

## N. Y. Regents Hold Quick Hearing on 'Subversives'

ALBANY, July 15—At a hearing yesterday before a special committee of the State Board of Regents, Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, speaking as acting national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, vigorously attacked the Feinberg "anti-subversive" law and presented the case for the deletion of the Workers Party from the list of "subversive organizations."

The Feinberg Law, which was passed over three months ago by the state legislature—in double-quick time and without any hearings whatsoever—is aimed at barring from the schools teachers who belong to organizations advocating overthrow of the government by force and violence. The law instructs the Board of Regents to draw up a list of such organizations and to promulgate rules and regulations for its enforcement.

On July 5, only nine days before the hearing, five organizations received requests from the board's investigation committee to appear before them in Albany. These were: the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Industrial Workers of the World, the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party and the Workers Party (which is now replaced by the Independent Socialist League).

In reply to a question at the hearing, Chairman W. V. Moot of the committee explained that these five were invited solely because they were on the attorney general's list of subversive groups. Questioned further why ONLY these five, he said that they were the only ones so listed as being subversive because of advocacy of force and violence or unconstitutional means. Like almost everything else about the attorney general's list, this distinction still remains obscure.

### NOT A REAL HEARING

It was not much of a hearing, if it can be called that at all. As planned by the committee, a total of twelve (Continued on page 3)

### LONDON LETTER

## Attlee Supports Employers' Case in Dockers' Strike

By GEORGE STONE  
Editor, Socialist Leader (London)

The first fortnight of July has been one of heat—sticky and unpleasant heat—in Britain. With the temperature stepping up into the eighties and nineties, the people have donned summer garb and the bright, colorful dresses of the womenfolk have given an air of gaiety to the social scene. For this is the time of year when people plan vacations, when newspapers usually fill their pages with photographs of happy holidaymakers, when people are out on week-end excursions and when the general mood is one of jollity and pleasure.

### LABOR PARTY DILEMMA

But this year things are different. There is industrial upheaval in Britain. The Emergency Powers Act is in operation and all the pomp and power of the State machine is being used to batter London's dockers into defeat. The gloves are off in dockland and it is the irony—and the tragedy—of the Government's blundering that has made inevitable a situation that it most fears. Moreover it has made it inevitable with the employers' assistance. Worst of all, it has made it extremely likely that any chance of a reasonable settlement of the dispute will be indefinitely retarded. Every aspect of this dispute is loaded with official mockery, with the Government and some of the trade union officials as the principal mockers.

If proof is needed that the Government has acted in the manner the employers longed for, it can be found in the history of this dispute.

Two Canadian manned ships which have been declared "black" by the Canadian Seamen's Union members, who were officially instructed to strike ship by their executive committee, have been in the Port of London since April 1st. London dockers, true to their traditions, refused to handle these ships. They were not concerned with the merits or otherwise of the seamen's dispute—they were concerned only that they should not scab on fellow workers who were on strike.

Their decision not to work the two ships in question was never challenged by the employers until after thirteen weeks, i.e., from April 1st to June 20th. During that period the men reported for work each day and worked on other ships in the port. The two Canadian ships which have cargoes of grain and timber were not touched.

### STATE AND EMPLOYERS ACT JOINTLY

On June 20th, however, the employers manifested their sense of power most arrogantly by insisting that no work would be allowed on any other ship until the two "black" ships were manned. The dockers rejected this ultimatum and were locked out. They turned up for work each morning but were always faced with the ultimatum, the "black" ships or nothing.

Government spokesmen tried to break the men. George Isaacs, the Minister of Labor, in a virulent and spiteful attack, alleged that the men were being duped by foreign agents and Communists, and that the affair of the Canadian seaman was being used as an excuse to disrupt the economy of the country.

Mr. Attlee, a week later, tried the same line with a little more finesse, but deliberately confused the issue by terming the dispute a strike when all the facts show that it is a lock-out. (In point of fact, the men's committee is composed of men with no definite political affiliations, they term themselves "loyal trade unionists." And the Communist Daily Worker has dealt very gingerly in its editorials with the Emergency Powers Act. (It seems unable or unwilling to deal with the issue on a class basis.)

Troops were moved in. The press gave this news headlines but, as was to be expected, failed to point out that the troops, who are not handling the two "black" ships, are merely performing work that the dockers have never refused to do.

In effect, this means that the Government has introduced military labor into the docks to smash the dockers' determination not to scab on the Canadian seamen. If this is not the case, why aren't the troops unloading the two Canadian ships? That they are not doing so shows that the employers' insistence that these two ships must be worked by the dockers before other work would be allowed was nothing more than a flimsy pretext and an act of discrimination against men who were being loyal to their principles. And it is a tragedy that the employers have acted in this manner with the connivance and open support of a Labor Government. This is a challenge that must be met by the entire working class movement.

### LABOR PARTY POLICY

And now, since Monday, the Emergency Powers Act has been in operation. A committee of five has been appointed by the Government and wide powers are vested in it under the regulations.

There are nineteen special regulations which give the authorities a carte blanche to take action against individuals whom it considers likely to prevent, mislead or interfere with the running of essential services. It covers such cases as that of a newspaper which in its editorial or other matter tried to induce troops not to work on the docks. It covers trespassing and loitering in the vicinity of any premises used for essential services, and it gives the police power to arrest without warrant any person whom they have reasonable ground for suspecting to have committed an offence against the regulations. Conviction makes anyone liable to three months imprisonment or a fine up to 100 pounds sterling, or both.

All the forces of vested interest are being used to crush the dockers and it is to be hoped that they will stand firm. This is a struggle between classes—between dockers and their employers—and it is vital at this stage of Britain's political history that the dockers emerge victorious.

The dockers are the spearhead of Britain's industrial workers. It is, unhappily, a distinction which has been forced upon them by callous indifference on the part of the employers and by marked antagonism on the part of the government. The British working class movement must indicate in no uncertain manner that the attitude of the government toward this lock-out is completely unacceptable to the Labor Movement.

# Reuther Controls UAW Convention But Delegates Uneasy at Trends

By BEN HALL

MILWAUKEE, July 18—The twelfth convention of the United Auto Workers (CIO), meeting in Milwaukee on July 10-15, was the scene of Walter Reuther's greatest triumph. He was able to unite the convention solidly behind CIO political policy. He raised it to a pitch of enthusiasm in preparation for the battles he promised to lead for the 1949 demands of the union. He obtained increased powers and succeeded in passing resolutions which in effect meant the separation from the CIO of unions dominated by the Communist Party. He effectuated the expulsion of two well-known opponents.

Nevertheless, in a convention which he dominated completely, all measures which were interpreted by the delegates as an invasion of the rights of the rank and file were rebuffed.

The scene was set for the political-action discussion with all the talent of gaudy Hollywood stage-managership. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr., it was revealed to the delegates, was to appear in a few minutes. A guard of honor was appointed to usher him into the hall. One delegate appealed to the chair: I worked for FDR Jr. in the last election—may I please be on the committee? "You may have that privilege," said Reuther benignly. Bouquets of roses. The band played "Home on the Range," known in musical history as the favorite tune of the FDR.

FDR Jr. materialized. He announced that he was a Democrat. He favored purging the Dixiecrats out of the party. He denounced the steel companies. Like Truman, he said, he demanded the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. Thunderous applause.

I place on your lapel, said Reuther, this badge as a fraternal delegate to this great convention. The delegates voted him honorary membership.

Now I can truly call you Brother, said Roosevelt. Standing ovation.

With this backdrop the debate on political action began. What started out like a big band ended a big bust.

Two resolutions were put to the delegates. The majority resolution simply restated official CIO policy with special emphasis on building rank-and-file PAC clubs as a machinery independent of all parties. The minority resolution, introduced by Paul Silver, president of Local 351 and one of the sponsors of the Committee for Democratic and Militant Unionism, reaffirmed the March 1948 policy of the International Executive Board of the UAW. This policy had called for the formation of a progressive political party after the 1948 elections.

The March policy had been an ambiguous statement; it allowed for a dual interpretation. It could mean that the UAW would favor the formation of a new, third political party; or it could simply mean a reshuffling of the two old parties by the exchange of the Dixiecrats for the "liberal" Republicans. But, once the March policy was posed in opposition to the present CIO policy and as a substitute for it, it assumed real significance. Such a proposal could make sense only by saying: against the policy of supporting Democrats and Republicans—for a new party based upon the unions.

### MAZEY GOES ALONG

Silver did not last long. There is no difference between the two resolutions—said speakers for the majority—the policy of the UAW still has, as its long-range objective, the formation of a progressive party some time in the unstated future, formed in an unstated manner.

The Most Complete Report on the Twelfth Convention of the UAW

## 37 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!

## Payoff on Strategy: Labor Gives Up Full Fight on T-H

By JACK BRAD

Several weeks ago the Democratic Party lost a parliamentary battle to Senator Taft on labor legislation. Yet it is difficult to find many downcast or disheartened faces in the administration as a result. Quite the contrary, the defeat has been analyzed and hailed as the portent of coming victory. In the 1950 congressional election, the Democrats expect once more to be assured of the labor vote on the same issue of T-H repeal as in the last election. Victory for the anti-labor forces in the Senate two weeks ago has become the guarantor of victory for the Democrats. It could not have turned out better for them if they had planned it this way.

Nothing so clearly shows up the conflicting interests of the working class and the Democratic Party as this. In a thousand ways labor will have to pay the bill for T-H in current negotiations. Labor has been dealt a painful blow, while for the Democratic Party this same defeat is the bright harbinger of the future.

Announcements come along almost daily of union demands being rejected by giant corporations in every major industry. A stiff-necked determination has appeared which makes a mockery of collective bargaining. The corporations are not "bargaining"—they are telling off labor. This is the payoff on Taft-Hartley.

For while this shackling law has been on the books for two years, its full effect is only now being felt. When passed in the late summer of 1947 it was too late to affect most major contracts, which had been signed earlier for periods ranging from one to two years. The act was sparsely used during the "third round" last year. The impending presidential elections placed larger stakes on the table than could be won by full application of the law. Even so, several major anti-labor precedents were established.

