September 5) explains why the three leading Stalinist stalwarts were passed over for this job—namely HI-

lary Minc, Jakob Berman and Roman Zambrowski. The Stalinist high command did not consider them available because "these three men are Jews. In historically anti-Semitic Poland the appointment of any one of them would have made the Communist wooing of the masses much more difficult." The existence of widespread and active anti-Semitism in Stalin's "popular democracy" is thereby not only acknowledged but catered to.

An AP dispatch from Warsaw makes clear that the crack-up in Poland is of no small dimensions. The party Executive Committee's resolution, it states, "admitted tacitly by its announcement of the switch in leadership that the Communist organization was facing a possibility of a breakup. Reliable reports say a large part of the party's membership is in open revolt against the dictation by the Cominform and Moscow. It is clear that the Communist Workers Party now is facing the most serious crisis in its history. . . . M. Bierut's new assignment will give him the task of settling disputes within the party ranks. These disputes are said to involve about one half of the party's 1,000,000 members. . . . M. Gomulka long has been known as a man who is a Pole before he is a Communist. He is popular and commands a huge following throughout the nation."

Gomulka's repatriation and breast-beating at a mass meeting was in the standard tradition of Stalinland. He was not permitted, however, to speak at an open public meeting even for this purpose. The audience consisted of a selected 800 party workers whose job it will be to "explain" to everybody else.

Wayne County CIO

(Continued from page 1)

Meanwhile, the Stalinists added another touch to inflame the disputed delegates. The galleries were ordered cleared, and the delegates were left outside, unable even to see the convention as visitors!

The disgruntled delegates met downstairs from the hall and told Germer they would give him an hour in which to act, or they would take action to seat themselves. Whereupon Germer informed Tracy Doll, chairman of the session, that unless the credentials committee reported (and he told the credentials committee the same thing) he would have to move.

Finally, late Friday afternoon, the credentials committee, headed by Whitey Urban, president of UAW Local 190, made its report, denying the delegates full representation, and blasting "CIO interference and bureaucracy."

Attempts to discuss the issue were made, but it was impossible because of the violent atmosphere. Noisy demonstrations greeted every anti-Stalinist spokesman, while the many sergeants-at-arms kept the anti-Stalinists from making much noise.

Germer outlined the CIO constitution dealing with this question of the relationship between local councils and the national CIO and easily demonstrated, of course, that the policies and rules of local councils were under the control of the national CIO.

He explained, and there was no denial, that Tracy Doll, Sam Sage and Coleman Young (Stalinists) had agreed in Pittsburgh to go along with the compromise formula that delegates be seated if local unions paid four months per capita (three months of that money to be held by the national CIO since no one trusted the Stalinists).

CPERS VIOLATE AGREEMENT

He also explained how, the previous year, these same officers of the Wayne County Council (except Young, who was not elected then) had asked for such an arrangement from the national CIO, thereby recognizing the authority of the national CIO as final in such matters, and how the national CIO had approved. He warned the Stalinists against splitting.

A vote was in order, and it looked bad for the Stalinist-controlled credentials committee. But Ernie Mazey came to their rescue. He suggested to the chairman that the time for adjournment was past, whereupon Doll took the hint and arbitrarily adjourned the session.

Of course, many anti-Stalinist delegates felt that victory was at hand the next morning.

But they did not reckon sufficiently with the desperation of the Stalinists. All Saturday morning was stalled around, and finally, after some noisy debate, a rollcall began.

The results of the rollcall were obvious to everyone following the vote. The anti-Stalinist bloc had won by nearly 300 votes! Seating of the delegates seemed, to many of them, just a matter of minutes.

But—and this actually happened!—the committee counting the votes disappeared. No results could be announced. A real clever maneuver! And the convention was again adjourned by action of the chairman!

Enough was enough, and at this point Germer announced that the na-

tional CIO would conduct the rest of the convention on Sunday morning at Local 174 hall. He urged all delegates to attend. It was all over for the Stalinists.

CONVENTION SPLIT

Some of the delegates wandered at this point if the Leonard caucus would dare participate in a rump convention if the Stalinists held one the next day or if they would retreat and participate in the convention under the authority they had been denouncing for the last three days.

This caucus had no choice. The next morning they recognized the legality of the national CIO action by walking into Local 174. The delegates cheered this action for it meant that everyone except the Stalinists recognized the Germer-called session as the legal one.

