

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 16, 1951

FIVE CENTS

GIVE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE!

Court Voids Calif. "Loyalty Oath"

... page 2

Labor Back in Mobilization Deal?

... page 3

The New Workers Party in Germany

... page 5

A Full Discussion of the **UAW CONVENTION**

By **BEN HALL**

CLEVELAND, April 6—On all questions of domestic policy, the United Automobile Workers convention, which concluded its sessions here today, endorsed a more radical, more militant program than did the Milwaukee convention of 1949. Resolutions to stand ready to strike in defense of the union against the employers and against the Truman administration were enthusiastically adopted by acclamation. Every militant speech won rousing applause. For the first time at a UAW convention, a minority resolution came out of the Resolutions Committee bluntly and squarely for the formation of an independent labor party. It was not adopted but it won encouraging support.

However, the convention reflected and recorded a disturbing shift away from traditional UAW rank and file democracy. It proceeded with smooth efficiency. It endorsed in almost every detail, without serious opposition, the platform of the administration whose candidates were elected to every major post with one important exception. This was the first convention

(Continued on page 6)

WEST COAST YOUTH CONFERENCE

LOS ANGELES, April 16—A West Coast, anti-war socialist, youth conference will be held in Los Angeles during the spring vacation of the University of California campuses. The conference will be a continuation of the joint socialist youth meeting held in Oakland last fall and will use the anti-war statement adopted at that time as a point of departure.

This conference will include, as before, among the participating groups; The Libertarian Socialist League, The Socialist Youth League, representatives from student groups on every major West Coast campus, and others.

The West Coast SYL cordially invites all socialists who oppose both war camps to attend and participate in the work of this conference because the sessions will have a unique educational value and mark a decisive step forward in orienting and developing the West Coast socialist youth movement in the struggle against war and for a socialist society.

(FOR TIME, PLACE, AGENDA—SEE PAGE 3)

MacArthur Replacement Highlights Crisis in American Foreign Policy

By **RICHARD TROY**

The removal of MacArthur from the various commands he has held so long in the Far East represents a decisive step by the Truman administration in its efforts to combat the more reactionary elements in the leadership of American foreign policy. MacArthur symbolizes, more than any other man, an American foreign policy based solely upon military force and completely disdainful of the hopes and aspirations of dozens of smaller nations all over the world.

This is not to say, of course, that we can expect, now that MacArthur has been dropped, any radical change in U. S. global policy. For, after all, the very fact that a man like MacArthur has held his job as long as he did, and was only fired when he publicly attempted to impose his own belligerent "Asiatic" policy on the administration shows that, for a long period of time, he held the confidence of men such as Marshall and Truman. MacArthur only represented the greatest evils of American imperialism, and his removal does not mean the passing of it.

However, the shift in Far Eastern leaders does signify a decisive, if temporary, victory of the Truman-Acheson line over the Taft-MacArthur line, and, at least, gives the world another breathing spell. A simple shift in personnel cannot alter those basic conditions and rivalries which, in the long run, will eventually involve the two great imperial-

(Continued on page 4)

Stop U. S. Aid to Franco! Release Political Prisoners!

UNITED DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST FRANCO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO, April 8—In response to the appeal from our brother socialists of the Spanish POUM for solidarity in their struggle against Franco's fascism, an enthusiastic united front picket line of students and workers demonstrated in front of the Spanish Consulate in the heart of downtown Chicago's Loop yesterday afternoon. The pickets attracted wide and sympathetic attention from the crowds passing by.

Thousands of leaflets of the united front, bearing the heading "Stop Aid to Butcher Franco—Help the Spanish People," were distributed on nearby street corners. The picketers carried some 25 signs bearing the slogans "Release the Barcelona Strike Prisoners," "Break the Truman-Franco Axis," "No Aid to Franco's Fascism," "Boycott Spanish Goods," "Dictatorship in the East, Dictatorship in the West—Against Both," "The Fight Against Fascism is Not Over," "Support Spanish Labor Against Franco," amongst others.

The Independent Socialist

League and its youth group, the Socialist Youth League, took the initiative in forming the united front committee which sponsored the picketing. The committee was composed of the Socialist Club of Roosevelt College, the Libertarian Socialist League of the World, in addition to the ISL. On the campus of the University of Chicago, the SYL issued a separate leaflet jointly with the Political Club, Students for Democratic Action and the United World Federalists explaining the situation and appealing to students to support the picket line against Francoism.

The leaflet distributed at the demonstration read in part as follows:

"Two weeks ago the world was amazed when, under the nose of Franco's totalitarian dictatorship, the workers of Barcelona staged a successful General Strike right in the industrial citadel of the country.

"It is difficult for us, living under conditions of relative freedom, to grasp the depths of desperation to which the workers of Barcelona

(Continued on page 8)



NEW YORK CITY

In answer to an appeal from the Spanish anti-fascist underground, some 125 pickets demonstrated before the Spanish Consulate in New York on Saturday, April 7, from noon to 1:15 P.M. A joint effort of eleven organizations, the united front demonstration demanded the release of the

more than 5,000 Barcelona strikers jailed by the fascist regime and called for an end to American financial and military aid to Franco.

Heartened by the recent Barcelona general strike and the continuing strike activities of the Spanish working class, the pickets shouted slogans indicating their support of the Spanish anti-fascist

struggle, and called upon the American labor movement to come to the aid of the fight against the tyrannical Franco government. Understanding the role that American guns and dollars are playing in Spain, the demonstrators demanded that the Truman administration cease propping up Spanish fascism. Placards demanding "Franco's Fascist Agents—Get Out!" were prominent in the demonstration, as were those that carried the anti-fascist, anti-Stalinist message "Down with Totalitarianism Everywhere!"

SOLIDARITY WITH STRIKERS

The picket line was the result of an appeal by the POUM (Workers Party of Marxist Unification) for demonstrations of solidarity with the Spanish strikers. This Spanish underground organization called upon socialist, working class and anti-fascist organizations to picket the Spanish Consulates and give all possible aid to the Spanish anti-fascist struggle. Taking the initiative, the Independent Socialist League contacted the Socialist Party and

(Continued on page 8)

Court Voids U. of Calif. 'Loyalty Oath'; Orders Reinstatement of Banned Teachers

By MARY BELL

One bright spot has appeared in the steadily darkening picture of civil liberties in the United States. It has emerged, startlingly enough, in one of the darkest areas of that picture, the state of California. This state has felt called upon to organize its own "little un-American activities committee" and has harassed its famous film stars, civil employees and especially its teachers, with loyalty oaths and security guarantees as has no other state.

force and violence is the danger of subversion from within by the gradual whittling away and the resulting disintegration of the very pillars of our freedom."

THE SUPREME COURT

The reactionary elements who fought for the imposition of the special oath may press the matter to the State Supreme Court. The course of the entire case is of extreme importance for academic freedom everywhere. The University of California is one of the largest institutions of higher learning in the world, with campuses in Berkeley, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Davis, Riverdale and Santa Barbara. Its regents, appointed by the governor, in-

clude representatives of some of the most powerful financial and industrial interests in the state, such as the Bank of America, the Fleishacker interests and the California Fruit Growers Exchange. The state constitution, like so many others, explicitly calls for a "university . . . entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs. . ."

One of the most infamous regents, L. M. Giannini, head of the all-powerful Bank of America, was one of the casualties of the struggle. The stripe of the man who helped to lead the fight for the oath is revealed in the con-

clusion of his statement of resignation:

"If the new implementation which is neither an oath nor an affirmation should prove ineffective, as I fear it will, I hold myself in readiness to participate with others in providing for the organization of 20th Century vigilantes, whose objective will be to unearth and expose Communism in all of its repulsive manifestations."

Whether the Court of Appeals' ruling will, in the statement of the defense counsel, "mark the turn of the tide against a dangerous and un-American trend to judge men by what they sign instead of by what they are," remains to be seen. It is a signpost in the right direction.

The court decision should hearten those who are struggling to maintain and extend academic freedom and political liberty in general in California and throughout the country. The onslaught against this freedom is being carried on by the "twentieth century vigilantes" both inside and outside the government. No court decision can decisively halt the impact of their activity, which is an endemic disorder of our society. It can only be halted and turned back by educating and organizing the mass of the workers, students and others to the need for a concerted and continuing struggle against it and against the society which breeds it.

Berkeley Socialist Polls Good Vote

BERKELEY, Calif. — The first third camp anti-war socialist candidate to run for elected office in the San Francisco Bay Area polled three thousand votes in the Berkeley councilmanic elections of April 3. Durward Du Rant, executive committee member of the Socialist Party, Local East Bay, with the official endorsement and the joint active collaboration of the Independent Socialist League, repudiated both American imperialistic and Stalinist Russian war aims and projected a model socialist program in a municipal election.

These Berkeley elections, however, returned to office all incumbents from mayor to school director. The two posts vacated by retirement were filled with additional conservative candidates. Neither the Democratic Party nor the ADA candidates for the council polled more than 7500 votes each. The solid bloc of business, real estate and merchant control in this city of 120,000 remained undented.

