

**INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
\$14,000 FUND DRIVE-GIVE NOW!**

# LABOR ACTION

JUNE 6, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## 30 WEEKS

since labor won its great "victory" at the polls on November 2 by re-electing Truman and a Democratic majority—but

## The Taft-Hartley Law is still on the books!

### Jim Crow Cracked in Baltimore's Legit Theater Through Picketing

BALTIMORE—This city's Negro segregation pattern is showing a crack. The Maryland Theater opened its house on a non-segregated basis for the showing of "Anna Lucasta," and it followed a few weeks later with a piano concert by Hazel Scott.

When the play opened, seats were sold to Negroes in the balcony only. Immediately a committee of representatives from the NAACP, the Baltimore Interracial Fellowship Youth, the Maryland Progressive Party and the Urban League contacted the management with a demand for a policy of non-segregation. It was refused and a picket line was set up. The picket line lasted for a week, while the management alternately pleaded with the pickets to go away and negotiated over a settlement.

At the end of the week, with the show losing money every day, the management capitulated and agreed to try a policy of non-segregation. The cast, which is almost entirely Negro, cooperated by promising to go without salaries for the second week if the showings failed to make money. The policy paid. At the end of the second week there was an overflow

crowd, and the booking was extended twice for a total of six more days.

The victory was significant because for two years groups have picketed Ford's, Baltimore's only legitimate theater until now, and failed in their attempt to break down segregation there.

With the Maryland Theater showing plays without segregation during the coming season, there is a good chance that Ford's can be cracked. That the picket line has already affected the attendance at Ford's is shown by the fact that they have been forced to book a higher percentage of musicals which get heavy attendance, since the people who attend serious dramatic productions respect the picket line in great numbers.

The Maryland has already attracted some theatergoers from Washington, who will not cross the Ford picket line, especially since the Washington Ford Theater shut down when faced by the refusal of Actors Equity to book at that segregated house.

The committee which conducted the picket line at the Maryland is actively cooperating with the theater (Continued on page 2)

## Labor Is Losing the Fight on T-H! Mobilize the Rank and File Through A Political Action Congress of Labor!

One after another, the points in the "Fair Deal" platform which mobilized labor's vote for Truman have gone down like so many clay pigeons. Chief among these has been repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Thirty weeks have passed since the national elections which were to have brought immediate and unequivocal repeal. The end result has been that no one, no one, expects the administration to push, and Congress to enact, complete repeal. The issue has long since become one of determining how far a new law shall go in crippling the limbs of an independent and vigorous labor movement. Meanwhile, Taft-Hartley stands.

Not even the most skeptical backer of Truman in the labor movement anticipated such utter rout. For the least that seemed reasonable to be expected was that the new Congress, under the leadership of the administration, would pay off on a few of the promises made. That these promises have not been fulfilled is good for considerable thought.

### TIME TO THINK!

We are not quarreling about Truman as an individual. Maybe he meant what he promised; maybe he didn't. It matters little. Nor are we discussing the complexities of political alignment in the U. S. government today. It seems obvious that a multiplicity of forces are combining to shape new alignments and strategems in the higher circles of capitalist politics, as can be witnessed in the Congressional debates. These developments require the closest attention of labor; not, however, its participation!

When a labor movement, which only a few months ago made its major political stand over repeal of Taft-

Hartley, is reduced to making a choice between narrow and wide injunctive provisions in the law, it becomes time for the rank and file of that labor movement to demand a new orientation. By and large, the leadership of the labor movement has decided political policy. The ranks have gone along expecting genuine accomplishment, it is now clearly time for the ranks to be involved in making policy. It is equally time for the political activities of the unions to be coordinated on a solid democratic basis in preparation for political advances that can be made.

Whether it was right or wrong to support Truman in November (and we thought it was wrong), the experience of the last months proves that the Democratic Party cannot be the vehicle of labor's political achievements. Whether it was right or wrong in the past to abstain from political action (and we thought it was wrong), certainly nobody today argues that political matters are not organized labor's concern.

Both AFL (Labor's League for Political Education) and CIO (PAC) have created political sections. As these bodies stand today, they are, from labor's viewpoint, ineffective machines whose purpose seems to be little more than that of promoting the candidacy of this or that big party candidate. They can, however, be converted into instruments of real independent political action.

### ASK THE RANK AND FILE!

Readers of LABOR ACTION know that we believe that a labor party is indispensably indicated. In our view the political action bodies of the AFL and CIO, could be best utilized as the core of such a labor party. But we are not even arguing that at the moment.

What we wish to suggest here is

that a conference of existing political action bodies, organized on a democratic level, involving leadership and rank and file, be called at once to consider labor's position in relation to the 81st Congress and those issues of particular interest (Taft-Hartley, housing, etc.). The broader issues of labor's political goals and weapons must inevitably rise, but a POLITICAL CONGRESS OF UNION REPRESENTATIVES is absolutely required for our immediate needs.

Taft-Hartley is still on the books. The most that seems likely to come of Congress is a watered down version of Taft-Hartley. Similarly on other issues. Labor has to sit down and plan its strategy for meeting this situation, and winning its demands. The ranks are not lacking in confidence. What they lack is the opportunity to get together to systematically promote their political interests.

### CONGRESS OF POLITICAL ACTION!

Moreover, new Congressional elections will soon be coming. The utility of backing this or that "friendly" capitalist candidate has been demonstrated for the umpteenth time. Clearly, the appearance of independent labor candidates, pledged to nothing but the advancement of the people's interest, is on the order of the day.

Political policy, like every other aspect of union policy, is best made with rank and file participation, is best made when coordinated on a local and national scale. Let us therefore start calling in our local union, in our shops, for a "getting together" of the political bodies that exist (PAC, LLPE) or are yet to be created.

We can start on a local scale, moving forward to a national conference of delegates in a CONGRESS OF POLITICAL ACTION. Let's start "talking it up" in our unions now!

## Reuther Retreats In Ford Strike — Discontent Grows

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, May 31—The 24-day Ford strike has ended with inconclusive results, in terms of the immediate issue that caused it—the speedup—and with a moral blow to the prestige of the UAW and the Reuther leadership.

The Ford Motor Company insisted on two main points: (1) arbitration of the speedup issue, and (2) no talks on pensions or the contract until after the men went back to work.

Walter Reuther told the strikers a week ago Thursday that the union wouldn't compromise with speedup, and (2) it would insist on pension negotiations during the strike.

### An Invitation

The coming convention of the United Auto Workers faces important problems of policy and leadership. This great union has taken on key importance for the whole labor movement, and in many ways its problems are those of the whole CIO.

In the next period, LABOR ACTION intends to follow these problems closely. But we wish also to extend an invitation to our readers—especially members of the UAW—to participate in our discussion. We invite letters dealing constructively, informatively, or critically with the issues before the Auto Workers.

Viewpoints differing from those expressed in our own columns are welcome. Regardless of the opinions expressed, letters will be published (as usual) depending on their general interest and space availability. As usual also (especially with respect to long letters) we reserve the right to cut, etc. Keep 'em as short as possible—500 words is a good mark.

The major retreat was made by Reuther. His statement proclaiming the settlement a union victory was disingenuous: "This is the first try. It was a hard clean fight. We won the first round. Now let's go into the second round—contracts."

If the union wins the speedup dispute in arbitration, there will be some basis for Reuther's claim. But the UAW suffered badly with regard to forcing the company into pension negotiations. Reuther backtracked in his demands; he accepted arbitration—he insisted on it as a means of ending the strike; and negotiations on the contract and on pensions now begin without any real spirit of victory or confidence among the Ford workers!

### WHAT "VICTORY"?

Whether Reuther outsmarted himself or was outsmarted by John Bugas (Ford's labor boss) in the final days of the strike is secondary to the fact that the Ford Company conceded very little, and did succeed in making the union reverse its proclaimed public policies and program.

When Reuther proposed arbitration he suggested it on the basis of a "loaded" question on speedup: Does a man have to make up work which was lost through no fault of his own? Secondly, Reuther had a deal fixed up in Washington where an arbitrator would be appointed who would probably rule in favor of the union. In that event the union would have won the first round, even though it accepted arbitration.

But Bugas and the Ford Company didn't fall for that one. Instead they stalled, and finally forced the union, which was now committed to arbitration, to accept a formula that compromises the whole fight against speedup.

The Reuther leadership had to spend some time convincing the Thompson forces in Ford Local 600 to accept the settlement. Even then, Tommy Thompson (head of the local) told the settlement meeting that he was still against arbitration.

Although Reuther told the meeting "I think we will win because our claim is based on a specific contract clause," his own lack of confidence in the results of arbitration were indicated when he said: "If we lose, then we still are in negotiations and we will have a good chance to change the line in the contract."

If the union can lose the speedup issue in arbitration, as Reuther admits, where does the victory in the present settlement exist, except in the publicity release of the Reuther leadership?

How the Ford workers felt about the settlement was indicated by the attendance at the settlement meeting. Less than 4,000 showed up to vote on the proposal. Why show up? If the union accepted arbitration it was over, so why waste a day going to a meeting? For three days the newspapers had been saying that the strike was as good as settled. Reuther's retreat was obvious to the most backward workers, let alone to the union activists.