Meanwhile the Stalinists, meeting at Local 17, made some speeches denouncing everyone and then adjourned, with all remaining non-Stalinists breaking from them and going to the CIO convention.

Two important actions were taken on Sunday. National CIO policy regarding the elections, the Marshall Plan and the Reuther viewpoint on a new party were combined in one resolution and passed as a matter of course. A new leadership was elected with Mike Novak, president of Dodge Local 3, as president, Al Barbour of Local 7 as secretary-treasurer, and Fuller of the steel workers as executive vice-president.

Carrying out the fare to the very end, the Leonard-SWP caucus pulled another stunt that didn't help their reputation any. Ernie Mazey, nominated against Novak for the presidency by Jack Lesnick of Local 36, declined after making a brief but violent denunciation of "this undemocratic convention" and these individuals walked out.

Among the many important features of this convention was the failure of the Stalinists to attempt even to put up a fight for their Wallace line. Rather they confined their whole struggle merely to retaining organizational control of the council. This played into the hands of the anti-Stalinists who mainly were behind "national CIO policy," but weren't too happy to engage in political debate on the national elections. Indirectly, of course, the political struggle was clear. Certainly in those circumstances a labor-party tendency would have difficulty in making its weight felt. But the SWP, having its leading spokesmen in Detroit there, made no effort to distinguish itself from the Stalinists. They confined their speeches and participated in the demonstrations strictly in defense of the Stalinist regime of the council. It will take considerable time and quite a change in their pro-Stalinist line to wipe out the disgrace they inflicted upon themselves.

While we disagree with the political policies (endorsement of Truman, etc.) of the majority of the delegates, certainly it was the duty of every union man to help bring the Wayne County CIO Council back into the CIO as an organization subject to the wishes of the American workers, in one form or another, rather than permit it to remain an outpost of the Stalinist wreckers of the labor movement.

PROS AND CONS: A Critical View on Civil Rights for Stalinists

Should We Defend the 12 Indicted CP Leaders?

By ERNEST ERBER

The indictment of the national leaders of the Communist Party by a grand jury that heard the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, confessed former agent of the Russian spy apparatus, indicates that the federal prosecutors will seek to link the defendants to espionage activities, in addition to the charge of conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence. This line of attack on the part of the government raises a problem for the defenders of civil liberties that is not easily resolved today.

The radical movement has, in the past, proceeded on the formula that it was obliged to defend the civil liberties of all political tendencies, except the fascists. Whereas the Marxists never called upon the government to act against fascist organizations and periodicals, it never rallied to the defense of the latter when they were prosecuted. The Marxists differed in this respect from the American Civil Liberties Union's point of view, which demanded civil rights for everyone, including fascists.

During the time when the CP was already a bureaucratic, monolithic organization that waged a war of "rule or ruin" against all its rivals but was yet considered basically a labor organization, Marxists defended the civil liberties of the Stalinists without reservations. Today our Workers Party no longer finds it possible to consider the CP a workers' party. We have designated it in official resolutions as a totalitarian, anti-socialist and anti-working-class party that aims to destroy the civil liberties of everyone and establish its own rule on the Russian model of a slave state.

Along with this designation we have recognized that the CP bases itself primarily upon the working class and makes the labor movement the main arena of its operations. As a result, an attack upon the CP can often be a simultaneous attack upon a section of the labor movement, especially when the prosecution is guided by reactionaries who have as little use for progressive unionism as for the CP.

We have avoided, therefore, taking a stand against defending the civil liberties of individuals because they are Stalinists. Where the defense of a Stalinist official of a trade union is a defense of the union itself, the Stalinist politics of the official must not be a barrier to rallying to his defense. However, do the interests of the labor movement demand the defense of the arrested leaders of the CP in the present case?

COMPARES CASE OF FASCISTS

The argument has been made that though the conduct and aims of the CP are such as to make them undeserving of civil rights, the denial of their civil rights would constitute a reactionary victory and a threat to the civil rights of all other political minorities. In my opinion, this argument is not different from the traditional position of the ACLU, and its

logical application by one who believes the CP to be a totalitarian organization must lead to the defense of the civil liberties of fascists as well.