The issue was left for decision in the elections. The union leadership did not reconcile itself to living under T-H. It organized extensive labor participation in the election under the banner of repeal. By spring, with the Truman-Democratic victory under their belts, they proceeded to organize the strategy of the "fourth round" on the assumption that they had "won" and T-H was sure to go. Now this strategy has come to naught. Negotiations are taking place in a political climate of labor's defeat.

However, this defeat did not take place, in a basic sense, with Taft's Senate victory of two weeks ago, but many months ago, shortly after the electoral "victory." Two things then became apparent:

1. Labor's elected "friends" were not for repeal, but for modification of T-H.

2. The union leadership would not insist on the status quo ante of the Wagner Act, but were amenable to compromise.

In the horse-trading over the Thomas-Lesinski bill, which was the administration offer on labor's behalf, amendments were accepted to permit seizure of plants in case of "national emergency strikes," keep the loyalty oath affidavit provisions, retain the requirement that unions submit financial records to the NLRB, guarantee employers "free speech" (which has seriously crippled the organization of new plants), require labor to bargain in good faith (an ambiguous formula permitting general policing of bargaining by the NLRB) and continue the ban on secondary boycotts without which unions like the AFL Typographical cannot enforce any strike effectively.

In other words, Truman and his party had reneged on repeal of Taft-Hartley and were proposing instead to amend it. The labor leadership accepted this altered policy without so much as a whimper, in the interests of "getting something through." Actually they had been ready to bargain for something less than repeal as long ago as the day after election. Louis Stark reported in the New York Times of November 8: "while spokesmen for both the AFL and CIO would be pleased to have the (Continued on page 3)

## Liberal Party in Repub Fusion Move

### Decide to Support Newbold Morris In United State for Mayoralty Race

By WILLIAM BARTON

NEW YORK—It will definitely be William O'Dwyer versus Newbold Morris for Mayor of New York in this year's elections. After sixteen about faces the incumbent, O'Dwyer, formally declared that he wanted to be a candidate again, and there was nothing for the five Democratic borough leaders to do but reverse their previous decision to run District Attorney Hogan and support the Mayor.

Immediately afterward a joint conference of Republican, Fusion, and Liberal Party leaders agreed on Newbold Morris, President of the City Council in two LaGuardia administrations, and generally considered a "liberal Republican." The rest of the slates have not been determined but Morris will probably have a member of the Liberal Party as one of his major running mates.

### LIBERAL-REPUBLICAN DEAL

This correspondent last week predicted that the Liberal Party would likely endorse O'Dwyer, despite its frequent vocal opposition to his administration, in order to enhance the chances of the Democratic nominee

in the election to succeed Robert Wagner as State Senator. We admit our mistake.

Reports indicate that some of the Liberal leaders were for O'Dwyer. But David Dubinsky of the dominant International Ladies Garment Workers Union was strongly opposed, and was joined by Liberal Party State Chairman Adolph Berle, a former official in the first LaGuardia administration. Morris was one of the possible Republican-Fusion candidates to their liking, and their counsel prevailed in the party. In return for its support, the Liberal Party will probably be allowed to select the candidate for Comptroller, highest financial post in the city, on the ticket.

Most of the labor movement, with the exception of the ILGWU, the AFL Millinery Union, and the Stalinist controlled locals of the CIO will back O'Dwyer. Issues will be more blurred than in any campaign in this city in years.

The Liberal Party will undoubtedly be behind the Democratic candidate for senator, who will probably be former Governor Lehman. In addition, although it has presented its own candi-



HENRY WALLACE

date for New York District Attorney, commentators believe that he will be withdrawn in favor of the incumbent, Hogan, if he should try for re-election. This is the same Hogan whose original nomination for mayor was vigorously opposed by the entire labor movement, including its Liberal Party section, as an indication of the still remaining power of the old Tammany crowd.

Any attempt to use "good government" slogans as in 1933, when Tammany was ousted in the first of three (Continued on page 2)

## ALP Gambles on Marcantonio

NEW YORK, July 19—Vito Marcantonio has been nominated for mayor by the Stalinist-controlled American Labor Party, which gives the ALP an independent candidate for mayor for the first time. However, contrary to all rumors, speculation and even the actual fact that the Stalinist leadership of the ALP approached him, Henry Wallace is NOT the ALP candidate for senator.

In making public his own candidacy, Marcantonio was forced to state that the ALP will not be able to announce a senatorial candidate until September. His chagrin was showing when he said this.

That it is Marcantonio who has been selected for the mayoralty post is of considerable significance. The ALP is in the midst of a serious internal row between the fellow-travelers' wing led by Connolly and Rogge, who want a show of independence from the CP, and the straight party-liners led by Marcantonio, who are putting on considerable pressure to tighten up the party and their own control in it.

Connolly will openly oppose Marcantonio (Continued on page 2)

### CANADIAN EXAMPLE CITED

Allen Schroeder, delegate from GM Local 199 in Canada, spoke for the formation in the United States of a party like the Canadian CCF (Cooperative Commonwealth Federation). The UAW board has endorsed the CCF and in fact contributed \$10,000 to its election campaign.

"The same applies to the political picture in Canada as in the United States. . . . In Canada," he said, "we have a political party made up of the working people of that country. . . . That party was a third party at one time. It is rapidly becoming a second party. . . . In a very few years, the people of Canada will have a choice between the party that represents big business on the one hand and the workers on the other hand, when they go to the polls. . . . I hope the same thing will happen in the United States."

Fishman of Ford Local 400 said: "Nobody has to convince any of the delegates of the importance of political action." But, he added, we must be for "a labor party as being the most effective type of political arm that we can build in this country."

But the convention was impatient and restless. With the minority report withdrawn, discussion was speedily terminated and the combined majority-minority report adopted by a thumping vote.

### FUND FOR FOURTH ROUND

Newspaper headlines had already announced the setting of a date for the steel strike and the rejection of Truman's mediation offer by the big corporations. As they rustled the newspaper pages, the delegates heard special messages from Ford locals all over the country: ten to one for a strike. Later editions quoted Henry Ford, who had just stepped off the boat returning to the United States from abroad; the UAW de-

(Continued on page 4)

Pot and Kettle Put on a Show—

# ADA President and Republican Boss Expose Each Other in Philly Debate

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, July 13 — Last night the current fair-haired "friend of labor," Attorney Richardson Dilworth, tangled with Sheriff Austin Meehan in a verbal battle at the Academy of Music. The so-called political debate between the president of the Philadelphia chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action and the Republican machine boss quickly degenerated into a name-calling and slander contest, the equal of which even this city has seldom seen.

Meehan led off by labeling his opponent "a chronic, dishonest liar," "a faking hypocrite" and other terms such as "cheat" and "perjurer." Dilworth in defense stated that "Sheriff Meehan's very skilled squad of ghost writers has constructed a fabric of distortions, sly half-truths and downright lies" and characterized the sheriff as "a symbol of corrupt city machine politics at their very worst."

## ADA CANDIDATE'S LABOR RECORD

Stripped of personal attacks and irrelevancies the Meehan statement threw some light on the labor record of Mr. Dilworth who is at present enjoying the unofficial support of practically all of the active elements in CIO-PAC. Richardson Dilworth was the unsuccessful candidate for mayor of Philadelphia on the Democratic ticket in 1947 and has proclaimed himself candidate for treasurer this fall. It has been reported that his ambition includes the governorship of the state.

Meehan claimed that Dilworth's law office attempted to bribe two deputy sheriffs by giving them \$30 to serve against the Communication Workers-CIO last year in an injunction proceeding by station WFIL. Dilworth made no public denial of this charge and in his entire speech he made no reference to any specific

problems facing the labor movement. Nevertheless it is expected that those in the labor movement who have aided Dilworth on his street corner tour during the current registration period will continue their assistance in the pre-election period. Labor evidently expects to ride to positions of prestige in the event the Democratic effort to unseat the long entrenched Republican City machine is successful.

No description can convey the backwardness of the political understanding in this machine ridden city half as well as a cursory examination of the Meehan and Dilworth speeches. The extracts printed here are from the stenographic reports of *The Evening Bulletin*.

## BOSS MEEHAN SPEAKS

Sheriff Meehan read his script in a broken mumble interlined with mispronunciations and long pauses: "Now as to you, Dilworth, you called me the Fat Sultan. This is Philadelphia's opportunity to see the Fat Sultan. I know I am not as good looking as you, and a lot of girls, don't like me because I am probably not good-looking. I don't have 45 suits in my clothes closet at home, and a lot of mirrors all over my house. I still buy my clothes at Howard's. . . . I have no interest in your personal life or your morals, but the people of Philadelphia are entitled to know you are a liar, a cheat and a perjurer. . . ."

"Dilworth, how about your record as a public servant? Well, here it is: 'You took a job in the Republican Administration in the City Solicitor's Office under Mayor Mackey. You were then a registered Democrat, but you quickly changed to Republican to get this job. You had to resign from this position. Tell the people of Philadelphia why.'"

"Then you changed your politics back to Democrat in order to take

a job under Governor Earle. . . . Dilworth, although maintaining a calm and even manner wasted a good portion of his time in dealing with the personal charges.

He began: "About the only thing the sheriff has overlooked tonight is our children's little cocker spaniel Prudence. . . ."

Near the end of his speech Dilworth again lapsed into irrelevancies.

## DILWORTH'S EXPOSE

Most of the Dilworth address, however, dealt with the corruption of the city machine. The picture he drew of conditions in the 35th Ward was a damaging one:

"Now the facts of our city government. What are these political empires—and I am picking out the sheriff's simply because it happens to be the biggest?"

"Mead's and Witkin's and the Mayor's all are the same, only they don't happen to be the most powerful. The contractor boss always happens to be the most powerful in building his political machine.

"The sheriff's empire, as you know, embraces the whole Northeast. He has about 150 committeemen in the 35th Ward, and of course each of them is on the city payroll, not because they have any particular fitness for any of the jobs, but simply because they are useful political henchmen. But that, of course, is only chicken feed.

"In addition to these 150 political committeemen, he has another 1,500 city employees living right in his ward, so that, plus their immediate families, means that almost one person out of every ten in that ward is on the city payroll and directly beholden to Sheriff Meehan. Not a single one of these men chosen for any ability to perform his job, but simply because of their political usefulness.

"But that is again only the beginning, because it takes money to run a political machine. So what is the next step? You have to organize the rackets and the gangs in your particular area.