### HEAT UNDER REUTHER

The Stalinists put out a leaflet denouncing the settlement as a "betrayal," but didn't try to make a major floor fight: (It was one of those situations where confusion and bitterness makes any discussion futile; and the workers are still hostile to the CP, especially the Thompson forces who, while going along with the settlement, are doing a real job on Reuther as the man chiefly responsible for it.)

Reuther, in his speech, denounced the CP and ridiculed its flipflops, but failed to mention by so much as one word his own painfully obvious flipflops in this strike.

In the auto industry as a whole, the fact that the UAW didn't win this fight encourages the other companies to continue their drive on (Continued on page 2)

## FBI Case in CP Trial Is Rested; Adds Up to Thirdhand Assertions

By WYATT LEE

NEW YORK, May 31—The trial of eleven National Committee members of the Communist Party has reached its halfway mark, with the government resting its case after the appearance of thirteen prosecution witnesses during a two-month period.

The defense now takes over and its first witness, John W. Gates, a defendant and editor of the Daily Worker, has been on the stand for the past week. Undoubtedly the other ten defendants will take their turn, with William Z. Foster, the indicted national chairman who has been excused from the trial on grounds of

ill health, presenting testimony in the form of an affidavit.

The prosecution evidence presented a picture of what the U. S. Department of Justice considers to be "teaching and advocating the violent overthrow of the government." This is the charge, under the terms of the Smith Act, that the CP leaders face.

### SMITH GAG ACT AT WORK

The prosecution laid the groundwork of its charges through the testimony of its first witness, Louis F. Budenz, a former managing editor of the Daily Worker who left the CP to become a Catholic and a professor at a Catholic university.

Through Budenz the government sought to prove that when the CP was reconstituted in 1945, following its wartime existence as the super-patriotic Communist Political Association, the party became a conspiratorial force, with its leaders, the present defendants, conspiring to advocate and teach the overthrow of the government.

The wording here is important, as it brings the charge under the provisions of the Smith Act, designed by Congress in the early days of the war to circumvent Supreme Court decisions that required proof of an (Continued on page 3)

## Cites Secret Speech by High Officer on U.S. Militarism

The charge that the American military establishment aims to fix its own control upon the country was aired this week by one of the most responsible labor newspapers in the United States—"Labor," the national weekly organ of the Railroad Brotherhoods, in its issue of May 28.

Citing at length from the off-the-record speech of a high officer, "Labor" also ties this trend up with the recent "Directive No. 1" issued by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, which imposed a gag rule upon any information to the press from any government Defense Department source.

The railroad unions' paper says: "For example, it is charged that the 'gag' is being used to muzzle opposition to army and air force schemes to use the proposed merger law to abolish the Marine Corps and naval aviation. Also to cover up the law's 'dangers to American democracy.'"

Following is the summary of the speech by the "high officer" as presented by "Labor":

An illustration of this point of view is provided by a high officer's recent talk to a military group. By expressing frank and unusual opinions, he risked punishment under the so-called "gag rule" and his name cannot be mentioned here.

Back of the armed forces merger bill, he said, "is a struggle for power in the entire military organization. It is copied out of the General Staff book of Von Moltke — is the same thing that took place in Germany in 1937 to 1939."

"It's the struggle, especially in time of peace, as to which service will get the biggest cut of the increasing military appropriation pie.

"It began in 1943, when the idea of unification was first proposed in a secret memorandum by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

"It was a proposal that there be set up a unified service, a single Secretary of War, a Chief of Staff as supreme commander of all the armed forces, and a national General Staff.

WRITTEN BY GENERAL, ADMIRAL  
"The secret papers of 1943 appeared in the Senate and House in 1945 and 1946, in a measure which was killed by Congress. Then, early in 1947, the

plan was again proposed in the National Security Act."

After a bitter battle, the officer said, the law was passed in 1947, and became known as the "Unification Act." It "contains some good features, but is heavily weighted in favor of the military."

"That was inevitable," he declared, "because the act was written by an air force general and a navy admiral."

### CONTROL OF COUNTRY

"The bill was deliberately drawn up to permit the military people to take control of the country in the next war or before," the officer asserted.

However, the army and air force chiefs did not get all they wanted in 1947. Congress made some changes in the bill before passing it.

Now, the officer said, the power-seeking militarists are again after what they failed to get in 1947. They wrote the bill now before Congress, to get a bigger share of the "pie" by doing away with the Marine Corps and naval aviation, and to make "the military" "all-powerful" in this country, as it was in Germany and Japan.

### "CHAIRMAN" REALLY CHIEF

"One of the amendments would appoint a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They didn't dare call him the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, so they called him 'chairman.'"

"Actually, he would be the very Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces which Congress would not accept two years ago.

"A little paragraph containing about four lines was slipped into the 1947 act. It said the General Staff would be restricted to 100 officers.

"The present amendment would re-

move all restrictions. That would mean an unlimited General Staff, as they had in Germany.

"One of the dangers of the proposed 'unified' organization is this:

### REARS DANGEROUS MONOPOLY

"A bill such as this, bringing all military branches into one department, under a supreme commander, would create the greatest monopoly this country has ever seen—a monopoly spending 40 per cent of all annual appropriations.

"Congress has realized what business monopolies would do to the average citizen, so Congress set up anti-trust laws to protect the country against that sort of thing. Yet Congress is asked to create a vastly more powerful and dangerous military monopoly.

"It is said this would result in economy," the officer pointed out. "Forrestal said that military 'unification' saved the country \$56 million last year.

### LIKE PRUSSIAN SYSTEM

"He failed to say that, during the same period, military expenditures increased from \$10 billion to \$14 billion, and are \$16 billion today.

"If we have that sort of monopoly, there is no economy. Military cost will go up and up, as it has in the two years we've had 'unification.'"

"The legislation now proposed will saddle this country with the same militaristic system it was copied from—the Prussian General Staff system. And with it the 'gag rule'—the same sort of thing they have in Moscow.

"These things go to the very root of democracy," the officer declared. "They involve the very things we fought for in the war."

A subscription to  
**LABOR ACTION**  
is only \$1 a year—  
**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**



### AN EDITORIAL

## On the Eisler Case

The British judge who refused to extradite Gerhart Eisler undoubtedly delivered a slap in the face to the United States. Up to the moment when the judge ruled that Eisler was not extraditable under the laws governing perjury in England, the United States government had assumed that the British authorities would do as they were told by the boss. The overbearing behavior of the United States shocked even the calloused sensibilities of imperialist diplomatic circles. The British cops were not only told to haul the fugitive off the Polish ship on which he fled the United States, but a couple of U. S. gendarmes were sent along to superintend the business in what is legally called "British waters."

That the British judge acted according to his own conscience is something for which he is to be commended. To the degree that he and others in England reared up and refused to act as servants for United States imperialism, they breathed a bit of fresh air into the international climate.

The opinion was apparently widespread in England that Eisler was a political refugee. He was not and is not. But insofar as the judge, or those who demanded Eisler's freedom, looked upon Eisler as a political victim, they were obligated to act as they did. The right of political asylum is a precious one. It would indeed be a monstrous thing to allow governments to snatch political refugees.

It is good that the mighty master got slapped in the face. It is good that there are people in England who will not permit violence to the freedom of political asylum. Beyond these two considerations, we have been little concerned with the sensational Eisler affair. For Eisler is a political victim only to the extent that the moment of his arrest was decided not so much by normal intelligence precautions as by the politics of the cold war.

Eisler is a spy (for the Russian despots). He is an agent of assassins, if not an assassin himself. (What was his involvement in the assassination of Leon

Trotsky?) Except insofar as he can be brought to answer for his crimes against the working class, crimes committed in performance of his GPU duties, we do not care what happens to him.

We are normally completely indifferent to the fate of spies. The activities of spies, and the apprehension of spies, are problems for the governments involved. Spies operate according to the rules of their profession. One of these is that they can expect to be caught, and they are treated accordingly by the government which traps them. That this particular spy whose activities were undoubtedly known to U. S. intelligence experts for a long time, was arrested at a moment convenient to U. S. imperialist politics does not alter the nature of his activities—nor command any greater concern for his fate from us. If we would like to see him examined on his complicity in the murder of Leon Trotsky and in similar crimes against socialism, that is the limit of our interest in this GPU agent and spy.

On Page 4—

**THE WORLD GOVERNMENT  
MOVEMENT**

**Road to Lasting Peace?**

**Labor Action Feature on UWF**



# Phila. UE Local Hits Nail on Head in Paper

PHILADELPHIA—The May issue of Local 107 News (United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, CIO) has carried a very excellent series of articles written by leaders of the union on the general topic of "Freedom." The articles condemned specifically the action of the attorney general in placing the Industrial Workers of the World on the "subversive list" (the first labor union to be so labeled) and the continued interference of the military at the Essington Westinghouse plant through denying union members the right to work in the aviation gas turbine division because they are "poor security risks."

President John Schaefer, in his remarks on the listing of the IWW, pointed out that this organization had made contributions to the American labor movement, had opposed the political parties of big business, and had denounced World War I as a war for profits. Because the IWW has criticized the established social order it is now tagged "subversive." In more general remarks on "Freedom to Criticize," Schaefer said:

"Criticism—of the nation, of the union, of society—is what makes for progress. To silence even one critic leads sooner or later to the suppression of all criticism. That is tyranny. That is totalitarianism. 'Think as I think, or don't think at all,' is the ideology of all dictatorships. That is the trend of affairs at the present time with the witch-hunts, red-baiting, loyalty oaths, and 'security-risk' firings."