Otherwise one would have to make an exception for the CP solely on grounds that it camouflages itself as a socialist and labor organization and, therefore, has the external appearance of a genuine labor and socialist movement. In this case, one ends up by making a virtue of the CP's worst vice, its deceitful misrepresentation of itself. Such a position, therefore, contradicts what should be the main task of Marxists today in relation to Stalinism, that is, exposing its fraudulent claim to being part of labor's great struggle for the emancipation of humanity.

We have followed a policy for some years now of disregarding the fate of the known agents of the GPU (the Russian secret police) when they were arrested by capitalist governments. The latest instance is the case of Gerhart Eisler. The latter's role as an operative in the Kremlin's international network is well known. We took the position that his imprisonment or deportation was no concern of the American working class. The question that arises, however, is whether a genuine distinction can be made between an Eisler and a Foster.

All the evidence that is available (and it is considerable) establishes that it is impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between the GPU apparatus and that of the Stalinist parties. That is why the GPU is unlike any other intelligence service in the world, with the possible exception of the relationship between the Jesuit order and the Catholic Church as a whole.

GPU AND COMMUNIST PARTIES

The Russian state is not merely a police state in the traditional sense of a state that maintains itself through police powers. The Stalin state is a police state because the GPU is its very essence. The GPU regulates life in Russia in the coal mines, in the theater, in the scientific laboratories, in the military academies, in the Orthodox Church, in party cells, in the diplomatic corps—in fact, wherever two Russians get together for any purpose. The international Stalinist movement, now doing business as the Cominform, is merely an arm of the Stalinist state. If the GPU is the essence of the Russian state, it is likewise the essence of the international Stalinist movement.

If there is a division in Stalin's international apparatus between specialists in espionage and specialists in political infiltration, the division exists only in the interests of efficiency. Eisler and Golos (Bentley's immediate superior) operated as part of the same international machine, though functioning in different spheres. Eisler was a specialist in politics and gave orders to Browder, while Golos was a specialist in espionage and gave orders to a motley crew of agents.

However, the cadres that served Eisler and those that served Golos were often the same and were always interchangeable. It is a notorious fact that even public leaders in the CP "disappear" for whole stretches from open activity while on secret GPU missions, either within the country or abroad. Trotsky accused Duclos of being the head of the GPU in France at a time when the latter was vice-president of the Chamber of Deputies. At another time, Trotsky flatly stated that the national leaders of every CP were part of the GPU apparatus.

To say that no clear-cut distinction can be made between the GPU and the CP is not the same as saying that they are one and the same thing. Obviously the millions of members of the Stalinist parties are not conscious agents of the GPU. Yet they belong to organizations that are merely extensions of the GPU.

As such even the lowliest rank-and-file member is utilized to facilitate the work of the GPU, even though he is rarely aware of it. One of the Swiss Stalinists who played an important role in the murder of Ignace Reiss claimed she was told that Reiss was an arms runner for Franco and willingly played her part as a service to the anti-fascist cause. Several of the Stalinists caught up in the GPU passport ring that was exposed as a result of the Robinson-Rubens case in 1939 said they were under the impression that the fake passports were being used to send volunteers to fight in Spain.

When a Stalinist fraction chairman in an industrial plant or engineering office sends in detailed reports on production he assumes it is for the trade-union department of the CP. When Stalinists in the army keep the party informed of their whereabouts and activities of their units, they assume it serves Stalinist propaganda among the troops. Yet all such information is collated and channeled to the proper authorities in GPU headquarters in the Lubyanka.

It is my opinion that the socialist and labor movement has no obligation whatsoever to defend the leaders of the CP in the present case, no more so that they had in the case of Fritz Kuhn and the German-American Bund. Foster, Dennis et al, are not martyred labor leaders; they are the arrested leaders of the Russian-American Bund.

We do have the obligation of fighting all reactionary legislation that in any way curtails civil liberties. Among such laws is the Smith Gag Act. However, the fact that fascists were convicted under laws we opposed was no basis for our rallying to their defense. We owe no more defense to the Stalinists indicted under the Smith Act than we owed to Eisler on grounds that aliens should have the same political liberties as citizens. Our struggle to repeal the Smith Act must go on, but it must not be linked to the defense of the arrested Stalinists.

What is immoral about the espionage of the Stalinists is that (a) it cloaks itself in the garments of socialism and liberty in order to advance the interests of totalitarianism and slavery; and (b) it debauches and corrupts the labor movement and seeks to turn it into an agency of espionage on behalf of a power that destroys everything the labor movement stands for.