ENCOURAGING RESULTS

That the voting results are encouraging for third camp socialists is substantiated by comparative election figures. Du Rant's

2966 votes comprised 17 per cent of the total received by the highest councilmanic candidate. Even the Stalinists through their numerous fake peace fronts and with the apparatus of the Progressive Party mustered only 4100 votes for councilman. Their school director candidate polled only 3800 votes. Moreover, the SWP candidate in the 1949 council election in Oakland which is over three times the voting size of Berkeley, netted 2100 votes.

Closer political relations be-

tween the ISL and this SP local, developed out of this election collaboration. At the end of the campaign the two East Bay organizations tentatively agreed to initiate a call for a united front picket line around the Franco consulate in San Francisco in support of the Barcelona General Strike. The two youth organizations began planning a Sather Gate mass meeting in conjunction with the Students for Democratic Action for the purpose of financial aid to the POUM.

Los Angeles Organizations Call For Anti-Franco Demonstration

(The letter which appears below was sent to some five hundred organizations, many of them trade unions, in the Los Angeles area. The organizations on the Initiating Committee hope for a good turn out for their picket line, which will take place in front of the Spanish Consulate at 6th and Hill Streets, one of the busiest corners in the city. A report on the demonstration is promised for next week's LABOR ACTION.)

tyrannies INCLUDING STALIN'S RUSSIA, ask that you unite with us in a picket line demonstration before the Spanish Consulate at 606 South Hill Street on Saturday, April 14th, at 10 A.M., to demonstrate our sympathy with the heroic workers of Barcelona.

- 1. We ask your union or organization to officially participate in this picket line!
2. Please post notices on your bulletin boards!
3. Come with your own signs and your own slogans!

- 4. Invite all your friends to come down!
5. Make this demonstration as representative as possible of all the Los Angeles Trade Unions and all friends of democracy!
6. Your slogans should emphasize your hatred of all totalitarian governments!

Initiating Committee Sponsors—Independent Socialist League, Libertarian Socialist League, Westwood Socialist Club, Young People's Socialist League, Socialist Youth League.

Dear Friends: THE WORKERS OF SPAIN ASK FOR YOUR HELP TO OVERTHROW FRANCO'S TOTALITARIAN TYRANNY!

You know that for the first time in twelve years since Franco's bandit army, aided by the Italian and German fascists, destroyed the Spanish trade unions and all democratic rights and freedoms of the Spanish people, the workers of Barcelona have risen again, and hurled their defiance at Franco's fascists by a general strike which has won wide support from all Spanish workers and the approval of all democratic and socialist forces throughout the world!

The leaders of the socialist underground of Barcelona (Executive Committee of the POUM), write, "The struggle against the fascist regime of hunger and misery has entered a new stage. That this struggle should end with the downfall of the Franco tyranny and the restoration of democratic liberties of the Spanish people needs the immediate, practical and effective assistance of the international working class."

They ask that we "Demonstrate before the Francoist embassies and consulates." Therefore, FIVE SOCIALIST ORGANIZATIONS, which are fighting against all totalitarian

Los Angeles MAX SHACHTMAN Chairman, I.S.L.

Will Speak On "World Crisis—1951"

Sunday, April 22 8:00 P.M. Case Hotel 1106 South Broadway (6th Floor)

Labor on New Board Does Not End Crisis

By GORDON HASKELL

Just seven weeks after they had walked out of the Wage Stabilization Board, and then out of all other posts in the mobilization set-up, the United Labor Policy Committee has agreed to send its representatives to a brand new agency, the National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy (NABMP).

Does this mean that the labor leaders have retreated from the position they took when they denounced the whole mobilization set-up and most of its policies as a successful attempt by big business to take over the government's direction of the economy? Has a formula been found which will bring them back into collaboration with the program of inequality of sacrifice which they have been blasting up and down the country?

At the moment of writing, the picture is not too clear. Yet it appears that the labor bureaucracy's decision to join the NABMP is more a reflection of their continuing inability to grasp the realities of the political situation in which the labor movement now finds itself, than the beginning of a full-scale retreat from the position they took when they walked off the boards and which was later re-affirmed at the United Labor Conference in Washington.

MUM ABOUT TRUMAN

At the time of that conference LABOR ACTION pointed out that all the top leaders carefully refrained from naming Truman as one of the culprits along with Charles Wilson and the other top businessmen - mobilizers. Even though it was clear to everyone at the conference that the Truman administration bears full political responsibility for the mobilization set-up as well as for the policy of wage freeze plus price increases, the labor leaders are still so confirmed in their alliance with the Democratic Party that they kept mum about this responsibility.

Now, it is clear that this new board does not give the labor movement any of the things they have been demanding: full participation of all policy and administrative levels of the mobilization machinery; a program of equality of sacrifice through a price freeze without a wage freeze, rent control, an equitable tax program, etc. All it does is to give them representation on a body which will advise the president, but which will have no powers whatever.

Why should the labor leaders have accepted this particular "window dressing" role when they are still holding out against re-entering the mobilization agencies? Their own explanations are so weak as to seem almost childish. One "labor executive" stated that they had agreed to sit on the NABMP "at the president's personal request." All of them emphasized that this board will advise the president, and not Charley Wilson. The most that any of them could say in justification of their action was that now they will have Truman's ear; that they will have direct access to the president rather than being forced to bring their grievances to businessmen who are acting as government officials.

WOULD HAVE TO RETURN

LABOR ACTION pointed out at the time of the big break in Washington that either the labor leaders would have to draw the full political lesson of this experience: that they must break with Truman and the Democratic Party, or they would have to return, sooner or later, to the mobilization set-up. They might return after some minor or even major concessions had been wrung from the government-business partnership by their show of independence, or even with no concessions at all.

That remains true now. No one really believes that the trouble, or any part of it, was due to the fact that Truman did not know what the labor leaders wanted. Everyone realizes that what is really at

stake is: who will bear the major burden of the vast armament program. And on this question, labor has yet to get a single concession worth mentioning.

The labor leaders' agreement to sit on the NABMP shows that they are still chasing up a political blind alley, whether it is a first step toward a resumption of the window-dressing role in the whole mobilization set-up or not.

RELIED ON WHITE HOUSE

Ever since the early Roosevelt administration, the labor leaders have been inclined to depend on the executive side of the government for what few favors they got. When FDR had a Congress which went along with him on social legislation, the labor leaders were happy indeed. As they never developed a political arm which could be relied upon to keep their "friends" in a majority in Congress, most of the time they tried to make up for this political lack by keeping as close ties as they could with the New Dealers in the administrative departments, and particularly with the White House. This has continued into the days of the Fair Deal, and beyond.

Of course, they had to pay for the favors they got, and heavily.

Whatever influence their position gave them in the councils of the Democratic Party had to be used for the candidates chosen by the administration, whether they preferred them or not. When Roosevelt proposed the labor draft during the last war, and when he and his successor began the regular process of breaking railroad strikes by government "seizures," they could do nothing but complain. What they lacked then, and what they lack now, is an independent political force of their own which could establish an influence block at the formal, and to a considerable extent real, source of power in the American political system: the electorate and hence Congress.

Until they steel themselves to a recognition of this fact, their political policy will continue to swing in mid-air. They can pound the ear of the president till he is deaf, and they can sit at all levels of the mobilization set-up till they are tired of sitting. But if they don't have a mass political instrument of their own, independent of the two great political machines which run the country in an interlocking directorate with the great business machines, they will always remain on the outside looking in.

ISL FUND DRIVE

By ALBERT GATES

Fund Drive Director

A considerable pickup took place this week in the ISL Fund Drive with contributions now totalling \$6304.59. This pushed the campaign over the halfway mark financially and makes possible the completion of the drive as scheduled. However, we are still behind the necessary average weekly income to do this, and weekly contributions have to be higher than the above amount.

The Socialist Youth League made the big jump this week to go over the 100 per cent mark. With contributions of \$90 from Chicago, \$38.50 from Berkeley and \$21 from New York, the SYL has sent in a total of \$528.75, or 105 per cent. The SYL says they are by no means through with their campaign in behalf of the Fund Drive, and knowing what they did last year, we are certain they will go far ahead of their quota. As it stands now, the SYL is the big noise in the drive and together with Streater, has passed the 100 per cent mark.

Chicago jumped into third place and passed New York this week. A payment of \$288 helped the branch

to go ahead five places in the standings. New York is not far behind, however, and with a real spurt in the next few days can overhaul its rival city. What do you say, New York? You have only just passed the halfway mark in your local campaign and still have a long road ahead.

St. Louis and Cleveland are keeping pace with the leaders. Both sent in good sums this week, as did Los Angeles. A letter received from Oakland explained the delay from that area, but promised that before many days go by, it will be near the top of the list. We know that Oakland can do it. Newark, Seattle and Philadelphia, however, are long overdue. If they don't get going quickly, they will be left far behind.