### "TELLING LOUD"

The year-long fight of Local 107 to maintain job rights for "poor security risks" was summarized by Business Agent Francis Bradley. Since last

June the Navy has denied four members of the local the right to work on classified work, and only action by the union in the form of the 26-hour sitdown strike last July prevented the company from interpreting these Navy directives by firing the employees involved. Bradley made public a letter which he circulated widely in labor and liberal circles after the second pair of risk cases arose eight weeks ago. In his letter the business agent summed up the local's attitude on "Freedom to Work":

"The uninformed might believe the factory is a hotbed of subversives—it's not so. It's only because we believe in yelling as loud as we can when we lose something—in this case, something more precious than economic gains. Others climb into their shells.

"Freedom to Organize" was dealt with by Edward Savitsky, a general committee man:

"Nobody gave us the right to organize unions so that we could better our conditions. The men of money and the government fought us every inch of the way. . . . It was our own mobilization for action that built the CIO, and not the generosity of a 'friendly Congress and President.' Labor has no friends outside its own ranks. We can depend only on ourselves. Today the Taft-Hartley Act and the other attacks on the rights of labor threaten our 'freedom' to organize. Our only defense is our own solidarity and determination."

And, it should be added, this solidarity and determination has to be shown on the political as well as on the economic field, by building an independent party of labor—not by supporting capitalist politicians.

# Ford Strike—

(Continued from page 1)

speeding up the workers. The struggle for a better contract and pensions in Ford is made much more difficult.

An indication of the present situation is revealed in the quietly ignored fact that at Chrysler, where the union can reopen negotiations on wages on June 15, Norman Mathews, UAW Chrysler director, hasn't even issued a call for a national delegate conference of Chrysler workers to discuss the problem and work out a program.

The period of disillusionment with the Reuther leadership has begun among the Reuther followers. There is little indication that the CP will gain. The other anti-Reuther faction seems to be completely dormant or still punch-drunk from all the defeats it took in recent local elections.

But in the Reuther ranks, dissatisfaction has grown and has become more vocal. It remains to be seen if it becomes strong enough to force some changes in the Reuther leadership at the next convention.

# Baltimore —

(Continued from page 1)

management to get bookings of plays for next season. They contacted a number of actors and actresses who have refused to play at segregated houses, also Lillian Hellman and Eugene O'Neill, who have refused to permit their plays to be booked where there is segregation.

Actors Equity was notified and has already told the committee that it has notified its New York members and has urged them to route their plays to the Maryland.

This victory on the Baltimore segregation front can be credited to the perseverance of a mere handful of people from the Baltimore Interracial Fellowship and the NAACP who, for two years, kept the issue alive by picketing Ford's in all kinds of weather and in the face of lack of cooperation from many Baltimore "liberals" who expressed their sympathy and walked on through. It is a vindication of the theory that a half dozen people (or less) with principles, a program and consistent activity can move mountains.

# Dog-Eat-Dog System,

"A lot of us ate dog food during the depression. It was not poisonous. But I don't think a foreigner would appreciate getting a can of it for human consumption under a fancy American label. . . ."

"Once someone has bought inferior food under an American label he will be through with American goods. We should learn from the British. Their labels stand for quality. In fact it is probable they export their best grades and leave the lower qualities for home consumption."

—Congressman Crosser (D. O.), chairman of the House Commerce Committee, at his committee hearing April 28.

We have no doubt that "a foreigner" would object to getting a can of dog food under a fancy label—but does the good congressman think that the Ohio constituency which elected him (here at home) consisted of Airedales?

# 60 Per Cent Is In: Now's the Time For Last Spurt on the Fund Drive!

By YETTA BARSH Fund Drive Director

MAY 30—This week's collections total \$1123. With three more collection reports and a little over two weeks to go, 60 per cent of the \$14,000 goal has been achieved.

There is no doubt but that this is the time for an all-out effort by everyone. Thanks to the continued cooperation of SYL units, the difference between the quotas set and \$14,000 has been reduced to \$937.

However, if we are to succeed in raising \$14,000, all units in the drive will not only have to realize their respective quotas but they will have to exceed them. A number of the League branches, appreciating this fact, have unofficially increased their quotas to help meet the \$14,000 goal. We urge all branches to make their all-out effort now; you have only two more weeks in which to make collections. See to it that all pledges are turned in immediately and begin

### working on your oversubscription.

Buffalo made a 40 per cent jump this week with its \$400 contribution. This raises its total contributions to \$790. The Buffalo Fund Drive director writes: "We WILL make our FULL QUOTA in time. Will do our best to get an extra 20 per cent."

Philadelphia, which has been maintaining a steady and even pace, sent in \$61 this week together with word that we will be hearing from this branch again shortly. Philadelphia is now second only to St. Louis in the list of League branches.

### SYL STILL IN VAN

Cleveland is right behind Philadelphia this week with another \$55 contribution, which raises its collections to 85 per cent of its quota. New York City joined the Cleveland branch in the 85 per cent bracket; it sent in \$265 and the assurance that it hoped to do even better the following week.

Our San Francisco Fund Drive director collected \$63, which brings its total up to 66 per cent and gives it a good chance of meeting its quota with ease. San Francisco is now putting on a real push to go over the top.

Seattle makes its first appearance in the drive this week with a \$80

contribution. At the very beginning of the drive the branch felt confident that it would be able to meet its \$300 quota. Since then it has encountered unexpected difficulties but we are informed that despite its slowness in getting started, the branch will meet its quota.

The Socialist Youth League continues to head the list. It had a total quota of \$350 (\$50 of which represented a voluntary increase in the original quota)—and to date the receipts from the SYL total \$370. The individual units of the SYL continue to set the pace for all.

The contributions from SYL units this week total \$53: the Buffalo SYL has gone over the top with its \$27, the Chicago SYL has contributed another \$24 in its effort to meet its \$200 unofficial quota, and the Berkeley SYL has sent in an additional \$200.

Our Minnesota friend continues to add to his original contributions. Another \$50.00 has been received from him with word that he is increasing his personal quota to \$50 and hopes to meet it before the end of the drive. Other friends have sent in a total of \$22 which helped to increase the contributions listed under "National Office."

### OHIO LABOR NOTES

# Cleveland Board of Education Slaps Loyalty Oaths on Teachers

By JOE CLARK

The Cleveland Board of Education has just voted to obtain anti-Communist oaths from 5000 of its employees, including its 3300 teachers. An excited discussion preceded the introduction of the legislation. The only employees of the board exempted from the oath are those who work by the hour.

The legislation was introduced by board member Charles A. Mooney and was seconded by Joseph M. Gallagher. Comment by Mooney: "I see no reason on God's green earth why anybody would not want to stand up and be counted. This will make them go on record as Communists or liars." Comment by Gallagher: "Anyone who wouldn't go along on this thing has no place on our school rolls; the hell with them."

### DEADLOCK

Negotiations between the Warner & Swasey Co. of Cleveland and the International Association of Machinists to settle the five-months-old strike have been ended with both sides standing firm. The strike involves 1800 workers, mostly machinists. No further meetings are scheduled or contemplated and it looks like a hopeless deadlock. The union is seeking a 10-cent hourly wage increase and six paid holidays a year. The union's offer to submit the dispute to arbitration has been rejected by the company.

### CIO VS. CP

The Cleveland Industrial Union Council (CIO) has just gone on record as being solidly behind the Mur-

ray leadership in opposing "leftist" (i.e., CP-controlled) unions. This could not have happened a few months ago. The CIUC has only recently passed from Stalinist control. This is noteworthy because of the fact that the national convention of the CIO is scheduled for Cleveland next October.

At a meeting of the council on May 25, Secretary James Quinn offered a resolution to the effect that the Stalinist leaders must either follow CIO policy or they will be kicked out next October. The resolution was directed at the Farm Equipment Workers, the United Office & Professional Workers, the Longshoremen's Union and the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers. The board members also cast their eyes over at the United Electrical Workers, in which an opposition is conducting a drive to oust the Stalinist leadership.

Quinn stressed the need for strengthening the council's political-action committee and its campaign for voluntary \$1.00 contributions to finance its political campaign this year and against Senator Robert Taft next year.

### LAYOFFS

Layoffs growing out of the Ford strike have reached more than 4000 in Cleveland and another four or five thousand are working short time. Heaviest cutback was one affecting 3000 workers in an auto-parts firm. A machinery and foundry firm has laid off 1300; an electrical machinery plant 500 and two other auto parts firms 500, all as a direct result of the Ford strike.

Branch	Quota	Received	Per Cent
Bronx SYL	\$50	\$78	156
Chicago SYL	100	152	152
St. Louis	50	58	116
Brooklyn SYL	50	52	104
Berkeley SYL	50	52	104
Philadelphia	400	349	87
Cleveland	400	339	85
New York City	4000	3406	85
Streator	25	20	80
Buffalo	1000	790	79
Newark	300	212	71
Chicago	1500	1005	67
San Francisco	800	525	66
Detroit	600	359	60
Reading	100	50	50
Manhattan SYL	50	25	50
Buffalo SYL	50	25	50
Labor Action and New Int'l	150	68	45
Akron	200	79	40
National Office	1500	521	35
West Virginia	125	43	34
Seattle	300	80	27
Boston	100	22	22
Los Angeles	500	107	21
Youngstown	100	20	20
Pittsburgh	50	2	4
Baltimore	200	4	2
Connecticut	50	0	0
Indiana	100	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Miscellaneous	983	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$14,000</b>	<b>\$8428</b>	<b>60</b>

**Readers of LABOR ACTION: Pitch In!**

Here's my \$..... for the ISL Fund Drive.