"Now, in the great Northeast which the sheriff controls, the principal concessions, as we said two years ago, are let out to some ten different groups, and there have hardly been any changes in those groups or the places where they operate since two years ago. The Terry McGovern's, the Zeldens, the Arturos, the Johnny Leonards, the Ferris, are all doing business today in the same old way at the same old places.

"These ten syndicates are estimated by the police to employ over 1,500 numbers writers, handbook operators and other employees of that kind, and they penetrate into every foot of the Northeast. Their total daily take is estimated by the police to be not less than \$100,000 a day.

"The protection money from that is collected in various places, and in fact it is actually collected—the police are forced to do it in their red cars.

"That is the kind of service that those fellows get in Sheriff Meehan's bailiwick."

During his rebuttal the ADA president presented a program of city improvement.

## WIDE POLITICAL INTEREST

The debate reached the widest live and radio-television audience in the history of Philadelphia. All listeners agreed that it was an entertaining "show." On other aspects there was little agreement.

Many were frankly skeptical that the Democrats and Dilworth were in earnest about breaking the Republican machine since they have always been dealt a fair share of "plums."

Others thought the effort was serious but would be unsuccessful since the patronage system will be hard to beat. A few regard the Democrats as serious contenders since labor, the Pennsylvania Democratic machine, and a number of industries (which have grown tired of paying "fees" to the Republicans) are interested in a Democratic victory. By itself Richardson Dilworth's 19th century muckraking will prove of interest but not of much importance.

# ALP Gambles —

(Continued from page 1)

Antonio's candidacy in the coming primaries in the first public schism of serious proportions in the ALP, unless the fight is somehow patched up before. Even if this one blows over, the differences will break out again because they are fundamental.

However, the only way these differences can be compromised now and prevented from developing into a split is for the ALP to run the strongest possible campaign this year. With Marcantonio as standard bearer, a large ALP vote would mean that his wing could claim to have the allegiance of ALP supporters and could consolidate its hold on the party for the pro-CP faction. A large vote for Marcantonio would mean the final CP victory inside the ALP; the opposition would have to bow or get out under unfavorable circumstances.

## ACE ON THE TABLE

There is still another reason for Marcantonio's candidacy. He is unquestionably the most capable machine politician in the ALP, with considerable command of personal support. He was re-elected to Congress last year by a considerable plurality. His district machine is extremely well integrated and blankets the area in the traditional manner of city machines—except that it has the Stalinist twist to it, so that his following is manipulated for CP political purposes.

The ALP is in a bad way. Not only is it torn by internal struggle but it has declined in strength everywhere. The by-election in the 20th district last month, when Roosevelt Jr. was elected, was a severe blow to the party because its showing was miserable. Not only that, but it lost to the Liberal Party, which it considers its chief enemy in city politics. If there is one thing the CP fears most in New York it is the possible rise of the Liberal Party.

If the ALP is to try to avoid disintegration it must produce, and soon, if not victory, at least a considerable show of strength. That is why the ace has been taken from the sleeve and offered to the public. For if Marcantonio suffers a severe defeat—if, for instance, he cannot get more than 250,000 votes, and if by contrast Newbold Morris gets considerably more—then not only will the ALP be on the wane but Marcantonio him-

self will be in jeopardy in his congressional seat. He must again stand for re-election next year. And to lose Marcantonio from Congress would be to lose the last Stalinist voice in Congress. (By the way, whatever happened to Glen Taylor?)

This is the full measure of the desperation of the Stalinist faction which controls the ALP: that they are offering up Marcantonio for possible defeat in the last stronghold they have.

As for Wallace, there has long been a rumor that he would contest the senatorial seat made vacant by the resignation of Senator Wagner. It would have made for a more powerful political effect if, when the

ALP announced the candidacy of Marcantonio for mayor, they could have coupled his name with Wallace's as candidate for the Senate. It would have signified inner unity between the factions behind the party slate.

But Wallace seems to have been unwilling to accept at this time. He may in the future. But his refusal now is significant of the dilemma not only of the non-party-line faction in the ALP but in the aborted Progressive Party as well. If Wallace were to refuse to run entirely it would mean the beginning of the end. In any case, his tacit admission of opposition has already upset the Stalinist plans.

# Liberals —

(Continued from page 1)

LaGuardia victories, will not go over. There have been no sensational scandals connected with the O'Dwyer administration. In fact, he is an active antagonist of the official Tammany leadership and its supposed "secret power behind the throne," Frank Costello. His ideological colleagues of the "Fair Deal" Democratic organization in Manhattan are prepared to contest just about every Tammany nomination in the primaries, including Tammany leader and Manhattan Borough President Hugo Rogers.

## LIBERAL'S LOST OPPORTUNITY

In 1945, O'Dwyer got a little more than the combined totals of his two rivals, Republican-Fusion nominee Goldstein and Morris, then running on the momentarily created "No Deal" Party. Since he did not have the support of any established political organization, Morris' achieving a vote almost as great as Goldstein's was considered impressive and, in some circles, is supposed to establish him as a possible winner this time, especially since O'Dwyer then had the support of the Stalinist controlled American Labor Party, which he will definitely not get this time.

However, O'Dwyer is running with a different background in this election. He is now officially and closely

identified as a "labor candidate," a politician closely allied to the Fair Deal administration, a proponent of "good government" and a friend of Harry Truman. Trying to combat him on any or all of those lines will get the Liberal Party nowhere.

A great opportunity was lost. The Liberal Party was in position to run its own complete independent slate, openly attacking the candidates, platforms, and records of all capitalist parties. An important base for a new national political alignment based upon the labor movement would have been established. The rest of the city's labor movement would have been compelled either to withdraw its support of O'Dwyer or maintain it with tongue-in-cheek and great reluctance.

## LABOR'S POLITICAL CONFUSION

Instead, the Liberal Party has become enmeshed in a crazy patchwork of involved politics, and the other elements of the labor leadership can be less shamefaced about their all out allegiance to the Democratic Party.

Only the Stalinist unions and their ALP will remain in opposition on a city-wide scale. Although the ALP vote will unquestionably be below previous totals, the decline will not be as great as it might have been because of its independent position in the election.

By **PRESS MANAGER'S**

# PRESS ACTION

By JOE ROAN

Social notes: This department had the good fortune to receive visits from some out-of-towners this week. Blackie S., from Chicago, dropped in and gave us a hand in collating last year's LABOR ACTIONS for the bound volumes. . . . Bought a batch of pamphlets, too. A couple of good friends from Buffalo, being on vacation, made this one of their stops to talk over expanding the LABOR ACTION sub list in that city.

This is a standing invitation to one and all: Any time you're in New York, drop up to see us. You'll be interested in our large stock of literature and we'll have an opportunity to get down to tacks on possibilities of greater utilization of LABOR ACTION in your town.

Buffalo popped up again in the mail this week with a fair bunch of subs. . . . Good work and keep at it! They write that the branch would like to see a prepaid postcard subscription for six months, selling at fifty cents. Our Buffalo friends feel that an item like that would help them to widen the list of subscribers. What do you other literature agents think of the idea? Send in your suggestions.

Arthur K., a friend in the Bronx, informs us that a sub sent to a library in that borough is kept in a drawer and is not readily available. He suggests that it be mailed to another branch. He offers to send in a list of centers that would really have a wide audience for LABOR ACTION. Send them in, Artie, and thank you.

The pamphlet of the "Libertarian" Socialists that we mentioned a couple of issues back, AGAINST BOTH WAR CAMPS, by Victor Howard, attracted a number of orders. There are still a few left. It's 25 cents, ordered from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, New York . . . and while you're at it you might as well order the current issue of STUDENT PARTISAN for another 15 cents. Postage on these orders, please.

We receive constant orders for all of the out-of-print works of Trotsky, especially from abroad. If you have duplicates in your library of these works or, for one reason or another you no longer need them, send us a list of what you have. We're willing to pay a fair price for them and can put them into the hands of people who really need them.

## 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.

By Max Shachtman

## Under the Banner Of Marxism

A Reply to Ernest Erber

Because of the unexpected size of this Workers Party Bulletin (116 pp.), the charge per copy is 50 cents. All orders already received at the previously announced rate will be honored.

Order your copy from

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

## Correction—I

To the Editor:

In the LABOR 'SCOPE column in the issue of June 13 the writer, Gordon Haskell, has made an error in the apportionment of votes at the national CIO conventions. Brother Haskell states:

"At the last convention of the CIO there were 150 delegates representing local councils. These delegates had the same number of votes as delegates representing the internationals of the following industries: auto, electric, steel, rubber, textile, clothing, longshore, seamen (NLU), packinghouse, transport and oil."

I believe that it would have been correct to say that there were as many delegates to the CIO convention representing local councils as there were delegates representing the above-mentioned international unions. Each local CIO council can if it desires send one delegate to the national convention while the delegation of internationals is subject to the following schedules:

- Up to 5,000 membership: 2 delegates
  - Over 5,000 membership: 3 delegates
  - Over 10,000 membership: 4 delegates
  - Over 25,000 membership: 5 delegates
  - Over 50,000 membership: 6 delegates
  - Over 75,000 membership: 7 delegates
  - 100,000 membership: 8 delegates
- for the first 100,000 members and one additional delegate for each additional 50,000 or majority fraction thereof."—Section 6, Article VII, of the CIO constitution.

However, on the question of votes that the delegates represent, the CIO constitution goes on the saq (Sec. 5, Art. VII):

"Each national and international union and organizing committee and each local industrial union shall be entitled to one vote for each member. Each industrial union council shall be entitled to one vote."

The error made in the LABOR 'SCOPE article would not have been serious were it not used to make the point that the CIO councils dominate the voting strength at the national conventions of that body. Of course it might well be true that the mere presence of such a disproportionately large number of delegates from the councils tends to give them influence far in excess of their voting strength. While the CIO has grown to be far more centralized than the AFL, its formal structure is still that of a

federation, i.e., the affiliated unions still have all but a small fraction of the voting strength.

Frank HARPER

## Correction—II

To the Editor:

It was with great dismay that I saw in the LABOR ACTION issue of July 4 a misrepresentation of the General Motors-UAW contract. This identical misrepresentation was widely reproduced by the Stalinist press and the Stalinist-controlled UAW local unions in the 1947 faction fight between the Reuther tendency and the Addes-Thomas-CP caucus.