The crucial weeks of the drive are now coming up. We need a little over \$6000 to come out ahead. The big cities are the ones who will make it possible. That means New York in the first place, and then Chicago, Buffalo, Detroit, Oakland, Los Angeles and Philadelphia. While we count heavily upon them, they alone cannot do it without the assistance of all branches and cities in the drive.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1951 Fund Drive.

NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE (Make checks payable to Independent Socialist League or Albert Gates.)

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

WEST COAST AGENDA

Time—Wednesday and Thursday, April 25th and 26th Place—The Case Hotel—6th Floor Conference Room 1106 South Broadway (11th and Broadway) Los Angeles, California Sessions—Morning at 10 A.M. Afternoon at 1 P.M. Evening at 8 P.M.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

Wednesday, April 25

- Morning and afternoon sessions: 1. Presiding Committee report 2. The American scene 3. Reports from localities 4. Report of April 14th Pacifist Conference Evening session: 5. Stalinism reports and discussion

Thursday, April 26th

- Morning and afternoon sessions: 1. Concrete actions and perspectives against war by this conference 2. The British Labour Party and Britain in the war; reports and discussion Evening session: 3. Socialism, socialists and war; reports, discussions and acceptance of a program against war

Fees and Registration—A single 25 cent registration fee provides admittance to all sessions of the conference

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$6304.59	50.4
Streater	25	28.00	112
Soc. Youth League	500	528.75	105
Chicago	1800	1107.00	61.5
Youngstown	100	60.00	60
St. Louis	50	30.00	60
New York City	4200	2441.00	58.1
Cleveland	300	167.50	55.8
Boston	50	\$ 25.00	50
General	975	476.50	48.8
Buffalo	850	400.00	47
Detroit	800	341.00	42.6
Los Angeles	550	208.25	37.8
Newark	300	100.00	33.3
Seattle	300	100.00	33.3
Oakland	650	206.60	31.6
Pittsburgh	150	43.00	28.6
Indiana	100	25.00	25
Philadelphia	450	95.00	21
Oregon	50	10.00	20
Reading	100	3.00	.03
Akron	100	0	0
Baltimore	50	0	0
Connecticut	50	0	0
Minnesota	10	0	0



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 16

April 16, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every county, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

YOU and SCIENCE

SCIENCE, STALINISM, AND SOCIALISM

By CARL DARTON

Recently this column has stressed the importance of the political factor in the application of science to society. In so doing we do not wish to appear as advocates of a "class science," particularly not in the vulgar form presented by the Stalinists. Unfortunately the Stalinists have twisted the meaning of the Marxist philosophy of science just as they have all aspects of Marxism.

Stalin himself has literally rewritten history in the past 30 years and more recently assumed the scientific cloak of semantics. However, the outstanding case of the taint of Stalinism in science has been in the field of genetics. In the notorious Lysenko affair science reached a new low in the Soviet Union when the Central Committee of the Communist Party officially intervened in favor of a particular clique of scientists. Rather than have the proponents of each scientific theory seek agreement through open discussion and freely organized experiments the Soviet Academy of Science pledged itself "to develop Michurinist biological science and to exterminate the anti-national (!) idealistic, Weismanist-Morganist movement in biology." Under the circumstances it is no surprise that Lysenko "won out" when it is realized that he often concluded his reports with such slogans as: "Glory to the great friend and coryphaeus of science, to our leader and teacher Comrade Stalin." According to Pravda, the Lysenko controversy arose "primarily because in the Presidium of the Academy of Science and in the Bureau of the Biological Department they forgot the most important principle in any science—adherence to the party point of view."

Science Used in Different Ways

Contrary to this concept of a class science we believe that the methodology of science is essentially classless. However, we would be blind to history if we did not understand that different social classes and groups have used science in different ways. Or to put it conversely, the form in which science develops and flourishes depends upon the social, economic and political conditions of an epoch.

The manner in which the structure of society determines the nature of science can be illustrated by reference to the Greece of classical antiquity. It was here that Western culture and science obtained their start. However, Greek science, based upon limited observation and unlimited theorizing, was never able to temper and test its activity by the controlled experiment which is such a vital part of the scientific method today. Most scholars of the history of science agree that this lack of the experimental approach was due to the Grecian scorn of manual labor. Such scorn was the natural accompaniment of a society based upon slavery. Thus Greek science was never able to rise above the limitations which the dominant class placed upon its activity.

Much later in history the desire of the bourgeoisie to exploit the earth's resources, coupled with the new science resulting from the union of the scholar and the craftsman gave us the twin development of capitalism and modern science during the past three hundred years. It was Francis Bacon, often called the philosopher of industrial science, who in the early 17th century propounded the idea that knowledge, contrary to Greek thought, ought to bear fruit in productivity; that science should be applicable to industry.

Science and Socialism

Under socialism we believe that science will express itself in many ways different than in any previous period of history. Moreover, since the aim of both socialism and science is the development of man's potentialities to their utmost, only then will science obtain its fullest growth. Then, not only the actual content, but even the methodology of science will undoubtedly differ from that of today. Nevertheless, though we believe that progress toward socialism can only be made today through the struggle of the working class for recognition, it is a vulgar distortion of history and science to attempt to give all aspects of science a class interpretation.

It is necessary, however, that the socialist and the class-conscious workers clarify their own approach to science; just as the dominant social classes of the past, consciously or unconsciously, had their own conception or philosophy of the use of science. Needless to say, this philosophy will not include merely: "science for science sake" whatever that means, or science solely for producing industrial profits, or for its subservience to the political aims of a decadent capitalism or Stalinism.

Socialists should not shun this task of understanding the function of science in our times and in the society they hope to build. Just as there is the need of scientists having the right understanding of socialism it is even more essential that socialists arrive at a sound philosophy of science.

OHIO

Senate Considers State T-H Bill;

By JOE HAUSER

There were two legislative hearings in Columbus this week, and neither one of them was aimed at helping the Ohio labor movement. The first was at a session of the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee, which is considering a new bill by State Senator Ferguson to ban the closed shop and include other restrictive measures to make a Ohio state little Taft-Hartley Law. A previous attempt to enact a similar bill, the Van Aiken Bill, was defeated a couple of years ago. Ferguson is already the author of a state law forbidding strikes among civil service workers. Principal lobbyists appearing in behalf of this measure were the well known anti-closed shop cru-

sader, Cecil B. DeMille, and several strike-bound employers. The organized labor movement is opposing the bill.

The second hearing was a public session of the newly formed subversive activities investigating committee. Various organizations from the fields of labor, veterans, and minority groups were represented and testified on their information on the activities of communists in the state. Press reports indicated that nothing new or spectacular was revealed. A few organizations did say that they felt that federal agencies were sufficient to cope with the problem, and that the state body was not needed. None actually protested the committee's activities or formation.

LABOR ACTION carried a story several weeks ago relating the defeat of the Stalinists in Fisher Body Local 45, UAW-CIO. Since then there has been a recount of votes for the executive board-at-large, resulting in the removal from the board of Leo Fenster, chief party-line advocate among Cleveland auto workers. With ten at-large members to be elected, Fenster had placed ninth in the original count, but dropped to eleventh (and off) on the recount. This is a real blow to the Stalinists in the local and is a measure of the loss of influence they have recently experienced. Moving up to the board was a member of the Freedom Slate, the group which conducted the fight against the CP.

MacArthur

(Continued from page 1)

ist powers, the United States and Russia, in a world war. But the removal of MacArthur can only be gratifying to those who seek a breathing spell in which to mobilize the anti-war sentiment of the common people all over the world.

MacArthur's removal was a direct slap in the face for that large group of extreme reactionaries in the Senate who have just completed a relatively successful struggle in congress to win the "Great Debate." In these heated congressional sessions last week repeated assaults were made on the administration's foreign policy by various irresponsible parties, mostly Republican in origin, but not confined to them. The result of the show was to point up again, the complete inability of the American pro-war parties to cope with Stalinism. The irresponsibility lay in the fact that they—like MacArthur—showed, from the point of view of their own interests, even less concern for, and knowledge of, the realities of modern politics than the Truman-Acheson line betrays.

TRUMAN-ACHESON LINE

The Truman-Acheson line, at least indicates some dim cognizance of the growing world-wide resentment of the United States and of the developing social revolution that stimulates it. Consequently, their line attempts, in so far as possible, to avoid antagonizing real and potential American allies. It makes some feeble efforts to enlist supporters, on both sides of the iron curtain, for a possible political victory over Stalinism.

However, for the majority of the U. S. Senate even these minimum measures are too much. In their eyes the U. S. is "coddling" the rest of the world. Thus last week's Senate "debate" was an incredible show, calculated only to make it clear to the rest of the world that the United States rules alone, a domination to be balanced and checked by nobody.

First, on the issue of whether or not to send troops to Europe (ostensibly stated as a semi-constitutional issue: does the president or Congress determine when troops may be dispatched overseas?). The Senate voted to permit four divisions to be sent, and requested the president to consult it before sending more. The real result of this action was to intensify the belief among the Western allies of the United States that a politically powerful group in the Congress is reluctant to do everything necessary for the military defense of Europe against Stalinist encroachments, while at the same time it is quite willing to challenge Russia all over the world.