Name..... Date.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....



**WITH THE**  
**Independent Socialist League**

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, classes, lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE. For general information and literature of the ISL, and for local information not given below, write to: INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, New York. For information on the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE, youth organization of the ISL, write to the SYL at the same address. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

- AKRON**  
Write to Box 221.
- BALTIMORE**  
Write to national office of ISL.
- BUFFALO**  
639 Main St., 2nd floor.  
SYL meets Friday evenings.
- CHICAGO**  
333 West North Ave., Room 3.  
Tel.: MICHigan 9003.  
SYL: same address.
- CLEVELAND**  
Write to Box 1190, Station B.  
Branch meets Tuesdays, 8 p.m., at Slovenian Home, 6409 St. Clair Ave.
- DETROIT**  
9016 12th St.
- LOS ANGELES**  
3314 So. Grand. Tel.: Richmond 7-3230 (if no answer, phone AX 2-9067).
- NEWARK**  
248 Market St.
- NEW YORK CITY**  
City Center: 114 West 14th St., third floor. Tel.: WATkins 4-4222, CHelsea 2-9681.  
Open daily 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.  
Manhattan Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.  
Industrial Branch: Thursday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.  
Brooklyn-Brownsville Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin).  
Queens Branch: Write to ISL at City Center, 114 West 14th Street.
- NEW YORK CITY—SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE**  
For all information, write: Socialist Youth League, 114 West 14th St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.  
Manhattan Unit: Open forum every Friday, 8:30 p.m. at City Center, 114 West 14th St.  
Bronx Unit: Open forum every other Sunday, 8:30 p.m., at 1330 Wilkins Ave.  
Brooklyn Unit: Open forum every Thursday, 8:30 p.m., at 1758 East 5th St., Brooklyn.
- PHILADELPHIA**  
1139 West Girard Ave., 3rd floor. Meetings Monday at 8 p.m. Open House, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.
- PITTSBURGH**  
Write to national office of ISL.
- READING**  
Write to P. O. Box 1671. Labor Action Hall, Reed St. (Reed and Court) is open Sundays, 7:45-9:30 p.m., for round-table discussions on trade-union subjects.
- SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA**  
Write to Labor Action Hall, 466 Tenth St., Room 212, Oakland 7, Cal.
- SEATTLE**  
Write to Labor Action, Box 358, 905 3rd Ave.
- ST. LOUIS**  
Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.
- WEST VIRGINIA**  
Write to national office of ISL.
- YOUNGSTOWN**  
Write to J. P. Walters, Box 605.

**A New York Event! Round Table**

**THE STATE OF ART TODAY AND ITS FUTURE**

Meyer Schapiro, Moderator: Prof. of Fine Arts, Columbia  
Clement Greenberg: art critic, The Nation  
James J. Sweeney: author and lecturer  
George Morris: artist and art critic

**FRIDAY, 8 P. M. HOTEL DIPLOMAT**  
**JUNE 10 108 W. 43d St.**  
**83¢ (tax incl.) New York City**

Sponsored by Kutcher Civil Rights Comm.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

## Labor and the Pope

To the Editor:

Gordon Haskell in his article on Pope Pius' pronouncement to employers on the relationship between them and their hirelings was timely, but he might have handled his material to better advantage.

Pius XII, several months after his election in 1939, directed an encyclical to the hierarchy of the United States attacking the schools of this country. In it he said, "God has ordained that for the exercise of virtues and for the testing one's worth there be in the world rich and poor." A statement issued by the Catholic Inter-American Seminar on Social Studies in 1942 insists that "the Christian concept of labor must be re-established." This derives from the dicta issued by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical Rerum Novarum. "This 'Christian concept,' according to Pope Leo, as interpolated by the Seminar, elicits this anomalous dicta: 'The poor must live well.' (!) A fatuous statement if there ever was one. It also says: 'It is a fatal error to regard economic life as independent of the moral teachings of the church.'"

Insofar as it is possible for the "poor to live well," the church, eagerly reasons that a satisfied "poor" who is willing to undergo the rigors of being poor, and all that goes with it, while at the same time "living well," will be exercising virtues that are God-ordained, that will test their worth, for after all man's reward is not on this earth but in the hereafter. By this line of reasoning the church subscribes to the biblical quotation of the chance of a rich man entering the kingdom of heaven.

## On Indonesia Policy

To the Editor:

The time has come for LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League to repudiate the policy of critical political support to the hangers-on of the Dutch Republic, Hatta and Soekarno.

An AP dispatch from Java dated May 7, 1949, states that these two gentlemen have accepted the following three-point policy: (1) Issuance of an order to Republican guerrillas to cease their warfare; (2) Cooperation with the Dutch in restoration of peace and maintenance of order; and (3) Participation in the round-table conference at The Hague.

The meaning of this "compromise" is obvious: the Republican leadership which once, despite its compromises and capitulations, represented in a distorted way the needs and aspirations of the people for independence, has become a complete puppet of the Dutch. These "revolutionary intellectuals" will now become "police-sergeants" in charge of dipping out of the guerrilla forces for their Dutch masters.

Had Jack Brad's policy been followed, i.e., "joining freely with . . .

## On Indonesia Policy

To the Editor:

The time has come for LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League to repudiate the policy of critical political support to the hangers-on of the Dutch Republic, Hatta and Soekarno.

An AP dispatch from Java dated May 7, 1949, states that these two gentlemen have accepted the following three-point policy: (1) Issuance of an order to Republican guerrillas to cease their warfare; (2) Cooperation with the Dutch in restoration of peace and maintenance of order; and (3) Participation in the round-table conference at The Hague.

The meaning of this "compromise" is obvious: the Republican leadership which once, despite its compromises and capitulations, represented in a distorted way the needs and aspirations of the people for independence, has become a complete puppet of the Dutch. These "revolutionary intellectuals" will now become "police-sergeants" in charge of dipping out of the guerrilla forces for their Dutch masters.

Had Jack Brad's policy been followed, i.e., "joining freely with . . .

## On Indonesia Policy

To the Editor:

The time has come for LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League to repudiate the policy of critical political support to the hangers-on of the Dutch Republic, Hatta and Soekarno.

An AP dispatch from Java dated May 7, 1949, states that these two gentlemen have accepted the following three-point policy: (1) Issuance of an order to Republican guerrillas to cease their warfare; (2) Cooperation with the Dutch in restoration of peace and maintenance of order; and (3) Participation in the round-table conference at The Hague.

The meaning of this "compromise" is obvious: the Republican leadership which once, despite its compromises and capitulations, represented in a distorted way the needs and aspirations of the people for independence, has become a complete puppet of the Dutch. These "revolutionary intellectuals" will now become "police-sergeants" in charge of dipping out of the guerrilla forces for their Dutch masters.

Had Jack Brad's policy been followed, i.e., "joining freely with . . .

## On Indonesia Policy

To the Editor:

The time has come for LABOR ACTION and the Independent Socialist League to repudiate the policy of critical political support to the hangers-on of the Dutch Republic, Hatta and Soekarno.

An AP dispatch from Java dated May 7, 1949, states that these two gentlemen have accepted the following three-point policy: (1) Issuance of an order to Republican guerrillas to cease their warfare; (2) Cooperation with the Dutch in restoration of peace and maintenance of order; and (3) Participation in the round-table conference at The Hague.

The meaning of this "compromise" is obvious: the Republican leadership which once, despite its compromises and capitulations, represented in a distorted way the needs and aspirations of the people for independence, has become a complete puppet of the Dutch. These "revolutionary intellectuals" will now become "police-sergeants" in charge of dipping out of the guerrilla forces for their Dutch masters.

Had Jack Brad's policy been followed, i.e., "joining freely with . . .

**ORDER YOUR BOOKS THROUGH LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.



# London Letter

by GEORGE STONE, Editor, Socialist Leader

## The Local Elections in May: An Augury?

The correspondent who challenged my analysis of the Labor Party's strength in this country [See letters in last week's issue—Ed.] possibly feels that the results of the May local elections substantiate his claim that Labor is losing ground. Let me admit at once that I did not anticipate the trend of the April elections to continue so markedly in those which took place early this month. But I would ask my correspondent to examine the results factually and objectively before jumping to any conclusions.

The seats involved were last contested in 1945 and 1946 when there was a landslide in Labor's favor and no one was so foolish to suppose that Labor could do quite so well this time. To some extent, indeed, Labor's position improved over the April county council elections. In the April elections, the Labor Party lost on an average four seats in each area (clearly a reaction to Sir Stafford Cripps' April budget), but in the elections held this month the average loss dropped to a third of a seat.

Commenting on the elections, the *Observer*, Britain's foremost Sunday newspaper, stated that "it is unwise to compare local with national elections. The Conservatives have yet to win a by-election, and until they do Labor has good reason for thinking that it will get back to power in 1950, though with a reduced majority."

And the *London Times* (May 14) had this to say: "It is still very far from certain, however, that the national balance of political forces, say, next May, will be similarly tilted. . . . It seems to be usual now for about twice as many electors to vote in Parliamentary elections as in local elections. It is doubtful whether those who have not voted in the local elections, many of them earlier supporters of the Labor Party, are likely to be divided between the parties in next year's general election in the same proportions as those who have just voted. Party loyalty will be more on its mettle."