Your correspondent wrote that "most contracts existing in auto today contain a uniform clause protecting the right of 'free enterprise' to exploit labor by increasing production standards (speeding up) unhampered by union interference." As an example of this he quotes Par. 78 of the GM-UAW agreement. This paragraph, when quoted by the Stalinists, was supposed to show that Reuther—the head of the GM Dept.—was in favor of a speedup policy by management.

The misrepresentation occurs not only in not understanding Par. 78 but also in not referring to the very next paragraph (79), which clearly places the question of production standards in the realm of bargaining between the union and the company, in that all standards can be protested by the union and taken up by the grievance procedure. Furthermore, the union is less hampered with respect to production standards than in almost all other phases of the GM contract in that a local union can strike over a disagreement on production stand-

ards even during the life of the contract.

I thought the appearance of this error in a newspaper which actively campaigned the slanders of the Stalinists and their allies was most unfortunate, particularly in that this specific issue of the paper was directed to members of the UAW.

M. G.

Buffalo, July 10

## —And a Boo, Too

To the Editor:

The other day the New York Times had an interview with Abe Cahan, editor of the Jewish Daily Forward, leading Jewish Social-Democratic paper, on the eve of his 89th birthday.

In the interview Cahan stated that he had always been a socialist, and that he pictures the world moving "generally forward toward the democratic socialism which he has been advocating for sixty-five years." To indicate his breadth and scope, he has praise both for New Zion (Israel), where "they are establishing socialism," and "the American system [which] has made good."

And then to indicate that he does not let his thinking interfere with his "socialism," he states: "You know, when Roosevelt was first elected president, I said at a big rally that his program was social-democratic, and that he should call himself a socialist. You could hear hisses all over the hall. Would anybody hiss that statement today?"

Well, we do not know what may be forthcoming from other quarters, but at this time we wish to register

a good long Bronx cheer—hiss-s-s-s-s.

In the interests of accuracy, to which the first two letters in this column are also dedicated, we wish to remind our correspondent L. that a Bronx cheer and a hiss are not the same. We'll concede that they convey the same general expression of sentiment.—Ed.

## PAC vs. Bridge Steal

To the Editor:

PAC's name has appeared in a new type of activity, according to stories in the Community Press of Dundalk in Baltimore County. It is named among a group of organizations that have set up a committee to campaign to take state control of the Sparrows Point toll bridge, which serves the huge Sparrows Point Bethlehem Steel plant and shipyards and the community of Sparrows Point.

The committee includes many dissimilar groups—the Dundalk Chamber of Commerce, an American Legion post, Democratic clubs, Local 33 of the Sparrows Point Shipyard Workers (CIO), an AFL local, the CIO-PAC, the railroad workers union (CIO), etc.

PAC people feel that a campaign for state control of the toll bridge is a practical political issue and are using it as a means to get their members to join and support PAC. They are saying to their union members: "We can make this a focal point of the 1950 election campaign, and you can see that your PAC dollar will go to help improve living conditions right here at home."

The vast majority of the thousands of people who now use the bridge, with its twenty-five-cent round-trip toll, do not know that it is owned

almost entirely by two McKees Rocks, Pa., families who have so manipulated it that only a small amount of the debt has been amortized in the nearly twenty years since the bridge was built. Their public reports show huge depreciation figures and inaccurate accounts of actual toll receipts. In short, most people do not realize that the bridge company has been milking Baltimore bridge users outrageously for their own personal profit. It is estimated that, under state control, the toll could be cut to five cents and still make it possible to pay off the debt in a reasonable time.

Several past attempts to free the bridge have fizzled, but this is the first time that an attempt has been organized on the basis of broad groups having an immediate interest in the use of the bridge. Labor people say that they are determined that there shall be no behind-the-scenes maneuvers to drop the issue this time.

When and if the state does take over the bridge, labor has another problem. It must use its strength and pressure to see that the private bridge company is paid off at a figure which takes into account the actual profit made on the original investment, and not permit the state to saddle the taxpayers with a big debt. It's possible that over a period of nearly 20 years, the private owners have already gotten most of what is coming to them. The state should not be allowed to help the private owners take graft from the public.

PAC people feel that the part they take in the toll bridge campaign will improve the relationship with the general public at the same time that they use PAC activity on a down-to-earth local level.

IUMSWA MEMBER  
Baltimore, Md.

## INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

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 ..... Tel. ....

Address ..... Zone ..... State .....

## HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

### LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  NEW  RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents

One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME.....

(PLEASE PRINT)

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

ADDRESS.....APT.....

Bill me  Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

# Editorials

## Stalinist Fingerman

While the trial of CP leaders in New York has not yet made clear just what "subversive" means, still it has been an education on the character of the politics and the quality of the Stalinist leaders as human beings. They have emerged as rather dull, slow-witted, politically stultified individuals. The answers they have given on the witness stand to major theoretical questions have been as trite as the catechism response of any fellow-traveler the world over. Nothing has yet come to light to show them off as leaders, as men of larger vision.

It should not come as a surprise then when Gilbert Green, member of the CP National Board and state secretary of the Illinois CP, turns finger-man on the witness stand.

Under questioning by Prosecutor McGohey, Green stated on July 5 that no one could be to the "left" of the CP and that was why they always put "left" in quotation marks when they attacked "left sectarianism" or "left opportunism," etc., ad nauseam.

The Times reports: "On direct examination the witness had cited the party's opposition to Trotskyites and other 'left opportunists' to show that the party opposed 'leftist' violence."

Green was merely repeating the old Stalinist canard that the Trotskyists, as "agents of the capitalist class," were obviously guilty of working for the violent overthrow of capitalism; and that if anyone should be on trial, it was they and not the CP.

For Green to retail this slander on the witness stand in a case involving the charges of subversion requires the morality of an agent-provocateur. But what can be expected of people who denounce the Smith Gag Act when it is used against themselves, after they applauded the conviction (under the same infamous law) of the 18 Trotskyists in the wartime Minneapolis trial?

## On Apologetics

Last week LABOR ACTION ran a page of documentary material giving the raw facts on anti-labor legislation and practices in Stalinist Russia. There are a couple of comments we want to add. They deal with the type of rationalizations with which such disclosures are met by the Stalinist Faithful.

Some of the decrees here listed and illustrated were put into effect by the Stalin government after the Second World War had started. During the war, when these particular laws were pointed out, a favorite line of Stalinist defense was:

"Well, what do you expect? There's a war on. The USSR is engaged in a life-and-death struggle. Such laws are needed to prosecute the war, because in wartime even a very small minority can disrupt resistance," etc., etc.

Even during the war, one had to point out:

(1) The wartime decrees were of the same character and a continuation along the same lines as the increasingly harsh penal laws passed before the war.

(2) Wartime necessity may be used to justify some increased harshness in certain kinds of cases directly involving national security; but (for example) can it really be used to justify forced-labor penalties for 20-minute lateness at work? The mentality that can accept such reasoning is not that of a worker but of a fascist capitalist turned inside out.

But today—the war is over. All of these laws are still on the books. The war, it turns out, was not the reason for them; it was the pretext for them.

Here's another gag that a sophisticated CP apologist may pull about the material presented:

"Most people in Russia are so happy that they wouldn't think of committing crimes. It is only against the intransigent minority that these laws are directed. The penalties must be severe in order to wipe out the last vestiges of crime in what is otherwise a vast sea of happiness. . . ."

The stupidity of this line is evident. When do governments get worried about passing new and tougher laws against crime or against a given crime? When is it dwindling away to nothing? When (as is the Stalinist claim) the very causes of crime in poverty and oppression have been done away with? In such a case, the recalcitrant elements become more and more merely psychopathic cases, to be treated more than ever by hospitalization, rather than by draconic penalties harsher than in any civilized country on earth.

When Jean Valjean (in Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables") is sentenced to the galleys for stealing a loaf of bread, one does not need a sociological treatise on the times to understand that *les misérables* are the masses of people. When a Russian worker is sentenced to ten years for stealing "various household articles" or cookies, it does not require the reading of a fat book to understand that the Stalinist regime has reduced the people to the misery and desperation of a century ago.

Just as a scientist may reconstruct the anatomy of an unknown animal from a single thighbone, so—from this one fact—the anatomy of the Stalinist society in Russia may be seen.

It is not a "socialist paradise." It is a prison-state for the masses. It is not any kind of "workers' state." The masses of people are cruelly exploited for the benefit of the ruling group, the bureaucratic masters of the prison-state. It is not any kind of alternative to capitalism, just as capitalist exploitation is no alternative for the horrors of Stalinism.

Independent socialism exposes and fights against the oppression and misery which arises from both of these exploiting systems, in the name of the struggle for a real socialist democracy: the democratic alternative to capitalism, the socialist alternative to Stalinism.

## THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

## The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

## 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. 30

July 25, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper

Editorial Board: Hal Draper,

Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett

Business Manager: Joseph Ross

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.

# WORLD POLITICS

## Bolivian Labor Squeezed Between Capitalist and CP Reactionaries

By JUAN ROBLES

The MNR (National Revolutionary Movement) adventure in Bolivia, which culminated in a general strike and an assault on the Bolivian frontier at Villazon by a group of MNR members with the support and aid of the Argentine police, has ended in a defeat for the Bolivian workers' movement. Unfortunately it will bear bitter fruit for the working and middle classes of Bolivia.

Now, even more than in the past, these political changes are the product of social and economic causes. Their frequency and irresponsibility are explained by the weakness of the bourgeoisie in semi-colonial countries, where the political structure lacks firm foundations. Political parties rise and fall away, exhaust themselves rapidly. The convulsive political life of the Republic of Bolivia conforms to the weakness of the ruling class, the Bolivian feudo-bourgeoisie.

### THE POLITICAL EQUILIBRIUM

The defeat of the miners, caused by the adventurism of the MNR in the Catavi mines, is being exploited by the feudo-bourgeois right, at whose head stand the Patino enterprises, the tin kings. Until the recent Catavi massacre there existed in Bolivia an equilibrium of social forces: the workers movement had come out of the revolution of July 1946 greatly strengthened by virtue of its decisive role in overthrowing the totalitarian regime of Villaroel. The big mining interests dared not ignore the power of the workers' movement.