To further disrupt the Truman-

Acheson program of "coddling" the allies, the Senate passed another resolution recommending that Spain, Turkey and Greece be invited to participate in arrangements for the defence of Europe. This can only further irritate the Atlantic Pact nations who resent dictation from the United States, and who have not resigned themselves to the fact that this is the "American Century." For them Europe is worth defending even if the U. S. air-force cannot guarantee perfect protection for American troops overseas (a resolution demanding this as a condition for sending troops was narrowly defeated).

SPAIN INVITED

Particularly irritating, of course, was the inclusion of Spain in the Atlantic Pact resolution. But, here again, the U. S. must have its way. And the Fascist-run country which the U. S. government, under pressure from this berserk congress (and despite the opposition of many important political forces both here and in Europe) is making its special protegee in European arrangements, will soon take its place in the anti-Stalinist line directed from Washington.

As if these maneuverings were not bad propaganda enough for American prestige the House Appropriations Committee slashed the budget for the "Voice of America" by 90 per cent the day after the "Great Debate" ended. It is the contention of liberals that if properly exploited, the "Voice" can sell capitalist democracy to the world. This faith in the "Voice" is, of course, based upon unsound suppositions, but, even were the "Voice" the proper reply to Stalinism, the Congress seems reluctant to let it continue. The "war for men's minds"—about which one reads so often in the New York Times Magazine section—is a non-existent battle in the mind of the average congressman.

NO WHEAT FOR INDIA

And while this show was going on in the Senate chambers, the House Appropriations Committee kept the Indian Relief bill bottled up securely on some, dusty shelf. Millions of Americans, reorganizing the political capital the Stalinists can make in India under the U. S. comes through with the much-needed grain, pleaded with congress to act. But nothing happened. Aid, on the other hand, is being extended to Franco to prop up his tottering government. Indians, it seems, think too independently.

While Indians starved, Franco's pockets bulged, and millions cried for peace in Korea, a good part of the Senate cheered when, from Tokyo, their military hero, MacArthur, demanded that the Truman administration permit him to continue the Korean War on a vast

scale. The same congressmen who fear that the United States cannot commit itself to the defense of Europe (and urge us to close up for a ten-year garrison-state siege) demand that MacArthur be permitted to open an unlimited offensive in the Far East, to embroil the U. S. indefinitely with a Stalinist Asia.

(It is interesting to note that MacArthur, who was, among other things, UN Commander, was fired by Truman first, and the UN was only notified of the action later. Although formally the UN has given the American government the prerogative of appointing its commander in Korea, the manner of his replacement re-emphasizes the extent to which the United States dominates that body. This is true even though it is evident that most of the allies are highly gratified at Truman's action.)

DRUNK WITH POWER

These actions, all occurring within one week in American history, are not simply the result of "stupidity" nor are they simply a "hangover from isolationism." They represent something much deeper. This is the behaviour of a group of leaders who have become so intoxicated with the sheer industrial power of the United States that they dream they can win with the atom bomb and military strength alone, and need not concern themselves with winning the hearts and minds of the masses of the world. Indeed, the idea of attempting to activate these masses, even in an anti-Stalinist direction, frightens them more than it reassures them.

Even though the United States runs the UN, they are impatient with it. They have confidence only when they have the "big stick" in their hands, and they want to wield it rather than to win through the more subtle pressures of diplomacy.

They represent, in themselves, a considerable political force in America. And they know of no other language but that of their own military might. The "liberal wing" in Congress does not have a radically different program, but they have a greater cognizance of the potential power of the masses of the world's people. They speak glibly of winning them to "our side," but, in the long run, they too will rely for victory upon howitzers and jets. For they too cannot speak the language of a human race which is seeking to talk for itself. They are the "enlightened wing" of the party which seeks to build the "American Century."

Get your L.A. every week! Subscribe at \$2 a year!

Ideology and Organization of the New Independent Labor Party

(The first part of this article, which appeared in LABOR ACTION last week, discussed the changing situation in Western Germany which, in the opinion of the author, has led to a revival of the economic and political class struggle of the German proletariat. The relationship of the Stalinist and Social Democratic parties to the workers in this new stage of development was discussed, as well as that of the small independent Marxist groupings. The article ended with a description of the initial efforts to build an independent labor party, sparked by a group of people expelled from the Communist Party and organized around the paper Freie Tribüne.

This is a translation of an article published in the February issue of Pro und Contra.—Ed.)

By S. BERNHARD

More than six months have passed since the Political Committee was created which is to undertake the founding of an independent labor party. Once the accomplishments and perspectives of this Political Committee have been stated, it is necessary for us to take a critical look at its activities. As things stand now, it is certain that the development of the movement, the regroupment of the independent Marxist left in Western Germany on a broad basis, depends to a considerable degree on the behavior of this committee.

It would be a mistake, therefore, to permit the movement to crystallize too soon, and not to make every necessary effort within the bounds of principle, to ease the coming together of other groups of the "homeless left" with those now gathered around the Freie Tribüne. We get the impression that the Düsseldorff comrades (the Freie Tribüne is published in Düsseldorff, and its headquarters is located there.—Ed.) are making this kind of a mistake when they assure us in the introduction to the first discussion edition (No. 7) that "today it is impossible to be a Marxist without being a Leninist."

Organization of the Discussion

The Preparatory Commission, a provisional body par excellence, shows a similarly regrettable attitude to the extent that it assumes a firm stand when it declares that this or that position stated in the Freie Tribüne is either its own or not its own (No. 20). At the moment the Preparatory Commission represents only itself, and not the organization on questions of principle. On the same grounds it would have been preferable if the eleven points of the limited program had been laid down by a democratically elected conference rather than appearing in the name of a Political Committee. This is especially so because the Political Committee issues from the Freie Tribüne, and has never been elected.

Draper, on Tour, Poses Dilemma Of Liberals in St. Louis Talk

ST. LOUIS, April 3—On Sunday, April 1st Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, spoke before some forty members and friends of the St. Louis Politics Club on the Liberal's Dilemma. In his discussion Draper very effectively demonstrated to the audience, composed almost entirely of left wing liberals, that American foreign policy will be contradictory to the liberal's point of view so long as it represents the foreign policy of the only remaining vigorous capitalist class in the world.

He showed that American foreign policy must support the most reactionary elements in the various "hot spots" throughout the world because to support truly revolutionary movements of the people in these areas would mean

The author of these lines is himself a supporter of Lenin's views—except for the Leninist conception of the role of the party—yet he is against such a position. He is particularly opposed to this thesis because of the circumstance in which it appears as an introduction to the discussion of principles. It cannot but have the effect of scaring away a large number of Marxist revolutionists. At the same time, this indicates a dangerous restriction of the discussion, which necessarily should take place on a broad basis, particularly at its beginning. (We would also like to take this opportunity to remark that at least up to this point the discussion on the USSR seems absolutely insufficient.)

As contrasted to the above, the assurance which appeared in No. 4, which states that our great teachers must be Marx, Engels, Lenin, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, is quite correct. One could also add Trotsky to this group. In any event, a Luxemburgist or some other non-Leninist comrade of the left wing of the Social Democratic Party should also be able to find his place in the new movement.

detailed reports in the Freie Tribüne are impossible, it appears that an internal information bulletin for the local preparatory committees is absolutely essential.

The significance of mentioning these questions here is this: they pose the problem of the relationship between the leadership and the mass of the members of the future party. This is a cardinal question for which there is no final solution and no finished formula.

Suffice it to say here that all large workers' parties have heretofore failed in the solution of this problem in the sense that in every case the leadership has made itself independent from the mass, and as a result has become

Relationship of the Party to the Masses

The problem of inner democracy, and of a living flow of ideas and experiences from below to the top, and from the top down again, can only be solved with that kind of a spirit. One will never be able to take too much pains in this sense, and all those who recognize to what extent this problem is significant for workers who are seeking the road to activity will agree with this attitude. "Who will guarantee to us that you won't become bureaucratic too?" That is the question one meets at every step among the workers.

In the final analysis the problem of the organizational relationships inside the party will also become the problem of the relationship of the party to the mass of the workers. A workers' party without a living inner democracy will sooner or later separate itself from the masses. Little by little it will become differentiated from the mass if not even alien to it, and therein lies the danger of becoming either a sect, or a machine for the "subordination of the workers to the state."

Once the principle has been accepted that the future labor party must be Marxist, revolutionary and independent of the two power complexes (Washington and Moscow.—Ed.) it appears to us that the problem of inner democracy and of the relationship between the party and the mass of the workers is the most important question. The road of giving an appearance of effectiveness which was traveled by the old worker's parties, and especially by the

bureaucratic. It appears to us that the only guarantee lies in a political life for the lower layers, and in the democratic rectitude of the politically educated comrades.