## The Fight Is Between Labor and Toryism

What these elections have clearly shown is that the Conservatives have streamlined their local party organizations with some effect, and that there is no immediate prospect of the people giving any serious consideration to any nominees other than those of the Conservative and Labor Parties. The smaller parties suffered devastating defeats—the only successful I.L.P. candidates were those who were not opposed by the Labor Party—and the Stalinists were treated so ignominiously by the electorate that their boast to put one hundred parliamentary candidates into the field for the next general election must be considered just an empty threat.

The defeat of the Stalinists is welcomed and is not worth further comment. But when will such parties as the I.L.P. face up to realities and accept the logic of the present situation? Surely the fact that workers in all parts of the country have refused to back a third party, in contrast to their continued loyalty to the Labor Party, is a measure of the I.L.P.'s mistake.

At the moment such intervention in elections by the I.L.P. merely displays its weakness. But if the I.L.P. vote were large in next year's elections—enough to split the working-class vote—victory would in all probability go to the Conservatives and we would be saddled with a government more reactionary than any we have known.

Those who support intervention in elections at this stage argue that it presents a "glorious opportunity" to build a genuine social-revolutionary party. The assumption appears to be that such a party can be built without the support of organized labor. But if the working-class has such a party to thank for a period of Tory rule, it will be far less likely to look upon it with anything but marked hostility.

I consider it all important to prevent the return of the Conservative Party to power. Such parties as the I.L.P. cannot effectively help in this fight outside the organized labor movement. The choice before such parties is whether to work within the movement of social-democratic reformism or to increase the chance of the reactionaries by splitting the working-class vote. I believe that to jeopardize the best prospects that the working people of this country have ever had is too high a price to pay for the luxury of hugging a self-righteous purity to our bosoms.

## Exit Two Stalinist Stooges

Meeting in London this week, the National Executive of the Labor Party expelled Konni Zilliacus and L. J. Solley, two Labor members of Parliament. The expulsions caused little surprise. Zilliacus, who was for eighteen years a member of the secretariat of the League of Nations, and who earned notoriety for being its best-dressed member, has consistently opposed the government's foreign policy. So have many others, but Zilliacus has supported the Stalinist party line on almost every issue, and if he isn't a Stalinist party member, he has certainly given every impression of being one.

No member of a British political party has served the Kremlin more faithfully. Both he and Solley were among the 21 Labor members who were signatories of the Nenni telegram about a year ago. Since then Platt-Mills, a Stalinist if there was ever one, has been expelled from the Labor Party, and it was known that Zilliacus and others would be similarly dealt with if they refused to accept party decisions.

Let me hasten to add that much of Zilliacus & Company's criticism of Labor's foreign policy was justified. Where I part company with them, however, is on their method of propagating their grievances and the groups with whom they associated. Stalinists are not interested in peace; their main—indeed only—objective is to swing Britain into line with Russia. Whether this involves Britain in war and her eventual annihilation is of no concern to these people; whether it means the decimation of the working-class movement is likewise of no importance.

The servants of the Kremlin do not question—they obey! And, it is because Zilliacus and his associates have not given sufficient consideration to this aspect of the issues, that they have lost whatever sympathy might have been coming to them in their present dilemma.

Zilliacus will disappear from the political scene. The Labor Party has given public notice that it will tolerate no Stalinists within its ranks, and we have no reason to doubt its intentions on this score.

But in the end, the question whether Stalinists will become a menace in Britain will be answered not by executive committees but by the rank and file both inside and outside the labor movement. And that, in turn, will depend upon the willingness of the Labor Party to adopt programs and policies more in keeping with the times and the temper of the people.

## COME TO THINK ABOUT IT . . .

# TV's Got a Future: Here's How To See Eye to Eye with the Boss

By JOHN BARNES

One of the blessings of free enterprise to befall harried humanity in recent years is television. This product of science, ingenuity, and stock issues brings into the American tavern (and threatens to bring into each American home) dubious entertainment skillfully designed to repel the overwhelming majority in all age and interest groups.

Thus far, free Americans retain the upper hand; we are free to turn away, to twist the switch if it is at hand, or to frequent watering places which cling to the old-fashioned principle that refreshment and enjoyment are found in the glass rather than in the screen. But how much longer will we have this advantage?

This is no idle question. Particularly in the face of reports which tell of two uses that the Entertainment Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers predict for the television medium.

These good-natured roustabouts, always ready for a jolly season of strikebreaking or a witchhunting safari, look up from their divided reports long enough to tell us that television will be decidedly invaluable in conducting time and motion studies and promoting greater efficiency on the production line.

The future is quite clear, dear brethren: Workers of the world, prepare for audition!

## SOUL-SEARING HORRORS

Luckily you need not rehearse lines, rouge your cheeks or practise balancing your lunch basket on your head while punching the time clock. All that is necessary is that you surpass a beaver in will and a giant in strength—so as not to spoil the picture.

For picture, if you will, the office of a modern hard-working tycoon. While trying to arrange for a foursome of golf at the country club, our hero flicks his television switch. Immediately on his wall there appears in black and white (color is not due until 1951) a detailed picture of what is going on in all or a portion of the shop.

The telephone line being busy, he turns his attention to the assembly line. And it is here that he sees the unpardonable: one man is blowing his nose, another is pausing to wipe his glasses and a third is walking—slowly, no less—to the washroom!

Need we describe the feeling of apprehension that fills the alleged mind of our hero? Here, with his own

eyes, he sees money being taken from his pockets! Here he is forced to sit idly by while loafers (all reds, when you get right down to it) throw a monkeywrench into the next stockholders' report.

As he watches further into the day he is beside himself with rage and indignation as he notices thirty-minute lunch periods, bits of conversation, and additional trips to the washroom. In short, his day is ruined, along with his digestion.

The logical conclusion to these soul-searing labors is easy to see. He stumbles into the arms of his wife babbling, "Darling, I'm exhausted. I watched those vermin for almost four whole hours today." The darling in this case, being a woman of breeding, suavely suggests an eighteen-month cruise in the Caribbean and the appointment of a less sensitive, more robust, underling watcher. The country's best brains are thus preserved in salt water and the boys in the shop continue to put on a rollicking eight-hour show daily.

Should business decline, of course, the assembly-line cast may "go off for the summer." Off to the unemployment insurance office, that is.

## TWO-WAY TELEVISION

Now before the highly paid minds in the labor bureaucracy come to grips with this television problem, an obvious suggestion is in order. This suggestion, if taken to heart and to negotiating conferences, can easily result in the horrors of peace, security and abundance and can lose for us our priceless heritage of unemployment, war and capitalism.

It is this: When a television set is installed in the front office for efficiency purposes, the union shall insist that a set be likewise installed before each worker. And, while the front office peeps on the production line, the production line shall keep a close television eye on the front office.

After a few hours (it may even take days or weeks) of seeing just who is doing what for whom—SOCIALISM!

How can it miss? For once the Joes and the Janes down below see all the "know-how, initiative, risk and enterprise" that goes into the making of an unearned buck by "management," there's no doubt but that the production program will undergo a . . . change of sponsors.

So we're all for it. Bring on the cameras! But just be sure they're shooting both ways!

# FBI Case in CP Trial —

(Continued from page 1)  
overt act in such conspiracy charges and proof of a "clear and present danger." The Smith Act has already had its victims, the 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party convicted in Minneapolis during 1941.

The core of Budenz's testimony is that by reverting to Marxism-Leninism in 1945, on orders from the Kremlin transmitted in the famous Jacques Duclos article, the CP once more became the "revolutionary" party it always had been except for the lapse of the war years.

## THIN REASONING

Budenz cannot prove this by the writings and action of the CP (in fact, Budenz admitted that in ten years as a CP journalist and editor he had never advocated the overthrow of the government!)—so he devised a circuitous means of reasoning to make his point. Reduced to its elements, the reasoning goes like this:

Marxism-Leninism equals conspiratorial violent overthrow of the government. Proof: the Bolshevik Revolution. But the defense can deny that this is true and back up its statement with quotations from Lenin. Budenz replies: Lenin invented an Aesopian language through which he said one thing and meant another. Using this magic key, Budenz says that any document in which the occult words "Marxism-Leninism" appears is an appeal to a violent revolutionary conspiracy.

But more than one of Lenin's enemies has admitted that his great ability as a teacher of Marxism lay precisely in his ability to get to the heart of the matter with a minimum of literary frills and circumlocution.

The real doubletalk came through the attempts of the Stalinists to hold fast to their claims of being Leninists while justifying all their flipflops and the most dastardly acts against the working class. Completely distorted and without a particle of its original meaning, the CP has used the term "Marxism-Leninism" to mask every betrayal perpetrated by Stalin in the past quarter century.

As the CP in the past used the magic word to justify counter-revolution, now Budenz and the government use it to prove their own charges against the CP leaders.

## PARADE OF STOOGES

The dozen witnesses who followed Budenz to the stand were divided between former militants who had left the party in disgust and stool-pigeons planted in the CP ranks by the FBI. Through their testimony they attempted to buttress the main outlines of the case presented by Budenz.

Much was made of the fact that CP members sometimes use false names or merely initials in party records; that certain educational meetings were held in private with only selected party members invited to attend; and that the reconstitution of the CP in 1945 was carried out from above in a typically ruthless and bureaucratic Stalinist manner.