The Hertzog government based itself on this equilibrium of the social forces, trying to be the arbiter of the political struggle. This was the reason for the existence of certain aspects of political democracy and "respect for the trade union organizations." Unfortunately, the strength of the workers' movement was divided between the Stalinists of the PIR (Party of the Revolutionary Left) and the Nazis of the MNR. The mining bourgeoisie called this state of things "the trade union dictatorship."

Foreseeing a new coup on the part of the Nazi-MNR based on its trade union strength, the mining capitalists proceeded to break the magic circle of the social equilibrium and to execute a cold coup, forcing President Hertzog to surrender the reins of power "for reasons of health." They considered Hertzog incapable of adopting "energetic measures" against the "dictatorship of the proletariat," which is how the Patinista press described the Nazi dictatorship over the mine workers.

Now that the miners have been defeated and the power of the MNR agents over the mine unions destroyed, the Patinista press seeks to exploit the fruits of its victory. In the first place, the Patino group is opposed to Hertzog's return, fearing that he would lose the fruits of victory. His successor, Urriolagoitia, an impoverished landowner from Sucre, representing the most reactionary clique within the Republican-Socialist Party which is now in power, positively pants with the desire to "finish off the rebels." But this interim president with the beard and profile of a "noble Spaniard" does not satisfy the big mining interests, who desire the complete destruction of the workers' movement. They desire not merely the destruction of the unions, but of the workers' political resistance as well.

The Patinistas' dream of the total prohibition of political parties and of a military dictator who will govern the poor country with the traditional methods of the native police, an inheritance from Spanish colonial rule. A military dictatorship of the right, supported by decisive sectors of the bourgeoisie, would replace the poor, weak Bolivian "democracy" and the exhausted, aborted "nationalist revolution" of the MNR.

The "cold" coup of the bourgeoisie enters, then, the third act of its realization: the first was the "license of Hertzog"; the second the defeat of the MNR, and afterward of the general strike; the third will be the military dictatorship of the feudo-bourgeoisie, the reactionary rule of the big mining interests headed by the Patino group under the auspices of imperialism.

### WORKERS PAY FOR DEFEAT

The Bolivian proletariat, especially the miners, were defeated because they followed the directives and command of the Nazis and Stalinists, both anti-working class and reactionary forces. Now the proletariat must pay for the defeat to which they were led by the Nazis.

All the attempts to save the workers from this defeat were useless, not only because of the weakness of the independent Marxist forces, but because of the fatal situation dominated by the two anti-worker blocs. And now comes the bitter phase of "vae victis" ("woe to the vanquished").

The Bolivian situation in its general features, therefore, reflects the fatal situation of the revolutionary proletariat crushed between two reactions: capitalist and Stalinist.

# Albany Hearing —

(Continued from page 1)

over five hours was devoted to all the proceedings for all groups. The committee accepted written statements and permitted "oral argument"—i.e., a speech by a representative or counsel—which was not recorded in any form by the committee. The regents made no attempt to cross-examine or ask questions of the representatives in any systematic manner (perhaps a half dozen sporadic questions were asked throughout the hearing). Above all, no specific charges or evidence of any sort was presented: the groups were expected, apparently, to defend themselves in the dark.

The procedure, therefore, obviously left the Board of Regents wide open to the charge that the afternoon was simply devoted to a formal gesture for the record which would permit them to claim that some kind of "hearing" had been held, without, however, making possible any really adequate examination of the issues.

Draper, for the ISL, contrasted this procedure with that followed last January by the president's loyalty review board of the Department of Commerce in the case of a Workers Party sympathizer. He pointed out that in spite of many inadequacies there also, at least a representative of the WP was thoroughly questioned and cross-examined before judgment was made. He further emphasized that, as a result, in this case, the WP was cleared of the charge, the man involved was reinstated—all this amounting to a clear reversal of the attorney general's opinion. The verbatim testimony of this hearing was submitted to the Board of Regents.

### WOBBLES SCORE POINTS

Most of the time at the Albany hearing was devoted to the Communist Party, whose representative, Mrs. Lillian Gates, read a long statement embodying the CP litany for such cases. The gallery of about 70 to 100 consisted largely of Stalinist delegations of protest and functioned as a clique. The CP line directed to the board was, in effect: The Feinberg Law is unconstitutional—refuse to enforce it.

Farrell Dobbs, for the Socialist Workers Party, read a statement largely attacking the Feinberg Law and denouncing such laws as leading to a police state.

The spokesman for the IWW, Fred Thompson (editor of the Industrial Worker), made a number of effective sallies against the law and the procedure in the course of extemporaneous remarks in which he emphasized that the IWW, far from advocating the overthrow of government, was not interested in government at all, being "the world's most non-political organization."

The written statement submitted by the ISL on behalf of the Workers Party presented its "objection to the concept of purge or loyalty lists as a measure which weighs against democratic procedure. We wish to object further to any move or act which brackets the Workers Party, based on the principles of democratic socialism, with reactionary and totalitarian organizations, as does the at-

The oral presentation by Hal Draper on behalf of the Workers Party, discussing the issue of independent socialism and the "subversive" listings, will be published in full in the next issue of LABOR ACTION.

torney general's list," and to emphasize again that no bill of particulars or evidence was ever received by the Workers Party, so that it is in a position of making a defense against unknown evidence."

### FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

After discussing the provisions of the Feinberg Law, the statement declared: "The Workers Party, as a socialist organization, proposed that the existing capitalist system of production for private profit be replaced by a socialist system of production for the needs of the people. Because it was a truly democratic organization and not totalitarian it realized that such a goal cannot be reached unless the vast majority of the people are educated toward this objective and convinced of its validity. Socialism, which can only mean the fullest freedom and democracy, cannot be imposed upon society by force and violence. It must be the free choice of mankind. He who would hold otherwise cannot be a socialist, call himself what he may. . . ."

"We realize full well that in the world today regimes have been foisted upon people by terror and violence

in the name of socialism. But these governments, the reactionary Stalin and pro-Stalin regimes, in reality have nothing in common with socialism. They are its vicious enemies; they are bureaucratic anti-labor class dictatorships."

### OUTCOME UNCERTAIN

The oral presentation by Hal Draper was devoted mainly to (1) a detailed argument against the adoption of the attorney general's procedure by the Board of Regents, and (2) an explanation, in terms of socialist principles, of why the ideas and views of independent socialism make the accusation of "advocacy of the overthrow of the government by force and violence" a senseless one, completely foreign to the real character of the movement. The full text of this argument will appear in next week's LABOR ACTION.

In spite of the character of the "hearing," which taken by itself would indicate little hope for any fair and unprejudiced examination by the regents, there are some indications that the regents may try to exercise their independent judgment in the matter. It is known, for example, that the chairman of the special committee, Welles V. Moot, was vigorously opposed to the Feinberg Law itself. The New York Times has disclosed that "the committee . . . has been reported divided on how to accomplish" the implementation of the law.

Decision on a subversive list is not expected until August or September.

## Just arrived!

The second issue (May-June) of the new international discussion review has just been received!

## CONFRONTATION INTERNATIONALE

Revue Internationale de Discussion

IN FRENCH

64 pages

Provisional Editorial Board: Baurfrère, Dechezelles, Demazière, Parisot, Rousseau (France); Andrade, Solano (Spain); Shachtman, Judd (U.S.A.)

In this issue:

Les Tendances du Mouvement Ouvrier Espagnol...W. Solano  
L'Aube Socialiste poindra-t-elle aux E.-U.?.....Andrée-Gelo  
Agonie du Régime colonial.....Ahmed Alaoui  
De Tito à Mao Tsé-Toung.....A. Demazière  
"Un Fils de l'Oncle Tom" juge Richard Wright...M. Baurfrère  
—and other articles and features.

### Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Single copy 50 cents; bundle of 3 or more 40 cents each; one-year subscription (6 issues) \$2.50.

## 'Freudian' Economics

### CAPITALIST SAGES TRY TO OUT-TALK DEPRESSION

By JOHN BARNES

The time for debating as to whether or not we are going to have a depression is over—if for no other reason than the assurances of the capitalist press that we are not. Clearly, these assurances should settle the matter for everyone. It is axiomatic that when the "free press" runs its boldest headlines in praise of "free enterprise," the working stiff is in for a siege of belt-tightening.

However, what concerns us here is not so much the discovery that the model system of the Model-T days is once again on the pebbles and headed for the rocks, but the manner in which the subject is being handled by certain sections of the press.

What strikes one immediately is the fact that Freud has been enlisted in the capitalist cause. To wit: we are asked—indeed, warned—not to let our psyches do us in, when appraising the possibility of depression. One paper writes: "LET'S NOT TALK OURSELVES INTO DEPRESSION." Another: "THIS IS NO TIME TO BE AFRAID." And a third: "WE'RE NOT IN A CRISIS UNLESS WE THINK WE ARE."

Now, the capitalist press, by and large, lets it go at that, aside from the usual rallying calls to the memory of our forefathers. But, obviously, more must be said; that is, more must be said if we are to properly respond and correctly treat others who are incapable of self-treatment. And this is why we note three symptoms of this un-American disease, so currently rampant, and suggestions as to how the sufferer may be quickly and easily resigned to this economic, social, and political state.

First, the patient may greet you some day (soon) with the announcement that he has been laid off. He may assume a pose of utter dejection, grim defiance, or calm indifference. Beware! This is but a pose. He may be seeking sympathy—or even, in a few isolated cases, a job.

Don't be taken in! Such a man is mentally sick. Show him no mercy. Instead, read to him the newspaper columns which prove, beyond doubt, that employment figures are higher today than they have been since some other period. If this doesn't bring him to your knees, denounce him to your Un-American Activities Committee Branch Office as incurable.

Another disloyal symptom is often cleverly concealed beneath the guise of apparently innocent anxiety. This patient will make sly references about the too few hours per week he is working, or to the fact that cutbacks have been announced in his shop. This type is obviously dangerous and should be immediately subjected to what Chamber of Commerce officials refer to as the "Index Test."