The right of the minority to express its opinions must be in the statutes. But this too is only the formal framework which becomes absolutely worthless if the most experienced comrades are not constantly concerned with its practical application. And not only minorities must be able to defend their positions. It is also extremely important that comrades who are not yet politically educated, who are in a certain sense unorganized, are also given a chance to express themselves in their own way, and are helped intellectually.

Stalinist party, must be avoided at any cost.

Germany and Austria are, except for the satellites, the only countries in Europe in which the working class has had the living experience of Stalinism and in which it is possible at present to create an independent Marxist party. The comrades of the Preparatory Commission in Düsseldorff have the chance to play a role of the first importance in realizing this task. The German working class movement has the possibility of becoming what it once was: the vanguard of the labor movement of all Europe.

The Düsseldorff comrades have a rich past both in practical experience and in theory. Nevertheless it is difficult to lift one's self sufficiently above one's own past—especially when this past is not yet far behind one—in such a way that it will influence the present only in the right direction. For the Düsseldorff comrades, and for all the comrades of the Preparatory Committees of the new party, we express the hope that they will never fail to realize their promises in their actions. We also wish for them that at every moment they will be able to assume a critical attitude toward their own actions! that they will be able to look at their task through the eyes of a worker whose hopes have been repeatedly disillusioned during the past twenty years, who has thus acquired an extremely critical attitude, but who has nevertheless not lost confidence in the destiny of his class.

Celebrate

MAY DAY

with the

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

MAY DAY DINNER

247 Lexington Ave. Saturday, May 5
New York City 7:00 P.M.

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name

Address

City Zone

State Tel.

CONVENTION OF THE UNITED

Delegates For a Fighting Program, But Allow Swing to Machine Control

(Continued from page 1)

fully under the unchallenged control of an officialdom at every point, and in this respect marks a new stage in the development of the UAW. The UAW remains a militant fighting union; at the same time, it moves toward machine control as power weakens at the base and grows at the top. What makes it possible for this trend to develop so strongly is this: the delegates, who represent the active cadres of the union, support Reuther's program as a program of stubborn defense of the labor movement; they permit control to slip out of their hands into the hands of a leadership in which they have complete confidence. This applies particularly to its main spokesman: Walter Reuther.

On Political Action — Militancy

In the political action discussion, the swing toward militancy was most clear and most dramatic. At the previous convention, it was roses for Roosevelt. Showered with flowers, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., entered the hall in 1949 in the midst of a wild demonstration. No one dared to criticize the Democratic Fair Dealers; the delegates impatiently brushed aside any unfavorable references to Truman. All that has changed.

Helen Gahagan Douglas, who addressed this convention, was duly applauded and received the customary honorary membership in the UAW. But it was open season on Truman and his administration. Reuther's oblique criticisms were understood and appreciated. Mazy's blunt attacks were cheered. When he repeated his denunciation of Truman first made at the Washington conference of the United Labor Policy Committee, the delegates voted to print copies of his speech and send them all over the country.

The Resolutions Committee split 6-3 on political action. Bert Foster of Cleveland local 45, James Schuetz of Buffalo local 501, and Robert Winters, the committee minority, insisted upon a resolution calling for a labor party. This was the only minority report of any committee at any session. [Resolution printed elsewhere in this issue]

The majority resolution took the 1948 position of the UAW International Executive Board out of moth balls. In ambiguous and non-committal phrases, it called for a "new political realignment" but not for a new political party and resolved "that the International officers, through the National CIO, request the United Labor Policy Committee to call a representative conference of labor in the spring of 1952, prior to the convening of both old party conventions. The purpose of such a conference would be to analyze the over-all economic and political situation that then confronts the American people and to determine the political course that should be taken in the 1952 campaign."

The minority resolution, first of its kind to hit the floor of any UAW convention, clearly and unambiguously called upon the ULPC "to take steps for the speedy formation of an independent Labor party in preparation in the 1952 campaign."

After permitting hours and hours to dribble away on assorted trivial matters, the organizers of the convention squeezed the debate on political action into a special night session of the fifth day, a session that was scheduled to end at 10 P.M. The political reports finally reached the floor at 9:30! By the time the resolutions were read in full and brief reports made for each, it was 9:55 and the delegates, weary and restless with five long days of speeches and reports behind them, were impatient. Nevertheless, so great was the interest that they voted down a motion to close discussion and extended the time to permit three speakers for each side.

Ken Morris, president of Briggs local 212, reported for the majority. He comes from Mazy's home local. Under their leadership, local 212 had always supported resolutions for a labor party. But times, Morris and Mazy have changed. He spoke his piece, unenthusiastically and uninspired. When he concluded, the hall was silent.

A simple reading of the minority resolution stirred the tired delegates to applause. Foster, for the minority, spoke of "the rape of the American people by the Democratic and Republican parties." "I learned all I know about politics in the UAW," he said. "I've listened to Reuther and Mazy and always thought they were for a labor party. Anyone who thinks that Truman and the Democratic party will carry out our kind of program is kidding himself." Unlike Morris, he was greeted with vigorous applause. So it went in the discussion. Three weak, apologetic, stumbling speeches for the majority. One of them concluded: "But I'd like to see a big vote for the minority. In fact, I'd like to see both adopted!" A Chicago delegate, speaking for the minority, brought down the house. "We won a great victory in 1948. We elected Harry Truman. A few more victories like that, and God help the UAW."

After this short but fair and square discussion, the

A basic pamphlet—
"SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"
 by Max Shachtman
 Read it! 10 cents
 Labor Action Book Service
 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

supporters of the majority were subdued; those for the minority, enthusiastic. The delegates seemed to be balanced evenly between the two. It is even possible that the minority might have carried; but Reuther was compelled to enter the discussion in order to guarantee the victory of the majority. As chairman, he feels free to take the floor at any time, before, during, or after debate is closed. It is significant that his intervention was necessary. He welcomed "the sentiments of the minority" but "supports the good judgement of the majority." The differences, he said, "are not on principles but on strategy; we're all out for the same objective." The minority "would isolate the UAW from the rest of the labor movement," he argued. "The UAW is the vanguard of the labor movement" but we must not cut ourselves off from it by poorly timed moves. "We must think with our heads, not with our hearts."

After Reuther's speech, the majority resolution was adopted but the minority still received perhaps 15-20 per cent of the votes. And the sentiments of almost everyone were clear. Not one speaker tried to defend the Democratic Fair Dealers. No one denied the necessity of forming a new party. The debate apparently narrowed down to a dispute over how, where, and when to establish it. And so, we will wait patiently and see what happens in 1952. Will Reuther press inside the labor movement for his own policy on political action? Will he carry out his own resolution? If he does it, resolutely and insistently, the UAW will have moved forward. CIO conventions have come and gone. Reuther has been satisfied to let well enough alone. Perhaps, next time. . . .

The delegates were for a more vigorous political policy; they were for fighting program of strike struggles if it was necessary to mobilize the full power of the union to protect their contracts. Next week *Labor Action* will report the details.

Not a Caucus, But a Machine

At all UAW conventions in the past, the formal sessions were supplemented by rival caucus meetings. A vigor and life was injected into the official meetings, by frank and tempestuous debates at unofficial evening rallies. Democracy reigned in halls and caucus rooms. But by now, the caucuses are almost completely disintegrated. The organized opposition has fallen to pieces, split into a few tiny squabbling fragments, unable to agree on a token slate for officers. Two Reuther "caucus" meetings were held at this convention. But these were only ornamental rallies where the leadership came, not to discuss its program, but to beat the drums for it. The Reuther "steering committee" was a decorative body handpicked by the regional directors to rubber stamp decisions already taken by them. The old pro-Reuther caucus is now shunted aside by the pro-administration machine. The top officialdom has grown in strength and tends toward apparatus control.

This apparatus is knit together out of the 350-500 staff officials, appointed by the top leadership and responsible to it. It is not elected by and cannot be removed by vote of the rank and file. It is obligated exclusively to the top officers. The men who make it up have no independence of action or speech. They may be and are removed whenever their actions offend their bosses. Convention sessions are now supplemented, not by democratic caucuses, but by this bureaucratic machine. There is nothing novel in this institution which exists in unions which have been highly bureaucratized for years. What is new, is its appearance in the UAW as a decisive factor in its internal life.

The administration came to Cleveland with a three point organizational platform: 1. Conventions every two years; 2. Local union elections every two years; 3. An increase in dues from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per month. At the last convention, the same proposals met such a hostile reaction from the delegates that Reuther was forced to publicly withdraw them. This year, the bi-annual conventions were voted with little opposition. Annual local elections were retained, over the recommendation of the Constitutional Committee after Reuther, in a magnanimous mood, suggested that the delegates might vote as they saw fit.

It was the fight on the dues question that brought to the surface every disturbing tendency. Reuther was determined to win, come what may. Here for the first time, the machine was mobilized in action on a grand scale. He faced serious opposition among his own supporters and decided to act with near-ruthlessness in an atmosphere that became increasingly tense.

The merits of the dues increase is not the decisive consideration in understanding what took place. It was on this issue that the administration made its stand; it might have been any other. Of paramount significance are the new methods introduced into the UAW.