While most of the FBI agents had been trusted members of the party,

none had reached the upper levels of the apparatus. They were functionaries on local or state levels and little of their testimony touched directly on the defendants themselves. Almost invariably the "revolutionary" statements quoted by the witnesses were made by persons of minor status in the party who evidently let their desire to establish themselves as followers of the "new line" run away with their tongues.

At the conclusion of the prosecution's case the defense made a series of motions to dismiss the case. Judge Harold Medina showed interest in only one—that no evidence of a "clear and present danger" had been presented. This doctrine had just been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in the Terminiello case, but Medina made his own interpretation and held that the government had presented ample evidence for the trial to continue. All defense motions, as throughout the trial so far, were rejected.

# SPARKS in the NEWS

## Cynical—but True

Donald Ramsey, columnist for the railroad brotherhoods' national newspaper "Labor," has got something here. Writing of the Stalinist strike-breaking in the Berlin "EL" strike, he comments:

"That situation was made to order for General Frank L. Howley, commandant of the American zone. He was a prosperous advertising man in civilian life, and knows a good 'sales talk' when he sees it.

"The chances are Howley is none too friendly to unions in the United States, and would be for calling out the troops to quell a railroad strike here. But in Berlin he talked good union language, to 'sell' the German workers on Uncle Sam and against the Russians.

"He issued public statements calling the young Communists 'scabs' and 'strikebreakers,' and spoke of the 'Red' German police in terms like those American unionists used to apply to the Pinkertons and other armed thugs hired by hard-boiled American employers." (May 29)

## Got an Extra Million?

In 1948 the Curtis-Wright Corporation got a \$35 million tax refund. Darryl F. Zanuck, the movie magnate, got back \$174,973 from the government, and there were many other huge refunds.

Did you ever stop to wonder why rich men and big corporations hire experts to figure out their taxes, yet pay so much more than is necessary that Uncle Sam has to hand them back a lot of money?

By LEON TROTSKY

# Marxism in the United States

35 Cents . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

The answer is very simple. The government refunds not only the "overpaid" money but interest at the rate of 6 per cent on it. With savings banks paying one or two per cent interest, and with bond buyers rewarded on the basis of 2½ per cent (at maturity), it makes overpaying your income tax a very profitable venture.—(From the Reading Labor Advocate.)

## Short Story

President Truman's summer White House at Independence, Mo., is being painted by a non-union man.

So says the local representative of the painter's union, in a letter to Truman.

The non-union painter, John H. Moler, says he doesn't understand "why the union is so upset."

Mrs. Truman says (according to Moler): "That makes no difference to me."

Mrs. Truman says she has an unquenchable love for organized labor.

So the summer White House is being painted by a non-union man.

## Indirectly Speaking —

(1) "We should not criticize profits. We've got to keep GM profits at a high level but they are only a small part of the good we do indirectly."—M. E. Coyle, executive vice-president of General Motors.

(2) "GM reported that its net income represented 16.7 per cent on sales as against 9.4 per cent last year and 11.5 per cent in the pre-war period. This rise in the profits on sales is a small one considering the volume done, and yet it demonstrates that the idea of lowering the profits on greater volume is still preached rather than practised."—C. F. Hughes' column in that well-known subversive organ, the New York Times, May 1.

(3) Coyle's total compensation last year as an officer of GM was \$441,099—close to a half million—not counting unearned dividends on his 6789 shares of common stock.

You see what he means by a "small part of the good we do indirectly."

Read LABOR ACTION and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL



"The industrial and commercial bourgeoisie," Rolly asserted Professor Joseph A. Schumpeter in 1942, in the very midst of the bloodiest imperialist war to date, "is fundamentally pacifist and inclined to insist on the application of the moral precepts of private life to international relations."

The professor cited no evidence to support his fascinating assertion, one of many wonderful things found in his anti-Marxist work, "Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy."

If you believe the professor, then of course you need not concern yourself with the possibility of a third world war. But if you are one of the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, or one of the victims of that predatory class, then you will be hip-deep in concern with the new blood bath which the "private enterprise system" is preparing for the world.

Just recently in Chicago a few hundred of the "industrial bourgeoisie" concluded a 10-day study course on economic mobilization planning, the second in a series of such courses conducted throughout the nation by the Armed Forces Industrial College. The course was not "planning for war." Professor Schumpeter would have liked the term used for the course; it was "planning for the prevention of war."

## Third World War Will Bring Ten-Cent Dollar

Some of the ideas expressed during the seminar are of general interest. Perhaps of greatest interest was the talk presented by Commander Greenhalgh on the inflationary prospects of a future war. A third war, he said, could lift the public debt from its present \$252 billion to \$600 billion. Interest charges would be "staggering," declared Greenhalgh. Debt service on the present national debt now costs \$5½ billion a year. On a \$600 billion national debt it would rise to \$12 or \$15 billion.

Greenhalgh doesn't believe the government would consider repudiating the public debt. Instead, he believes, prices might be allowed to rise, with the dollar further devalued as a means of lightening the debt burden. He predicted a "nine- or ten-cent dollar" in terms of 1939 purchasing power, as the aftermath of another world war. "The dollar of today, worth less than 60 cents in pre-war purchasing power, might very well become a nine- or ten-cent dollar of a post-World-War III period," he said.

## Is There an Adding-Machine in the House?

Lecturers described the increasing costs of war. Whereas the annual expense of maintaining a soldier today is \$3,300 (against \$1,350 in 1940) prices of raw materials and manufactured goods would be up 50 per cent from World War II, in the event of another war, it was declared.

Assuming 12 million men under arms, and purchase of the same amount of munitions as in 1944, a new war would cost \$143 billion a year. If it lasted as long as the United States was in the recent war, it would cost \$540 billion. The U. S. bill for the last war was \$381 billion, of which \$153 billion was squeezed out in taxes and \$228 billion was borrowed.

Commander Greenhalgh said the prevailing opinion in top military circles was that a war with Russia would continue longer than the fracas with the Axis powers.

Among the subjects discussed by the peace-loving industrial and commercial bourgeoisie in the present study course were joint strategic planning, geopolitics, joint mobilization, and the relation of economic factors to political and military problems.

## Economic Notes

Profits through 1950 are assured the peace-loving aircraft manufacturers, according to official sources which show current backlogs of prime military aircraft and engine contractors to total \$2,626,303,594, a sum which is less than half the total to be spent on aircraft and equipment by the air force and navy. Forecast for 1949 is that the industry will show an operating profit of about \$200 million. . . .

Tito recently signed a large contract with the Continental Supply Company, a subsidiary of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company. The contract calls for the company to supply several million dollars' worth of oil-drilling equipment and tubes to the Yugoslavian ministry of mines. American technicians will go to Yugoslavia to supervise installation and operation of the equipment. . . .

The Chevrolet division of General Motors Corporation has purchased a war-built manufacturing plant in Saginaw, Mich., which it now occupies. Chevrolet paid \$1,300,000 to the War Assets Administration for the property. It was built at a cost of more than twice that figure, \$2,800,000.

## Ten Giants of Steel: Net Profit After Taxes

	1939	1946	1947	1948
U. S. Steel	\$41,119,934	\$88,683,530	\$127,098,148	\$129,627,845
Bethlehem	24,638,384	41,731,931	51,088,375	90,347,560
Republic	10,671,343	16,033,468	31,018,409	46,438,382
J. & L.	3,188,944	10,854,084	19,225,184	31,222,451
National	12,581,636	20,461,651	26,838,788	40,121,506
Youngstown	5,004,484	14,254,905	26,299,223	35,711,732
Armco	4,011,909	18,552,491	25,002,210	32,030,712
Inland	10,931,016	15,556,897	29,888,558	38,606,897
Sharon	255,497	2,857,856	4,722,019	9,234,983
Wheeling	5,560,753	5,372,910	10,445,161	15,050,044

## More on UWF (see Page 4) —

# Cord Meyer and Russia

The World Federalist views on Russia are presented most completely (though unofficially, as we have noted already) in the book published by its president, Cord Meyer, Jr., entitled *Peace or Anarchy*. Where these views lead may be sketchedly illustrated by the following remarks in Cord Meyer's discussion of the subject:

As long as the U. S. has the Bomb and Russia has not, Russia "is forced to take emergency measures. . . . This consideration helps to explain as legitimately defensive Russian policies which many have considered irrefutable proof of aggressive design." (Page 70.)

"Sacrifices for armaments are never popular. . . . It therefore seems fatuous to demand that the Soviet government replace the strict discipline of the Communist Party with the more representative methods of parliamentary democracy." (Page 71)

"Likewise, the iron curtain must continue to hide the Soviet Union behind its impenetrable folds so long as the threat remains of atomic and bacteriological attack. The curtain of censorship performs two functions indispensable to Russia's security. It is, first, a military necessity. . . . The second. . . . is to preserve a unified opinion within the Soviet Union." (Page 72)

"To Americans, the existence of the Russian secret police is the most damning indictment against the Soviet state. Yet it is difficult to see how so useful an instrument of national security can be eliminated, while the basic need for preparedness remains." (Page 73)

"Until atomic aggression is no longer a possibility, the Soviet leaders must maintain huge occupation armies as a simple and obvious measure of self-preservation." (Pages 76-77)

This is as close to an apology (and in a sense) a justification of Russian totalitarianism as anyone will see outside of the Stalinist and Stalinoid press. We emphasize that Meyer is driven into this position, not by pro-Russian sympathies, but by the dilemma of his position—that Stalin must be persuaded and that he must therefore be viewed as persuadable, the Russian facts of life notwithstanding.