In this deucedly clever test, the patient is left in a dark room for six hours with long lines of blurred figures relating to warehouse storage, capital outlays, guided-missile appropriations, and Dominican silver. If, after this foolproof test, the patient persists in his feigned uneasiness, feel free to recommend him for placement in the about-to-become-violent-ward at the local Stock Exchange.

The third symptom, and by far the most terrifying from any decent shareholder's point of view, is found in the patient who persists in asking: "We gonna have a depression?"

COUNTRYMEN: Every syllable in that cursed question is a violation of Wall Street dogma, an insult to the women we cherish, and as nasty as thoughts of sex. Don't you stand there and listen. Run! Don't allow yourself to be infected with this gutter talk. Shutter your windows. Wear earmuffs to bed lest a friend mutter in his sleep.

Report all such violations to your local newspapers. They'll apply a warm, reassuring editorial to your head before you can say "Roger Babson." And who but the socialist devil himself could ask for anything more?

## Showing the Danger of Thinking On an Empty . . . Stomach

We set down the following quotation for our readers in order to illustrate the dangers of doing heavy thinking on an empty stomach—that is, while eating breakfast.

It is from a column by Editor William E. Bohn of the New Leader, Socialist Democratic weekly, in the issue of June 11.

"I need not explain," writes Bohn, "that with regard to civil rights and racial equality I am a Southerner down to the bone." But "it may be that we have as much to learn from the South as the South has to learn from us. The notion came to me the other morning as I was eating breakfast in my hotel dining room. . . . I suppose there were an equal number from North and South among the guests. I looked and listened—and I fancied that I could go through the room and divide the sheep from the goats."

"The distinguishing marks were quietness of manner, ease and readiness in communication, ways of acting that betokened confidence in old and well-tried patterns of living. These were the stigmata [sic] of the Southerners. The representatives of North and West were less uniform. Many of them might well have been sent to school a few hundred miles nearer the equator. Their voices needed toning down. The movements could have been less jerky and angular. Their personalities lacked softness."

"I suppose I shall be told that I am wasting emphasis on superficialities. Correspondents will complain that what Southerners have to learn from us is basic, what we have to learn from them is merely ornamental. I doubt that anyone can prove it. . . ."

Socially speaking, it is doubtful whether Bohn knows that he is describing the characteristics of an aristocracy accustomed to living on other people's labor ("old and well-tried patterns of living").

Educationally speaking, if some people's education had taken place in Mississippi, we doubt whether they would have come back less "jerky." At any rate, we "doubt that anyone can prove it."

# Payoff —

(Continued from page 1)

former Wagner Act re-enacted, they know that this will be impossible without certain changes."

Even on the question of the injunction, for whose rejection the Democrats had agreed to accept everything else in the T-H Law, the issue was very far from clear. The chief argument of the administration in Congress was that Truman already had injunction powers implicitly and could break strikes by injunction whether the law specifically said so or not.

Just before the Wood bill, the anti-administration labor bill, was momentarily passed by the House on May 4, Democratic Speaker Rayburn announced that his party was ready to accept the injunction provision of the bill. His comment at the time was most illuminating on the mentality of the Truman congressional machine: "That is what I thought should have been in it in the first place."

In the recent debate on the injunction issue, Senate Majority Leader Lucas refused to commit himself "until he saw the label on the bill." The issue was not Taft-Hartley but party strategy.

In a surprise move, Lucas proposed an amendment in favor of plant seizure, narrowing the issue to the single question of the injunction. Labor, acting as a lobby instead of as an independent political power, agreed to the Lucas strategy of putting all the chips on this single issue. That is, Murray and Green were willing to accept Taft-Hartley without the injunction provision. They

were no longer fighting for full repeal and reinstatement of the Wagner Act.

They did not do anything to organize for repeal but relied completely on lobbying through the best possible compromise measure which labor's "friends" would vote for, accepting all those disabling features of Taft-Hartley.

The big battle, from which Taft emerged victorious, was fought over a thoroughly compromised issue. There could be no victory for labor regardless of the outcome on this particular question of the injunction. The basic surrender had occurred before when CIO and AFL leaders accepted the Democratic Party policy of aiming for an amended Taft-Hartley Law.

And if in 1950 the PAC and LLPE succeed in their threats to get the scalp of every senator who voted the wrong way—what then? The new Congress, elected of course to repeal the T-H Act, will begin, however, with the compromises already accepted by Green and Murray. Repeal has come to mean retention of the basic features of T-H minus injunctions. It is on such dubious ground that labor leadership is taking its political stand for 1950.

If the corporate monopolies are arrogant in current contract battles it is not only because they won in Congress but also because labor's leadership has accommodated itself to the anti-labor law. They have accepted the new balance of class relationships and are functioning within the new legal grooves.

# Reuther Controls UAW Convention But—

(Continued from page 1)

mands will wreck our economy, he says. Reuther was his militant self. The hall rang with his phrases: End the double standard on pensions. The companies tell us that now is not the time, but now is the time. We're not waiting. In a few weeks we'll be going out after Ford.

In double-quick time the convention voted a special assessment of one dollar a week for twelve weeks in the event of a strike emergency. Although Reuther had been compelled to withdraw a proposal to increase dues from \$1.50 to \$2 a month, only a baker's dozen opposed the assessment. Everyone expects action. Everyone is ready to back it up.

But nobody pointed out certain difficulties of the fight for wage in-

## Reuther's Slate In

movement. The majority resolution, however, favored the dissolution of CP-controlled unions which "sat on their charters" and the removal of the leaders of all CIO unions who refused to carry out official CIO policy. The minority resolution reaffirmed the autonomous rights of international unions to carry out their own policies.

Delegate Shier of Local 6, speaking for the minority resolution, recalled the many occasions when the UAW and its present leaders, Reuther and Mazey, spoke out against official policy. He concluded: "Not for the sake of the Communists, but for our own democratic rights, for the needs of the labor movement . . . we should support the minority resolution."

Paul Silver, who introduced the minority report, reminded the delegates that the CP during the war had conducted a bitter campaign against Mazey and Victor Reuther when they criticized CIO policy. The split between the AFL and CIO, he pointed out, was made inevitable by the very principles established in the majority report.

"Too often in this union," he said, "if you honestly disagree with the policy enunciated by the International Executive Board or the national CIO you are immediately called a Communist, a Trotskyite, a Free Booter." This was a reference to terms used in Reuther's written report.

Its spokesmen said their piece but made no impression. Stalinism in the UAW is thoroughly, completely and, it would seem, irrevocably discredited. Only some unforeseen calamity could restore its influence. As in all unions when their time is running out, the Stalinists act with a frenzied recklessness and begin to shout clearly what they are: disloyal union wreckers.

Their leaflets to the convention included accusations against Reuther for conspiring in secret with the employers. Paul Silver they denounced as a "Trotskyite." The CIO, they thundered, was for the Taft-Hartley Law. Reuther quoted at length from leaflets issued by Stalinist unions accusing Murray of working with the Ku Klux Klan.

**"COMMUNIST DISRUPTION"** In no mood to temporize with Stalinism, the delegates readily shouted approval of every move against it demanded by Reuther. At every point where the concrete issue related to the CP it became impossible for them to draw a line between legitimate and proper measures against it and the broad question of democracy in the labor movement.

The wreckage of Stalinism falls on everyone's head. Such was the case in the discussion on "CIO Policy Regarding Communist Party's Program of Disruption."

Two resolutions were before the convention, both castigating the CP for its reactionary role in the labor

creases, pensions and health plans in 1949. How will "our liberal friends" in Congress react to a strike? Will Truman utilize the emergency-strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law? Will we have to compromise our demands in order to avoid embarrassing "our" administration in Washington?

These questions not only remained unanswered: they were not even asked. Reuther could not deal with these questions. He is now the foremost defender of official CIO policy, working hand-in-glove with Murray. A political knife hangs over the '49 negotiations. But to admit this would be to admit the weakness of official CIO policy, which portrays Truman as a great friend of labor.

But: roses for Roosevelt Jr. . . . we are the vanguard . . . unite for action . . . solidarity forever—who could see his way through this to the political problems of the day?

handling of funds. Aside from a score of opposition votes, the convention voted to a man to reject the appeal, seeing in this case one more example of the misuse of a union local by pro-Stalinist elements.

The report contained not a single case of intimidation of delegates. But it did make the wildest accusations of gangsterism and racketeering throughout the union, hysterical and unsubstantiated. The board, still controlled by the Addes-Thomas forces, considered the report so irresponsible that it voted to suppress it; in fact, George Addes withdrew all copies of the report from the hands of board members. Although Reuther was already president, he was not permitted to keep a copy.

The report remained suppressed and forgotten for many months. It appeared suddenly at the gates of an agricultural-implement shop in Iowa, where the UAW was fighting to win an NLRB election against the CP-controlled FE. But the report, now distributed by the FE, was signed by the Progressive Unity Caucus of the UAW in the name of Sage and Doll as its officers. Lurid headlines were added accusing Reuther of suppressing the report and implying that he and the other top officials were personally involved in gangsterism, rackets and tire-slashing. A near riot took place. The international representatives of the UAW were besieged in hotel rooms by a mob. State troops had to be called out to protect their exit from the Iowa city.

The proposed increase in dues from \$1.50 to \$2 a month had to be shelved by the leadership itself. It felt the resistance of the convention and decided to initiate a period of discussion on the problem in the ranks of the union. But the same delegates voted for a twelve-week dollar assessment in the event of a strike. They were willing to make financial sacrifices if the money was earmarked for strike purposes.

Reuther sailed into choppy waters with a proposal to split one of the regions, Region Four, in two. This region was large numerically and widespread geographically. The arguments for division seemed organizationally sound. But hundreds of delegates suspected that the real reason for the division was to allow the comfortable election of two directors from the original region instead of one. In fact, everyone knew that two candidates were in the field and that the race would be close.

Reuther himself had to speak at length to ensure the passage of his proposition and he finally won by a narrow margin, so close that it was decided only after two hand votes and a division of the house. Laughter and catcalls greeted his assertion that "politics" was in no way involved in this issue.

One question arises. Were the delegates right who were suspicious of the leadership and jealous of the rights of the rank and file? Or were those delegates right who said: "The UAW is growing up" and therefore we have to get rid of these childish thoughts? To answer these questions we must consider not merely the sessions of the full convention but the caucuses, the hotel room conversations, the maneuvers among the officials themselves, and above all the general picture of the UAW and its leadership.