At a pre-convention rally of his supporters, Reuther pointed to the economic gains won by the membership since 1946 when dues were set at \$1.50. He outlined the tasks ahead and summarized the financial status of the union and demonstrated the need to build a fighting and organizing fund in preparation for struggles ahead. Two days later, at the convention itself, Mazy forcefully argued the same convincing case. 90 per cent of the delegates were undoubtedly swayed by the arguments.

But delegates from big locals in key centers like Detroit and Flint, most of them Reuther supporters, had come to the convention pledged to vote against an increase and were elected on this pledge. They felt that their members back in the shops remained unconvinced. They knew that the international leadership had done nothing to explain the issues to the ranks. Many of them, therefore, wanted to settle the question by a membership referendum at local meetings after a period of discussion.

Knuckle Under — Or Else!

But Reuther would have no compromise. He went to work on his critics, selecting a few well-known anti-administration leaders, like Paul Silver and Kenneth Forbes, as whipping boys. He exoriated them as anti-union saboteurs and disruptionists for opposing the increase. "We have democracy in our union. Anyone can run against me for president and nothing will happen to him," and then added ominously, "but that doesn't mean we will tolerate union wrecking." Carl Stellato, president of the powerful Ford local 600, came to Reuther's caucus as a supporter of the administration. He tried to explain that he, himself was for the increase. But he had to vote against the convention setting the new dues because his own membership had voted 23,000 to 9,000 against it. He asked for a membership referendum. But he was booted down as Reuther heaped the same abuse upon him as on the others. All hesitant Reutherites knew what to expect if they persisted in active opposition on this issue.

The question was settled long before it hit the convention floor on the second day. The machine of International Representatives had cogent reasons for swinging into action; they had been told that their own salary increases hinged on the convention action. They fought with all the bitterness of men fighting for their own livelihood. They pleaded with the delegates in hotel rooms; they threatened reprisals against stubborn resisters; they promised efficient service to locals that went along. They were being squeezed from above and had to press hard on those below. One International Representative in a fit of drunken honesty shouted to a group of recalcitrant delegates from his region. "I have to knuckle down to the top brass and by God you'll have to knuckle down to me."

Above all they demanded one thing: "Don't vote for a roll call." In a hand vote every delegate gets one vote. In a roll call, each vote is weighted. Delegates from big locals carry more votes than those from smaller locals. A roll call therefore threatened the defeat of the increase. Besides, a roll call put every delegate on record. A hand count would permit delegates to vote for the increase and tell their memberships that they had stood firm against it. This was the blunt suggestion of the International representatives. After the delegations were whipped into line behind the scenes, the convention could proceed with all the forms of democracy. Only 450 delegates rose for a roll call; but 700 were required.

The UAW now claims 1,250,000 members. Of these, perhaps one-fourth to one-third are new members or enrolled in newly organized locals. Events passed over their heads. Reuther's eloquence and a simple hint from their international representatives were probably enough to convince the delegates from such areas. But the delegates from many big established locals, experienced in union politics, aware of the UAW's internal history, and sensitive to the feelings of their rank and file left this convention resentful and disillusioned. They heard Reuther's ringing phrases and listened in sullen silence. "Act like men of principle," Reuther told the convention. "Do what you think is right, and then explain it to the membership. Be leaders. Don't play petty politics with this issue." It was very impressive to the newcomer.

But the oldtimers know what goes on behind the scenes. They know about unprincipled maneuvering among the top officials. They know that Reuther himself was never averse to jockeying with principle and engaging in organizational deals. They know how large a role this played in Reuther's own rise to power. They remained impressed because they felt that deception was practiced and hypocrisy tolerated.

The international officers didn't bother to prepare the rank and file for the dues increase. Perhaps they have discovered that it will be necessary to sell it to the membership now that it has been adopted. It is certain that they could have won in ordinary democratic discussion. But they wanted to be sure and they had to show who was boss.

(To be continued)

The Handy Way to Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

LABOR ACTION
 114 West 14 Street
 New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:

- NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
 (please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

- Bill me Payment enclosed

AUTOMOBILE WORKERS—CIO

Highlights and Sidelights of the Convention

By WALTER JASON

CLEVELAND, April 7—Neither the press reports nor the convention proceedings are enough to give the full flavor of the 13th convention of the United Automobile Workers Union (CIO).

The tone and atmosphere of this convention was set by the top leaders at the Saturday night Reuther caucus meeting. It came as quite a shock to some delegates, who thought Labor Action had been too critical in its estimate in the pre-convention story. Walter Reuther and Emil Mazy made hard-hitting speeches for a dues increase at the caucus meeting. When Carl Stellato, president of local 600, took the floor to present his argument for a rank and file referendum, the boos and jeers were vociferous. "Throw him out; kick him out; what's he doing here!" The ferocity of the attack almost stopped Stellato, who kept pleading he was a right-winger and belonged in the Reuther caucus.

Detroit's large delegations got the point of the sharp polemics against Stellato. In no time, they switched in favor of a dues increase although elected on an opposite platform. Briggs 212 delegation led the rest.

The Reuther leadership cleverly put on the Korea resolution before the dues increase report. This served to expose some of the opponents of the dues increase as "Communist," and increased the difficulties of the Detroit delegations.

The shocking part of the foreign policy debate was not that this resolution was 100 per cent state department, without any of the familiar Reuther trimmings, but that a flag-waving speech, worthy of an American Legion convention, received a spontaneous ovation, and cheers when the speaker suggested, "Let's drop the apple right on Moscow!" referring to the atom bomb. His remark that Chinese breed like rats was not challenged, nor was his war-mongering speech rebuked by Reuther, who used to be sensitive on those points. It took a left-winger to make a suggestion that the remark about the Chinese be stricken from the record.

After 24 hours of hotel room meetings, delegation conferences, etc. it was clear to everybody that Reuther would get the dues increase easily with a hand vote, and not quite so handily on a roll call vote. Knowing this, the Reuther leadership used the issue to pound away at the small and ineffectual anti-Reuther caucus headed by Kenneth Forbes and Paul Silver. But most important of all, to give Stellato a work out; as a lesson to any other pro-Reuther local union leader who might step out of line.

All through the convention, it was mainly from the Michigan areas that any significant opposition to the leadership's proposals occurred. For the hundreds of new delegates, from all over the country, Detroit and Michigan was made to appear as the only place left in the UAW where "cheap politicians play politics." Reuther's strictures on this score were very popular among the new comers. Among the old hands, cynicism was a dominating mood. Purely by accident, to be sure, the Michigan delegates

were on the far end of the convention hall, where they couldn't mix easily with the many other delegations.

The language of the Reuther leaders was different than in other years. Stellato was an "enemy of the union," and anyone agreeing with him was "sabotaging the union."

The trick, of course, was for the union leadership to identify itself and its program as the "union." Anyone against the Reuther leadership thus was easily placed in the anti-union category. And the surer the leadership became of its control of the convention, the harder the tone, the firmer the grip.

One international union representative made the "mistake" of agreeing to run for regional director on a pro-Reuther slate. He was forced to withdraw, and was fired temporarily. The lesson to other international representatives is clear: Don't play around anymore. They now understand they are merely to serve as part of the machine.

At the last convention, the debate over the proposed expulsion of Tracy Doll and Sam Sage was argued seriously and intently. They were expelled but by a slim margin. (Incidentally, they were reinstated later by court action which ruled the action of the convention was unconstitutional.)

The charges against Doll and Sage were grave. At this convention, the grievances of Coburn Walker and his associates against the international union were large, and vice versa. The Flint publication, the *Search Light*, had some very lousy anti-union shop material. But certainly, nothing they did compared to the charges against Doll and Sage. Yet the terrific "work-out" that Reuther, Mazy and Livingston gave Walker was disturbing. Mazy was brutal. "Sit down and shut up before we sit you down," his tough voice, commanded over the microphone.

Here was the voice of a leadership that felt itself firmly entrenched in power. Here was another warning to anyone who gets out of line!

Behind the scenes, pressure, threats, red-baiting, a scurriously leaflet; all the techniques of a hardened bureaucracy. On the convention floor, Reuther speaking in reply to almost every speaker from the floor, like Phil Murray does at a steel workers' convention. Speakers carefully chosen, and as a rule, the unpopular opponents seemed to get the floor the easiest!

At the 1949 convention, the delegates cheered Walter, Victor and Roy Reuther as three militants who did much in the early days to build the union. This time, Vic Reuther was in Europe. Not even a message of greetings came from him. Why? Did he get fed up with the set-up? Roy Reuther was an unobtrusive figure very much in the background. The speeches and the slurred-over history of the union gave many new delegates the impression that Walter Reuther built the union single-handed and against the sin of factionalism. Second in command was Emil Mazy, "whose role is not yet appreciated for

UAW Minority Resolution: For a Labor Party

(Below we print in full the text of the resolution on political action presented by a minority of the Resolutions Committee at the UAW convention.—Ed.)

WHEREAS: The American people now face a serious and unparalleled crisis which threatens to rob them of rights and standards won in years of bitter struggle and sacrifice.