A by-product is its implication for the U. S. If the Russian system of regimentation is "legitimate," "indispensable," "so useful," and "a simple and obvious measure of self-preservation" because of the danger of aggression in the world. . . . then how can a reasonable person deny the same expedients to Washington? We have no doubts about the sincerity of Cord Meyer's (or UWF's) belief in democratic processes or their detestation of the Russian system, but they and their followers—having been crowded into this "line" by a set of ideas—should stop to examine the implications.

We socialists do not believe that the danger of war in the world justifies the abandonment of democratic rights in any sense. Nor did Russian totalitarianism arise as a reflex to the atomic bomb. One scarcely can gather from Cord Meyer that this monstrous regime arose long before the present world situation.

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK

— IN —  
THE SOCIALIST LEADER  
Britain's Foremost Weekly  
Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars  
Shorter Periods Pro Rata

Order from:  
SOCIALIST LEADER  
318 Regents Park Road  
Finchley, London, N. 3, England

## LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.  
114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.  
GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.  
Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 23

June 6, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper  
Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates,  
Emanuel Garrett, Goldman  
Business Manager: Joseph Roan

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.







About the United World Federalist Movement and Its Program -

World Government: Road to Lasting Peace?

The organized movement for the idea of world government is represented in the United States by about eight groups...

Of these the largest and most important is the UWF, and it is this organization and its ideas which are the subject of the accompanying article.

One difficulty in discussing the ideas of UWF is the fact that its official declaration of principles is "phrased in general terms" (as one of its pamphlets, by Vernon Nash, says), skirting a host of questions upon which there are varying points of view within the World Federalist movement.

Is World Government Achievable Through the Present Governments?

By HAL DRAPER

The period between the two world wars saw a flowering of peace societies of all kinds in great profusion. It was a natural development. Even the First World War—which was less savage than the Second, and may in the future appear to be positively idyllic in comparison to the horrors of a third world war—aroused the loathing and revulsion of everybody to whom civilized values were dear.

The Second World War did not quite live up to the direct of these fears, but it came close enough to justify them in triple measure to a generation which lives in dread of the bomb, of germ warfare, and of super-sonic robot missiles. It takes only a minimum of imagination and a widely possessed degree of sensitivity for any man or woman today to become, if not panicky, at least appalled by the fate which looms before a world apparently passively drifting toward Armageddon.

What can we do? What can we do? WHAT CAN WE DO? WHAT CAN WE DO? The question beats insistently in the brain as soon as the full horror of this post-war world is grasped.

And for the same reason, the question becomes: What can we do right now? Something must be done right now. There must be something we can do right now...

A Powerful Idea

The political psychology of the "peace society" is based on the kind of thinking which refuses to go more than one step beyond this impressive question. It would be unfair to say that it is based on panic. It would be fairer to say that it is based on the yearning for a short cut to peace, driven by legitimate and even laudable anxiety.

The multifarious peace societies of yesterday were often simply imbued with the idea that if enough people talked Peace Peace Peace, there would be peace. This empty silliness is not with us today, at least in organized form. The crop of peace movements which have followed the recent war are in comparison grown up and sophisticated.

They are founded on an idea. It is a powerful idea. It is a programmatic idea, it is a great and idealistic vision, and it is a perfectly correct one.

It is the idea of World Government, the aim of a supra-national power superseding the clash of national sovereignties, a United States of the World.

We socialists are for the goal of a world government, which would eliminate the obsolete national boundaries into which the earth is divided. We enthusiastically agree that only under a world government, or under its adequate beginnings, can world peace be achieved.

This understates it. The fact is that this conception has been part and parcel of the socialist program and socialist thinking for over a century. The World Federalist movement today, as it should, likes to refer to the great men of the past who

by one eminent world-government exponent, Bertrand Russell. But this is specifically and completely rejected by the movement organized in the United World Federalists (UWF), and we could not improve much on their characterization of this "ideally motivated" modest proposal for super-imperialism and a world-wide Iron Heel in the name of democracy.

Bertrand Russell's program has one virtue: it is conceivably realizable. This is, in fact, its decisive virtue in Russell's own eyes (he has a personal distaste for world conquest). The UWF, having rejected it with praiseworthy vigor, is left with the program of persuading the rulers of the world to... abdicate.

The World Federalists have, we said, ripped the world-government concept out of its historical context, but they are not backward about appealing to "the lessons of history." This consists, roughly, in pointing out that, for example, there was constant warfare between England and Scotland until both were united under a single government; that there was warfare between the Italian states until all were united under one government; that if the thirteen colonies could stop their scrapping and voluntarily federate under a single government, why can't the nations today? etc.

Russell, in spite of his monstrous viewpoint, could give this bit of historical naiveté a proper working-

Fallacy No. 1: Wars Are Simply Unfortunate Misunderstandings

Surely one can hardly propose a cure for war, as the World Federalists do, without holding a notion about their cause. The UWF has such a notion.

It is: War results from mutual fear. Only that? Well, primarily that.

"As the diplomatic representatives of both countries [U. S. and Russia] publicly fire insults at each other... fear feeds on fear until both governments may awake to discover that the docile instrument of propaganda has become their master... It is as if one told two men that they were sworn to kill each other. They might first be unwilling to believe it, but the precautions both would take could only convince each of the murderous intentions of the other and serve to provoke a final tragedy of errors." (Cord Meyer Jr., Peace or Anarchy, pp. 83, 85.)

"The present drift... is less the product of any clash of rival interests than of mutual fear. There is actually no real clash of vital interest between the Soviet Union and the United States." (James P. Warburg, How to Achieve One World.)

The gigantic world slaughters of our days result primarily, decisively from regrettable and avoidable misunderstandings. This is the rock-bottom theory of World Federalism, and a moment's thought shows why this otherwise disconcertingly naive theory is necessary for a movement which banks its all on persuading the present masters of the world.

Tragedy of Errors?

Was the Second World War between the Allies and the Nazi power also simply a "tragedy of errors"—or was it irrepressible because both sets of rulers wanted the same things (markets, colonial slaves, control of backward countries for capital investment, etc.) and because they could not maintain their national power without them? I do not know that the World Federalists extend their tailored theory backward in time, but why not?

In fact, the statesmen of the world must be blithering idiots. Two world wars devastated the earth, destruction accomplished and threatened on a scale hard for the mind to grasp—a misunderstanding, a complex of blunders! We see this so clearly, ex-

Fallacy No. 2: Persuade Stalin To Abandon Totalitarian System

This is the meaning of the very strange attitude of the UWF toward Russia.

It is strange because there is no question of pro-Russian or pro-Stalinist sympathies involved here, not even of the Wallaceite kind. (In fact, the UWF has an "anti-subversive" clause in its rules which should make the FBI very happy.)

The first item of their approach toward the Russian question in relation to world government is undoubtedly correct, on the basis of their premises. Russia must be in it. (This is the main difference between the UWF and Clarence Streit's group Federal Union.)

Russia must be in it—otherwise it is not a world government at all. Worse: otherwise it will not mean peace. What would be the meaning of a federation without Russia? The danger of war is between the U. S. and its satellites and Russia and its

out. Does it really never occur to the World Federalist historians that peace came to Britain only when England conquered the Scots, that peace came to the Italian peninsula only when one Italian state conquered the others, that Bismarck unified the German states by "blood and iron," etc.?

Wherever rival power groups have been opposed to each other, where there are interests of collapse-or-survival involved for the power group, unification has been achieved only by conquest.

It is even more tempting to pursue the analogy of the U. S. colonies; but it may be sufficient to point out this much: The secret convention of representatives of the colonial ruling class who drew up the Constitution had internal scraps but they were able to iron them out by compromises. But with the later rise of a quite different ruling class in the South, one based on a different economic system (slavery), no compromise was able to avoid the "irrepressible conflict," the Civil War. Because what was involved was not bargaining for advantage, but the life-and-death of a ruling class as such.

Or perhaps the World Federalist school of history tells us that the Civil War was merely a misunderstanding? This brings us to the first of the three most important fallacies of the UWF.

plain the World Federalists (as did a thousand others before the Second World War), but the statesmen go right ahead. Twice already—worse to come! Aren't we justified in concluding that they must be stupid, witless, cloaked, brainless imbeciles, dolts, boobies and nincompoops—in short, idiots?

Now we socialists also have our unflattering opinions about the present rulers of the national states, but we do not regard idiocy as the common denominator of their imperfections.

It is certainly true that neither the U. S. nor Russia wants war (and neither did Hitler, we may add in the same sense with no charity toward that tyrant)—they want something else which means survival-or-collapse for their respective power groups, their ruling classes. They both have to expand their economic and political power or else succumb within their national borders.

The World Federalists have gotten a whiff of a germinal idea and do not half realize the import of what they are broaching. One World is not merely a necessity to prevent war—it is an economic necessity for the fullest flowering of economy in a world where economy is world-wide, a world economy.

The national boundaries are obsolete not only because they breed fear; they are obsolete because they choke and distort the inevitable need for political integration in a world where economic integration is already a fact in various ways. No nation can live within its borders alone. Each rival ruling class seeks to integrate the world for itself, for the economic necessities we have mentioned.