Reuther faces no "opposition" from the incoming International Executive Board. Two of the four hold-

ings of the convention Grievance Committee spoke along the same lines. Although he had felt compelled to go along with the convention in the expulsions, it had left a bad taste in his mouth. In the future, he said, let's have no more of these trials rushed through in the heat of convention emotions.

In three minor cases, the Grievance Committee, with the support of the convention, upheld appeals of members of the union against decisions of the International Board. Reuther assured the delegates that

## Is Their Suspicion Justified?

overs from the Addes bloc on the last board were induced not to run and will undoubtedly be rewarded properly.

**BUREAUCRACY HARDENING** In fact, not a single man in the top leadership enjoys a status or stature remotely approximating Reuther's. Emil Mazey plays no outstanding role. Only his exalted official position as secretary-treasurer, a post which he fills capably and honestly, distinguishes him from anyone else.

The history of the UAW has been one of resistance to bureaucratism. Now, for the first time, a stable officialdom is slowly consolidating itself as a permanent body. Of the 19 regional directors, who become members of the International Board, ten were elected by acclamation.

In only three regions was there any serious contest. The strong opposition to Matthews in Region 1 was somehow dissipated. In Region 1A, the candidacy of Tommy Thompson, previously announced against McCucker, was withdrawn—why and how we do not exactly know. . . . These are some of the vital questions affecting the regime in the union which are decided in the smoke-filled rooms.

In its majority, this crystallizing officialdom is no different from the type of apparatus which holds office in the more conservative unions of the CIO, the Steel Workers Unions for example. But it can keep power in the more radical UAW only under the sway of a man who knows how to capture the imagination of the fighting militants. That man is Reuther.

The officialdom cannot do without him. When Hillman goes, the apparatus in the Amalgamated remains intact. Without Reuther, however, a bitter struggle would develop in the UAW between a radical and conservative section of the officialdom.

## Democracy — from Above

Reuther today wants a strong and disciplined officialdom. International representatives and regional directors must toe the line. Democracy and criticism in the ranks—that is one thing; but the top leadership must be unified and consolidated. The formula around which this consolidation takes place is: "Obey CIO policy." Reuther, at the moment, has no plans for any big move forward comparable to his actions in the GM strike, which lifted him into the presidency of the union.

His next step is toward increased intervention in the broader arena of the CIO, where he is beginning to concern himself with its general affairs. One of his arguments for extending the time between conventions pointed to the great burdens being thrust upon him in the councils of the CIO.

He is now a vice-president of the CIO. In taking his first small steps as a CIO "statesman," he holds the hand of Philip Murray. He carries the fight against the CP; he is content to play second fiddle.

He shows himself to the other officials of the CIO as a man able to grapple with the broad questions facing the labor movement from their own point of view; he shows that he is able to handle the CP; he shows that he too can be a well-balanced statesman. He proves that he is not the maverick offspring of a maverick union.

Meanwhile he must consolidate his hold on his own union. He must build a reliable machine. He must show that the UAW, too, can be a "responsible" as well as a militant union.

He has not become a "conservative" union official; he is not a union "boss" or "dictator." In this respect he differs from the ordinary run of CIO officials.

But his radicalism and his democracy propose a subtle transformation of the UAW. That change could be summarized as follows: Militancy must come from above, stimulated and organized by the leadership.

It must be of a type that can be turned on or off in accordance with the complicated necessity of tacking between the need of yielding to official CIO policy and the need of pressing forward the demands of the UAW. The radicalism of the UAW is not now to be abandoned; it is to be "controlled" and "disciplined."

many months this committee investigated, traveling all over the country, spending thousands of dollars. Finally it reported to the International Board.

The report contained not a single case of intimidation of delegates. But it did make the wildest accusations of gangsterism and racketeering throughout the union, hysterical and unsubstantiated. The board, still controlled by the Addes-Thomas forces, considered the report so irresponsible that it voted to suppress it; in fact, George Addes withdrew all copies of the report from the hands of board members. Although Reuther was already president, he was not permitted to keep a copy.

The report remained suppressed and forgotten for many months. It appeared suddenly at the gates of an agricultural-implement shop in Iowa, where the UAW was fighting to win an NLRB election against the CP-controlled FE. But the report, now distributed by the FE, was signed by the Progressive Unity Caucus of the UAW in the name of Sage and Doll as its officers. Lurid headlines were added accusing Reuther of suppressing the report and implying that he and the other top officials were personally involved in gangsterism, rackets and tire-slashing. A near riot took place. The international representatives of the UAW were besieged in hotel rooms by a mob. State troops had to be called out to protect their exit from the Iowa city.

The proposed increase in dues from \$1.50 to \$2 a month had to be shelved by the leadership itself. It felt the resistance of the convention and decided to initiate a period of discussion on the problem in the ranks of the union. But the same delegates voted for a twelve-week dollar assessment in the event of a strike. They were willing to make financial sacrifices if the money was earmarked for strike purposes.

Reuther sailed into choppy waters with a proposal to split one of the regions, Region Four, in two. This region was large numerically and widespread geographically. The arguments for division seemed organizationally sound. But hundreds of delegates suspected that the real reason for the division was to allow the comfortable election of two directors from the original region instead of one. In fact, everyone knew that two candidates were in the field and that the race would be close.

Reuther himself had to speak at length to ensure the passage of his proposition and he finally won by a narrow margin, so close that it was decided only after two hand votes and a division of the house. Laughter and catcalls greeted his assertion that "politics" was in no way involved in this issue.

One question arises. Were the delegates right who were suspicious of the leadership and jealous of the rights of the rank and file? Or were those delegates right who said: "The UAW is growing up" and therefore we have to get rid of these childish thoughts? To answer these questions we must consider not merely the sessions of the full convention but the caucuses, the hotel room conversations, the maneuvers among the officials themselves, and above all the general picture of the UAW and its leadership.

Reuther faces no "opposition" from the incoming International Executive Board. Two of the four hold-

ings of the convention Grievance Committee spoke along the same lines. Although he had felt compelled to go along with the convention in the expulsions, it had left a bad taste in his mouth. In the future, he said, let's have no more of these trials rushed through in the heat of convention emotions.

In three minor cases, the Grievance Committee, with the support of the convention, upheld appeals of members of the union against decisions of the International Board. Reuther assured the delegates that

overs from the Addes bloc on the last board were induced not to run and will undoubtedly be rewarded properly.

**BUREAUCRACY HARDENING** In fact, not a single man in the top leadership enjoys a status or stature remotely approximating Reuther's. Emil Mazey plays no outstanding role. Only his exalted official position as secretary-treasurer, a post which he fills capably and honestly, distinguishes him from anyone else.

The history of the UAW has been one of resistance to bureaucratism. Now, for the first time, a stable officialdom is slowly consolidating itself as a permanent body. Of the 19 regional directors, who become members of the International Board, ten were elected by acclamation.

In only three regions was there any serious contest. The strong opposition to Matthews in Region 1 was somehow dissipated. In Region 1A, the candidacy of Tommy Thompson, previously announced against McCucker, was withdrawn—why and how we do not exactly know. . . . These are some of the vital questions affecting the regime in the union which are decided in the smoke-filled rooms.

In its majority, this crystallizing officialdom is no different from the type of apparatus which holds office in the more conservative unions of the CIO, the Steel Workers Unions for example. But it can keep power in the more radical UAW only under the sway of a man who knows how to capture the imagination of the fighting militants. That man is Reuther.

The officialdom cannot do without him. When Hillman goes, the apparatus in the Amalgamated remains intact. Without Reuther, however, a bitter struggle would develop in the UAW between a radical and conservative section of the officialdom.

felt that the facts were clear, that some form of discipline was justified. And they heard Reuther repeat again and again: "If this were a matter of the exercise of your democratic rights we would not now be discussing it because it would never have come here. . . . You have a right to criticize the officers of the union, that is your democratic right—but this is not carrying out your democratic rights in this union; let's be ever on our toes to defend the democratic rights of everyone to criticize honestly, to be in honest opposition to anyone's point of view. But there is a difference between honest criticism and honest opposition and treason."

And thus Reuther carried the day. But in the back of the minds of the best union militants the reservation remains: "Will this decision give the green light to the conservative forces to begin a crusade in the union, not against Stalinist union-wrecking, but against all militant oppositionists, against all honest critics, and especially against all anti-Stalinist radicals?"

The merits of this case aside, certainly the most backward sections of the leadership will interpret the decision in the crude fashion of one speaker: "This is what you fellows get for playing around with the CP."

Ten minutes later, the convention virtually unanimously expelled a group of racketeers, using the same procedure as in the Doll-Sage case. These men had been caught red-handed receiving a payoff from employers as a reward for putting over a wage-cutting contract.

What stands out in this case is the diffidence of the delegates. They all

felt that the facts were clear, that some form of discipline was justified. And they heard Reuther repeat again and again: "If this were a matter of the exercise of your democratic rights we would not now be discussing it because it would never have come here. . . . You have a right to criticize the officers of the union, that is your democratic right—but this is not carrying out your democratic rights in this union; let's be ever on our toes to defend the democratic rights of everyone to criticize honestly, to be in honest opposition to anyone's point of view. But there is a difference between honest criticism and honest opposition and treason."

And thus Reuther carried the day. But in the back of the minds of the best union militants the reservation remains: "Will this decision give the green light to the conservative forces to begin a crusade in the union, not against Stalinist union-wrecking, but against all militant oppositionists, against all honest critics, and especially against all anti-Stalinist radicals?"

The merits of this case aside, certainly the most backward sections of the leadership will interpret the decision in the crude fashion of one speaker: "This is what you fellows get for playing around with the CP."

Ten minutes later, the convention virtually unanimously expelled a group of racketeers, using the same procedure as in the Doll-Sage case. These men had been caught red-handed receiving a payoff from employers as a reward for putting over a wage-cutting contract.

What stands out in this case is the diffidence of the delegates. They all

felt that the facts were clear, that some form of discipline was justified. And they heard Reuther repeat again and again: "If this were a matter of the exercise of your democratic rights we would not now be discussing it because it would never have come here. . . . You have a right to criticize the officers of the union, that is your democratic right—but this is not carrying out your democratic rights in this union; let's be ever on our toes to defend the democratic rights of everyone to criticize honestly, to be in honest opposition to anyone's point of view. But there is a difference between honest criticism and honest opposition and treason."