Recent events demonstrate that an historic turning point in the political life of the nation imperatively requires the speedy formation of a new political party, a party which represents all working people, in factories, on farms, in offices, a party which opposes reaction in every and all forms whether it threatens from the economic monopoly of Wall Street and big business, the dictatorship of Nazism and Fascism, or the totalitarianism of Soviet Russia and its Communist parties in this and every other country. What labor gains in collective bargaining it can lose for lack of effective political action; what labor has won on the picket line is now endangered by the government in Washington. Skyrocketing inflation and an unjust wage freeze jeopardizes our living standards; compulsory labor threatens to replace the labor of free men by a form of forced labor; the Taft-Hartley Law, with its notorious injunction provisions, especially dangerous in these times of mobilization, undermines the existence of our free trade unions.

For many years, an anti-peoples coalition of Dixiegrats and reactionary Republicans has carried on an unrelenting fight against labor. This bloc remains what it has always been: a vicious enemy of all progress, a disgrace to American politics. Now labor faces another adversary. It is compelled to beat off a head-on attack from the Truman administration, which joins the anti-labor forces. It is this fact, recognized by virtually every union in the country, which poses new and unprecedented tasks for organized labor.

In 1948, labor helped to elect the Truman administration together with a whole group of congressmen be-

cause they promised to fight for a liberal program, for what was called a "Fair Deal" But, with few exceptions, they have openly and unashamedly betrayed their promises to the people.

Instead, the Administration has turned over control of all mobilization machinery to the representatives of big business and Wall Street. It promulgates a tax program which makes equality of sacrifice a mockery; makes the rich richer; and the poor poorer. It adopts a fraudulent price program of inflation and an unfair wage freeze program of deflating the real income of workers. It abandons all pretext of fighting for rent control and a decent housing program. It gives up any effort for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. It makes only feeble gestures for civil rights while discrimination throughout the land, especially in the armed forces, continues.

When labor registered its protests against this reactionary trend of government policy and resigned first from the Wage Board and then from all defense boards, it was viciously attacked in the public daily press by the newspapers which voice the opinions of big business. At a time when we needed and still need the active aid of every true supporter of labor, it is a brute fact that virtually none of the old party politicians whom we helped to elect speak out in justification of our course and defend on the floor of Congress and in public debate our action in quitting the mobilization boards.

These so-called Fair Dealers have turned out to be fake dealers. Their fair deal has become a raw deal. Truman has ceased giving even lip-service to social legislation. The fight for a real Fair Deal now depends upon labor and upon the party it must and will create. The parties of big business, the Democratic and Republican Parties, exposed by the Kefauver Committee as hopelessly corrupt machines, must make way for the new first party of the common people, a democratic party of Liberals—Farmer and Labor.

With the exception of the miners, organized labor is now united for the first time in history in its United

his part in the early days," said one speaker. All that needs to be done now is a new history of the union!

Changing times: changed people. One of the richest experiences of any UAW convention was to watch the rank and file delegates, one way or another, show the leadership who was real boss of the union. In such demonstrations, the Briggs 212 delegation seldom took a back seat. It was always in the forefront of militancy and aggressive anti-bureaucracy moves. At this convention, the main speaker from the ranks against a labor party now, was Ken Morris, president of Briggs 212, and long time advocate of a labor party. At a press interview, Emil Mazy said his own private views were still for a labor party. At the convention he was silent.

As a matter of fact, the Briggs delegation was one of the few real bases the Reuther leadership had solidly on all questions among the large locals in Detroit. UAW leaders see this as a sign of maturity. It seems far more likely to be a sign of retrogression.

The tight grip Reuther exercised at the convention affected not only the critical Reutherites, the skeptical secondary leaders from Michigan, but also squeezed hard at the ACTU influenced delegates, who felt the pressure from the top as well as the next man.

A new note in the UAW: Coburn Walker says Reuther told him he'd castigate the Flint delegation on the convention floor unless they agree to support Reuther's candidate for regional director. The fury on the stage over Walker's charge was something to see. Mazy, in reply to a point of information from another delegate, said the accusation was a damned lie. But Reuther did not reply to it. On more than one occasion the delegates were put in the position of deciding things on a personal basis: Who was lying? This acid posing of the question in the discussions helped explain some of the vindictive and vehement attitudes displayed at the convention on both sides. It was not very pleasant to watch.

For the UAW militants a very difficult period is ahead. How to adjust their thinking and actions to a union in which the forms of democracy are still observable, but in which the content has largely been vitiated.

The mass-base of the Reuther leadership is not so much its one-time appeal to the militant traditions of the UAW, as it is the hundreds of new and inexperienced union leaders who know of the past only what they see through the distorted vision of a power-conscious leadership, and a reading public loaded with prejudice against "radicals" and the whole decade of the early CIO days.

Outside of a little gesture now and then to "honest differences of opinion," to be defined, of course, by the leadership as its prerogative, Walter Reuther concentrated intensely on the organizational problems of the day. Here was a man who seemed to solve his doubts and contradictions by a compelling drive to power. He was impatient and scornful of all critics and criticism. His colleagues, except Mazy, were reduced strictly to the background instead of a Reuther caucus, he was intent on building a Reuther machine, built in his own image, and without any real dependence on secondary leaders, or the rank and file democracy that was the heart of the UAW.

Labor Policy Committee (ULPC). It is already on the right track. By getting off the boards, it repudiated responsibility for Truman's program and refused to serve as window dressing for it. It was this step that at least slowed down the trend toward reaction. Labor now need only complete the job by declaring its independence from Truman's Democratic Party and refusing to serve as window dressing for it. Such a step taken at this critical juncture will effectively rally all the American people and strike fear into all the anti-labor elements.

Faced by a crisis similar to what we face today, the British Trade Union movement founded its Labor party. And today this party has won the support of the people of Britain, rules the destiny of that nation and rebuilds the devastated country under the real control of the working people.

In Canada, the common people already have their own political party, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), a party which carries on the fight in their interests.

United States Labor must now take its place with them. Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: I. That this convention calls upon the United Labor Policy Committee (ULPC) to convene a representative congress of labor to take steps for the speedy formation of an independent Labor Party in preparation for the 1952 elections. Toward the end of forming such a party, which fights the reaction of Wall Street as well as of the Kremlin, we propose that labor approach other groups representing the plain people of America.

II. That the UAW-CIO intensify and expand its political action program setting up independent political machinery in every Congressional District where it has membership, carrying on political education and action not only before election day but 365 days a year.

Submitted by:

- Bert Foster
 James Schuetz
 Robert Winters

The SWP and the Demonstrations Against Franco

Another Experience—And Its Lessons

By ALBERT GATES

The politics of the Socialist Workers Party, the self-styled "orthodox Trotskyists," has for years been a rather weird phenomenon. Its response to political problems of the day shift from a hard-shell jungle radicalism to a type of anti-Stalinism which often borders on semi-Stalinism. The reason for the latter is that the SWP regards Stalinism as an integral and legitimate part of the working class movement. It compounds a self-defeating confusion on the question of Stalinism with practical stupidities that defy ordinary intelligence.

A case in point is the recently held New York united picket line before the Spanish Consulate. A brief recapitulation of the event is necessary before dealing with the role of the SWP in this small-scale but excellent demonstration of solidarity with the Barcelona strikers.

ISL TOOK INITIATIVE

In response to the call of the POUM and *La Batalla*, the Independent Socialist League took the initiative in bringing into motion some kind of public defense of the Spanish workers, as well as a public protest against the reprisals of the Spanish fascist regime. The Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers Party were contacted simultaneously and asked to join the ISL in a common call for such a protest. The SWP, surprisingly enough (considering past experiences), agreed to the proposal, while the Socialist Party rejected it on the ground that the SWP was participating.

Under the circumstances, the ISL and SWP went ahead with plans for the picket line and called a larger conference of other organizations to join with them. Knowing full well the position of the SWP, the ISL hesitantly agreed to narrow the issue of the picket line to the Barcelona events and the Franco totalitarian regime, proposing only a general slogan against totalitarianism.

The mistake consisted in adopting the premise that such an issue could be confined when as a matter of fact, the issue of totalitarianism, of dictatorship, is a universal issue. The struggle against one form of totalitarianism cannot be carried effectively without a general struggle against all its manifestations. Given the present world situation, clarity on the issue of Stalinism, masquerading as a working class movement, is of the highest importance. Any genuine progressive, democratic and socialist struggle, no matter what its proportions, must clarify itself instantaneously on Stalinism before it can hope to make any serious progress. This lesson has been brought out repeatedly in recent history.

AGAINST STALINISM!

In the enlarged conference called by the ISL and SWP, the question of Stalinism was raised by a representative of the Libertarian Socialist League. He asked that the picket line carry some slogans which would distinguish it in the minds of the public from a Stalinist action and Stalinist organizations and proposed that such a slogan might be: "Against Totalitarianism on Both Sides of the Iron Curtain." His organization, he advised, could not go along with the action unless some such distinction was made. He was not alone. The representative of the Spanish International Anti-Fascist Solidarity declared that he could not understand why the conference should not speak out openly and frankly on the question of Stalinism because of its special bearing on the Spanish question.