They do not want war any more than two dogs want to fight over a bone; they merely want the bone. War is a tremendous risk, especially in the atomic age? We venture the opinion that even President Truman knows this as well as Cord Meyer Jr. This aspect of the World Federalists' emphasis harks back to the yesterday of the peace societies. Everybody nods his head. But the statesmen go on doing what they have to do, because they have to do it, and they go on sincerely hoping that it does not lead to war, as it must.

Fallacy No. 3: World Government Will Benefit U.S. Capitalism Too

This too is perfectly true if the people of the U. S. are meant. But that is not the question. It is a question of the life-and-death needs of the U. S. capitalist system; and the question does not change if this system is referred to euphemistically as the free-enterprise system.

We have pointed out that the U. S. (like the rest) does not want war—it wants something else. The capitalist economy of the U. S. also must expand into the world, or die. The meaning of the second alternative is clear enough before our own statesmen in the form of the capitalist systems of Europe today, shattered and weakened by the war, incapable in their extreme senility of expansion, and which are literally dying before our eyes.

U. S. capitalism is the only capitalism which is alive and kicking today, the only one that is a going concern. It is top dog. It can remain so only if its expansion drives have free play in the world. The U. S. does not want war (because its statesmen are not idiots) but its official economists, such as the president's Committee of Economic Advisers, proclaim that the American dollar (that is, American investment) has to penetrate into every corner of the globe if its economy is to remain healthy. This is the well-known Point 4 of Truman.

The same committee's latest report to the president indicated clearly enough the extent to which the post-war pseudo-prosperity has been shored up (and a bust avoided so far) by the growth of the war economy in this country.

No. The UWF people, without being in the slightest sense pro-Russian, are literally driven and hogtied in a position where they present, as the key objective of their movement, the effort to find out... whether the Russian regime is really the brutal, bloody totalitarianism that it's cracked up to be. It goes this way:—Is it? Who knows? Some claim this, some claim that. We're not Russia-haters. "They have as much to lose as we do in a mutually destructive war." We're not pessimistic. Until the U. S. itself declares for world government, "we cannot tell whether the purpose of their present policy is aggression or defense." It is possible to have "an effective system of security protecting them and us alike." (The quotes are from Cord Meyer.)

Would world government protect "them"? Who is "them"? The Russian people? In that case, of course. But the totalitarian oligarchy of the Kremlin?

With almost unique naiveté in this day and age, the UWF proposes in its optimistic way to make a modest proposal to the Moscow butchers (we use this restrained and moderate epithet in order not to offend too many people). We paraphrase:

"Mr. Stalin & Co.: We propose that you give up only some of your power. We do not wish to be unreasonable, so we limit these concessions to the following few. Give up any control over armed forces [this to a regime which is based on naked terror]. Give up sole control over tariffs and currency [this to a regime which won't even give out economic statistics]. Give up the armed forces of the MVD (GPU, or secret police) [this to a regime which keeps millions in slave camps]. Give a bunch of foreigners (world-government inspectors) the right to inspect and patrol your economic setup from top to bottom [this to a regime which is apt to arrest a man for visiting a foreigner's home]. Give foreigners (world government) the right to ARREST YOUR CITIZENS [to UWF, this right is a necessity for world government]."

It can be shortened: "Messrs. Totalitarians: We propose that you give up your totalitarianism, in the interests of humanity."

Slight Difficulty

Now it is a sad fact that while various forms of government can be and have been federated under one roof, there is at least one form of government which cannot be federated. That is a totalitarian government. Totalitarianism means that every

Fallacy No. 3: World Government Will Benefit U.S. Capitalism Too

facet of every department of life, every organization, every source of power, every potential source of power, every institution which might become a potential source of power—all must be under the undivided sway of the bureaucratic state.

Now if the devoted and self-sacrificing activists of the World Federalist movement wish to consecrate their energies to the task of persuading Stalin that his totalitarianism was a lamentable blunder in the first place, that its steady development into forms that continue to amaze and startle by their extremeness is merely the outcome of the idiosyncrasy congenial to statesmen, and should be voluntarily cast off by a resolute act (of the selfsame idiots)... then we can only suggest that they are presuming too much on Stalin's idiocy.

The strangeness of all this can be highlighted from another angle. The World Federalists do not propose the enforcement of a world Bill of Rights. They argue, with justice on the basis of their premises, that this would exclude Russia, and Russia must be in. Very well. But they are democrats. And so they follow up this hard-headed self-restraint with another (also perfectly correct) argument to appease the sentiments of anyone outraged by the lack of world Bill of Rights enforcement.

They argue: the very existence of a world government will mean more and more "free exchange of ideas," intercourse, breaking down of barriers, the spread of democratic beliefs, the demonstration of the superiority of our ideas over the Russians', etc.

That's why the Russian rulers are not going to be persuaded that world government will protect "them." They will not last an historic minute after that. And while they notoriously have no insuperable prejudices against cutting throats, they draw the line against cutting their own. Not even in the best interests of humanity.

And the whole existence of the UWF is founded on the premise: Let's find out if they will. Suppose they do find out, what then? Suppose the U. S. makes some kind of world-government proposal and Stalin rejects it? At this point, the UWF people sadly admit: In that case, we will be forced to accept a federation of only those countries willing to enter, without Russia. But haven't they demonstrated cogently that such a federation would not be an instrument of peace? Yes, they have; but this demonstration is never repeated at the point mentioned. Still: doesn't every idea have its slightest difficulties?

And the whole existence of the UWF is founded on the premise: Let's find out if they will. Suppose they do find out, what then? Suppose the U. S. makes some kind of world-government proposal and Stalin rejects it? At this point, the UWF people sadly admit: In that case, we will be forced to accept a federation of only those countries willing to enter, without Russia. But haven't they demonstrated cogently that such a federation would not be an instrument of peace? Yes, they have; but this demonstration is never repeated at the point mentioned. Still: doesn't every idea have its slightest difficulties?

the capitalist structure, in England, France, Italy, the rest. In Asia, there is precious little love for either the U. S. or its free enterprise.

Surely, the U. S. will not have a majority in a world government, not by itself, even with the weighted votes of various kinds proposed by the World Federalists. Is U. S. capitalism going to put its fate in the hands of a world-government majority which will not have the standards of the NAM nor even of Truman? It is not here a question of a socialist majority or an anti-capitalist majority in a world-government set-up. Even with the present governments, and on the basis of even the minimum economic powers proposed for a world government, it is inevitable that all kinds of holes be shot in the economic structure of U. S. capitalism.

We would go further if it were necessary: we would add that the very existence of a world government would require and lead toward a greater and greater assumption of economic control over the national states, and would in fact tend to undermine the whole capitalist structure of the United States. But it is not even necessary to try to demonstrate this here. It would certainly undermine the power of U. S. capitalism vis-a-vis the other countries, even in the short run.

This is an argument for world government in our eyes; it may be an argument for world government in the eyes of World Federalists—but it is NOT an argument for world government in the eyes of the Powers That Be in Washington and Wall Street.

The U. S. capitalist class will not abdicate any more readily than Stalin. We socialists are entirely for a supra-national government which will set its face against any and all imperialism, which will integrate the economies of its world, its currencies, etc., regardless of the effect of this indispensable course on the private-profit system and the well-known sacred rights of property.

No Short Cut

If we have a quarrel with World Federalism at this point, it is only because there is no point in wasting energy trying to persuade the capitalist class of the U. S. that this program is in its interests, any more than there is a point in futilely trying to persuade totalitarians to be philanthropic. We believe in building a labor and socialist political movement to take the government out of the hands of this capitalist class and its two parties, in order that the great aims of both peace and security shall be achieved.

It is especially in Western Europe today that there exists the very greatest need for political and economic integration across national boundaries. Precisely because the capitalist systems of these countries are in such shattered, prostrate condition, even the top leaders of these countries proclaim the need.

But it is not only an economic entity that a unified Western Europe is needed. It is needed also for peace. A "Western Union" which tore itself free from domination from Washington as well as from Moscow, independent of either power, would be a tremendous force for peace.

Where the UWF is justly afraid of a Western federation which includes and is headed by the U. S. as being merely the organization of the anti-Russian war bloc, a genuinely Independent Western Union, though not a world government, could be an independent power standing between the two colossi. Our independent socialist co-thinkers in Europe proclaim the need of such a federation.

But because the weakened capitalist powers of Europe are dependent on U. S. capitalism for their lifeblood, the statesmen of the West who talk about world federation are not at all willing to federate independently of both Washington and Moscow, the only kind of federation that can make for peace.

World government—yes! An Independent Western Union in Europe—yes! But the road to it does not lie through the persuasion of the same kind of governments that have already dragged us through two world wars and are feverishly preparing for the third. The road lies through changing these governments, through building a labor and socialist movement that can challenge the power of capital and reorganize society in the interests of the masses of people.

The fight for socialism is no short cut, and it does not appeal to the psychology of the "peace society," but it sets itself the aim which alone can make world peace possible.

U.S. Won't Abdicate  
Furthermore, as we have pointed out, the U. S. is the proud possessor of the only capitalist system that is still a going concern in the world. In Europe, all kinds of disturbing operations are being performed on

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League. I want more information about the ideas and principles of independent socialism and the Independent Socialist League. I want to join the Independent Socialist League. Name, Address, Zone, State, Tel.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM by Max Shachtman. A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism. \$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00. INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.