And thus Reuther carried the day. But in the back of the minds of the best union militants the reservation remains: "Will this decision give the green light to the conservative forces to begin a crusade in the union, not against Stalinist union-wrecking, but against all militant oppositionists, against all honest critics, and especially against all anti-Stalinist radicals?"

The merits of this case aside, certainly the most backward sections of the leadership will interpret the decision in the crude fashion of one speaker: "This is what you fellows get for playing around with the CP."

Ten minutes later, the convention virtually unanimously expelled a group of racketeers, using the same procedure as in the Doll-Sage case. These men had been caught red-handed receiving a payoff from employers as a reward for putting over a wage-cutting contract.

What stands out in this case is the diffidence of the delegates. They all

felt that the facts were clear, that some form of discipline was justified. And they heard Reuther repeat again and again: "If this were a matter of the exercise of your democratic rights we would not now be discussing it because it would never have come here. . . . You have a right to criticize the officers of the union, that is your democratic right—but this is not carrying out your democratic rights in this union; let's be ever on our toes to defend the democratic rights of everyone to criticize honestly, to be in honest opposition to anyone's point of view. But there is a difference between honest criticism and honest opposition and treason."

this proved that the committee was no rubber stamp.

In fact, the chairman of the committee, Willoughby Abner, is known throughout the union as a man of independent views and independent following. This was no accident. Only the decisions of such a committee with such a chairman would have been accepted by the convention.

If the results proved that the committee was no rubber stamp, they also proved that the union must remain vigilant in reviewing the decisions of the board.

She insisted she had merely been "discharged."

Corporation executives are "released" from a job, white-collar workers are "discharged" from a job, and Joe Blow on the assembly line is "fired" from a job. There's a class angle for practically everything.

Class Angle

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, testifying against the national health insurance plan before a House committee, objected when a committee member asked her if she had not been "fired" from her job as health consultant for a Senate committee. She said the imputation was an insult to her professional dignity.

She insisted she had merely been "discharged."

Corporation executives are "released" from a job, white-collar workers are "discharged" from a job, and Joe Blow on the assembly line is "fired" from a job. There's a class angle for practically everything.

International Advice

The Socialist Leader (London) reports that England's East Suffolk is going to insure its county councilors against falling downstairs at council meetings.

While we hesitate to criticize our British cousins, seems to us it would be cheaper for the city council to meet on the ground floor.

Consistency

Some people will do almost anything for a laugh. Senator High Butler (R., Neb.) has solemnly asserted that he surveyed 6,000 business firms and found out the following: that the vast majority of corporation executives, retiring at 65 with large annual pensions, are opposed to extending old-age benefits to workers who aren't receiving them now.

Somebody ought to write him a letter about the 400-odd Congressmen in Washington who recently voted themselves an additional \$3,000 a year in expenses and then decided to do nothing about raising the 40-cents an hour minimum wage.

We think the above-mentioned corporation executives have the edge over the congressmen: at least they weren't elected as "friends of the people." And we think the people ought to put a fine edge on both sets of gentlemen. Edge 'em out of power.

Accounting for Hoover

Looking for security—job security, financial security, or what have you? Here's what Herbert Hoover told the graduating class of Ohio Wesleyan on June 11:

"Security kills the joy that lies in competition, in individual adventure, new undertakings and new achievements. . . . At all times in history there have been many who sought escape into 'security' from self-reliance."

"Security kills the joy . . ." Now we know why Hoover wears a sour puss. He's a millionaire.

Hartley: Fascist

Fred A. Hartley, formerly of the Washington act known as Taft and Hartley, is now president of the "Tool Owners Union," whose application for a charter to operate in New York state was rejected with the following official reason:

"No more fascist organization with all the potentialities for undemocratic action and danger to our way of life has yet come before the official attention of this board."

The other half of the team has, in the meantime, shown who really controls the U. S. Senate.

Read LABOR ACTION and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

By LEON TROTSKY Marxism in the United States 35 Cents . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

San Francisco Bay Area Weekly News Commentary by

GORDON HASKELL can be heard over FM Station KPFA (Berkeley) every Thursday evening at 7:45 o'clock 101 ON YOUR DIAL!

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed. 13-30 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW

## SPARKS in the NEWS

### Class Angle

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, testifying against the national health insurance plan before a House committee, objected when a committee member asked her if she had not been "fired" from her job as health consultant for a Senate committee. She said the imputation was an insult to her professional dignity.

She insisted she had merely been "discharged."

Corporation executives are "released" from a job, white-collar workers are "discharged" from a job, and Joe Blow on the assembly line is "fired" from a job. There's a class angle for practically everything.

### International Advice

The Socialist Leader (London) reports that England's East Suffolk is going to insure its county councilors against falling downstairs at council meetings.

While we hesitate to criticize our British cousins, seems to us it would be cheaper for the city council to meet on the ground floor.

### Consistency

Some people will do almost anything for a laugh. Senator High Butler (R., Neb.) has solemnly asserted that he surveyed 6,000 business firms and found out the following: that the vast majority of corporation executives, retiring at 65 with large annual pensions, are opposed to extending old-age benefits to workers who aren't receiving them now.

Somebody ought to write him a letter about the 400-odd Congressmen in Washington who recently voted themselves an additional \$3,000 a year in expenses and then decided to do nothing about raising the 40-cents an hour minimum wage.

We think the above-mentioned corporation executives have the edge over the congressmen: at least they weren't elected as "friends of the people." And we think the people ought to put a fine edge on both sets of gentlemen. Edge 'em out of power.

### Accounting for Hoover

Looking for security—job security, financial security, or what have you? Here's what Herbert Hoover told the graduating class of Ohio Wesleyan on June 11:

"Security kills the joy that lies in competition, in individual adventure, new undertakings and new achievements. . . . At all times in history there have been many who sought escape into 'security' from self-reliance."

"Security kills the joy . . ." Now we know why Hoover wears a sour puss. He's a millionaire.

### Hartley: Fascist

Fred A. Hartley, formerly of the Washington act known as Taft and Hartley, is now president of the "Tool Owners Union," whose application for a charter to operate in New York state was rejected with the following official reason:

"No more fascist organization with all the potentialities for undemocratic action and danger to our way of life has yet come before the official attention of this board."

The other half of the team has, in the meantime, shown who really controls the U. S. Senate.

Read LABOR ACTION and THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

By LEON TROTSKY Marxism in the United States 35 Cents . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

San Francisco Bay Area Weekly News Commentary by

GORDON HASKELL can be heard over FM Station KPFA (Berkeley) every Thursday evening at 7:45 o'clock 101 ON YOUR DIAL!

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed. 13-30 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW

## The Wheel Is Turning

If a Stalinist can be removed from union office for supporting Wallace, can a Republican be removed for supporting Dewey, or a Socialist for supporting Norman Thomas? How under this principle can the unity of the AFL and CIO be effectuated? And if the lofty leaders of international unions may be forced to resign for failing to carry out "CIO policy," are the humble leaders of local UAW unions to enjoy any greater rights?

Despite Reuther's affirmation of the principles of democratic rights, the wheel is turning toward "discipline" and "control" over the locals.

Silver himself expresses the changing mood. His own resolution provided: "It is the obligation of the local member, local union officer and international officer to carry out meticulously . . . all policies adopted by the higher bodies of the UAW."

But back in 1944, Paul Silver, president of Local 351, together with Emil Mazey, then president of Local 212, formed the now defunct Michigan Commonwealth Federation as an independent political party in opposition to the policy of the UAW and the CIO. Times are changing.

### ALLIS-CHALMERS CASE

The foreign-policy discussion was over in a flash. An omnibus resolution endorsed the basic elements of U. S. foreign policy, including the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. The Stalinist point of view was presented by Paul Boatin of Local 600.

Reuther replied: "We are op-

posed to imperialism, whether it comes from Wall Street or the Kremlin. That's the fundamental difference here." That seemed clear enough to the delegates and the "dispute" was over.

This debate, of course, evades the crux of the question: Isn't the administration in Washington carrying out the program of the Wall Street bankers? But who could think of that when the symbols were clanging for the Fair Deal Democrats?

On the last day the Grievance Committee reported on the appeal of a group of Stalinist-Addes former leaders of Local 248. They had been expelled from the union following the ill-fated strike at Allis-Chalmers, which reduced the membership of the local from 8000 to 184. The charges against them were that they had mismanaged the funds of the local and strike contributions from the international after the strike was over.

Robert Buse, who spoke for the appellants, admitted that they had submitted fraudulent financial reports to the international, that the \$2,000 weekly contributions from the strike fund which had been assigned for the relief of victimized strikers were never used for this purpose but that the money had been used for unexplained "organizational" work under instructions from George Addes, then secretary-treasurer of the UAW.

Their defense rested on two grounds: (1) they had a long record of union building from the earliest days; and (2) none of them profited personally from the mis-

## Delegates Are Uneasy

Speaking in their own defense, Sage and Doll challenged the constitutionality of the procedure under which they were being tried. They refused to reveal the source from which they had received copies of the report.

They claimed that they had not themselves turned the report over to the FE, nor had they added the headlines and comments. They said that they had merely mimeographed several hundred copies for private distribution to "key people" in the UAW and finally turned it over to their own caucus to be printed in its name. When they first saw the printed copies reprinted with the misleading headlines they tried to recall it but it was too late. They portrayed themselves as innocent dupes of irresponsible elements in their own caucus.

But it didn't work. The delegates knew both men as old experienced hands in union activity and in faction fighting. Doll, for example, was sufficiently known as a union leader to win election to the Michigan legislature as a state representative. And so the delegates voted for expulsion. But they were uneasy.

Not more than 60 per cent of the delegates participated in the balloting. And of those who voted, at least one third voted against the expulsion. Emil Mazey, who chaired the sessions, said in a reply to a question that 90 per cent of all the delegates had voted for expulsion. His eyesight is no doubt exceptionally defective.

What stands out in this case is the diffidence of the delegates. They all

## Ranks Sensitive to Democracy

The readiness of the delegates to strike down Stalinism