The reader must bear in mind that at this point, the conference had already adopted over a dozen anti-Franco, anti-Fascist slogans, as well as a considerable number

dealing with the role of the United States in supporting and saving the rotten Falangist regime in Spain. These slogans called for an end of financial aid to Spain, the breaking off of relations with Franco, and no arms to his regime. There was no mistaking what the character of the picket line would be with so many slogans dealing with the issue itself. What these people wanted was some kind of distinguishing mark from Stalinism.

SWP SAYS NO!

The SWP at first rejected the above proposition. Its representative stated quite correctly that a united front has to be based upon some agreement and that the SWP had agreed to sponsor the conference on the basis of limiting the issue to Spain and America's role in relation to it. He cautioned the conference against other action since such action would make it impossible for his organization to go along with it, for its views on Stalinism were quite different from those present.

Instead of accepting that, the ISL sought to compromise the issue, and it did this by proposing the adoption of the slogan: Down with Totalitarianism Everywhere! The ISL pointed out that while it was true that sharp differences did exist on the nature and role of Stalinism, it did not understand how the SWP, given its public pronouncements on the subject could possibly object to any slogan relating to the totalitarian nature of Stalinism and its dictator Stalin. The SWP often uses precisely these terms in its own press. It was after a discussion of this nature that its representative finally agreed to the broad anti-totalitarian slogan proposed by the ISL.

In the course of the week, when the signs were being prepared for the picket line, the sign-maker proposed to draw caricatures of Franco and Stalin on the placard carrying the above slogan, to illustrate the slogan itself. Mindful of the untenable position of the SWP, its representative was telephoned and advised of the proposal. He rejected it out of hand! Why? For what intelligent, practical reason? See if we can figure it out.

The SWP replied that it would consider such caricatures if President Truman were added to the list! Why Truman? Is he the personification of a totalitarian regime in the United States? No, but the demonstration is held for two purposes: anti-Franco and U. S. administration policy toward Spain. But, you reply, there will be forty signs dealing with

that. Well, comes the answer, we have many disagreements on the question of Stalinism. But how do such disagreements prevent you from putting a caricature of Stalin as a totalitarian on an essentially democratic slogan which distinguishes you from Stalinism? Well... they can't go along with such a proposal.

A MISTAKE WAS MADE

And so the picket line, excellent though it was, did not clearly and unmistakably distinguish itself in a dramatic and forceful way from Stalinism, "the syphilis

of the labor movement." And only because a prior agreement with the Cannonites was adhered to. A mistake was made—not a decisive one, nor of epoch-making proportions, but a mistake nevertheless.

In Chicago, where a like attempt was made to organize the same kind of a picket line, the SWP refused to go along with the conference because the Stalinists and their organizations were not invited! There is nothing fatal in the absence of the SWP. The Chicago Conference went ahead with a picket line that stood out

for its clarity on the important issue of Stalinism. To repeat, any democratic, anti-fascist struggle, whatever the issue, that does not cut itself loose from Stalinism and semi-Stalinism, cannot clearly, forcefully and effectively wage the struggle for democracy.

In dealing with the fumbling SWP on this great question of our time, one has the feeling that he is dealing with a politically punch-drunk fighter who cannot find his own seat between rounds, but always finds himself sitting down in the Stalinist opponent's lap.

REACTIONS TO THE NEW YORK PICKET LINE

Worker: "That Franco's No — — Good!"

Bourgeois: "Turn a Hose on Them!"

By RICHARD TROY

The demonstration in front of the Spanish Consulate on 53rd Street caught many stray eyes, and caused considerable chatter. "What do you think we can do with these undesirables?" asked one well-dressed woman; obviously distressed with the scene of 125 demonstrators marching on the other side of the street. The man to whom she spoke, who was busy operating a movie camera, replied: "I ain't got time to think, lady... got to keep this machine going... an interesting crowd... huh?"

"I don't think they're interesting," she retorted, and walked away, in disgust. For others, of course, it was a spectacle. "Everyone wants to act," a man said to the woman operating the newsstand, "and today this gang gets its chance." "Yeah, they seem to be having a lot of fun," remarked the next man.

At that moment the demonstrators broke out with "Solidarity Forever," and the street was ringing with noise. "... the union makes us strong..."

"That's right," said the newsstand operator. "The union makes us strong." "Aw, what have unions ever done for us?" asked a small, wiry woman standing nearby. "These guys are a bunch of reds," said the next fellow. "Hear them talking about unions... that's red stuff."

The newsstand operator was persistent. "Communism's got nothing to do with this. Those people believe in unions and so do I. My husband has been in unions

since he was seventeen. We stand by them."

I moved on, somewhat encouraged, only to be confronted with an extremely distinguished looking gentleman getting into his Buick. He stood there, watching intently, for several minutes. A hefty, but small, man walked up and said, "why in hell don't the cops turn a hose on them?"

"The sooner the better," the other gentleman replied, and he got into his car and drove away.

I tried to persuade the janitor of the building across from the consulate, whose eyes were pinned to the demonstration for the entire hour, that the slogan "Down with Totalitarianism Everywhere," meant that the marchers were against Stalin as well as Franco. "Oh, no, you don't know these reds," he said, "they'll use any damn slogan just to throw you off the track." "Sure," said another man who was eavesdropping, "... you can be sure when a guy's yelling against Franco he's a red. Franco's the only one over there that got rid of the reds, you know. Besides," he added, "do you see a single Spaniard over there in that parade?" This stumped me, and I left.

"Down with butcher Franco... Down with butcher Franco," the chant was going. A taxi-driver emerged from his cab for a moment to get a look. "Fine... fine," he muttered audibly. "You approve?" I asked. "Sure... one thing I know... that Franco's no — — good."

He laughed. "Ho, ho... the

Catholic worker is in there. What is the Pope gonna say to that! He seemed highly satisfied with the demonstration, gave it one last look, and drove away.

I returned to the newsstand, which was, after all, my ideological home, on the other side of the street. The proprietor was still in her pro-union frame of mind. The demonstrators were shouting "Up with Freedom, Down with Franco," moving the placards rhythmically with the chant, a very infectious moment. Her hands were moving in time with it, as if she were holding a little placard herself.

Two Spaniards walked briskly by, toward Park Avenue, chatting in Spanish. They stopped, and looked, almost incredulously, at the scene. I approached and asked them if they were connected with the consulate. "No, but this is an outrage," one of them said in crisp tones. With no further words, they continued to walk to Park Avenue.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and E. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House

Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

Picket Line Story — —

CHICAGO

(Continued from page 1)

were driven to engage in a General Strike in a country where not only strikes but any type of protest or expression of opinion is punishable by long imprisonment. Yet they walked out to a man in protest against the oppression and corruption of the dictatorship that had reduced them to a state of permanent semi-starvation.

"Part of this desperation resulted from their knowledge of the steps being taken by the U. S. to help dictator Franco. They knew, because Franco's press crows about it every day, that Franco had received a big loan from the Export-Import Bank of the U. S. Government. They knew that our Government had helped push through the United Nations decision to resume 'normal' diplomatic relations with Madrid. And they knew that every day the United

States is pressing Franco and Great Britain to agree to the inclusion of Spain in the Atlantic Pact.

"These steps mean that Franco will be given enough arms and money to keep the Spanish people under his heel!"

At the first meeting of the united front committee the representatives of the Socialist Workers Party (Cannonites) refused to join in planning or participating in the demonstration when their own proposals were defeated. The SWP wanted to invite the Communist Party, its Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives to join the united front. After considerable discussion, all groups in the committee voted down the SWP proposals on the grounds that for good reasons the POUM's appeal for aid had not been directed to the Stalinists and that a consistent anti-totalitarian position would not admit

working with them. The Cannonites, who walked out of the united front committee meeting, objected also to any inclusion of picket signs critical of Stalinism, which would differentiate the demonstration specifically from the Stalinists.

NEW YORK CITY

(Continued from page 1)

Socialist Workers Party in an effort to form a united front committee which would call for the organization of such a picket line. The Socialist Workers Party accepted the invitation while the Socialist Party informed us they would not picket on the same line with the SWP. A joint call was sent out by the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Workers Party to a number of organizations. Those who responded held a planning meeting

which decided on all aspects of the demonstration.

Participating in Saturday's picket line were representatives of the following organizations: Independent Socialist League, Socialist Workers Party, Libertarian Socialist League, New York Student Federation Against War, Solidaridad Internacional Antifascista, Students' Union to Resist War (CCNY), Students Left Unity Group, Spartacus Club of NYU, the Internationalist Socialist Youth, the Socialist Youth League and The Catholic Worker.

The picket line was a successful, colorful demonstration. The participating organizations took their stand for liberty for the Spanish people and against the Franco regime. The American labor movement must take a like stand, and push for vigorous action. It is its voice, its aid for which the Spanish people are hopefully awaiting.