



MAY 6, 1946

Arithmetic and The Labor Party

A little simple arithmetic on the recent House of Representatives vote on the OPA amendments will demonstrate the fallacy of the course of the Political Action Committee in seeking to elect "friendly" capitalist politicians, usually Democrats.

The bill with its crippling amendments was passed 355 to 42. Out of the 355 votes for, 205 were Democrats and 148 Republicans. Of the 42 votes against, 33 were Republicans and 9 Democrats.

There aren't 205 Southern Democrats nor 148 "reactionary" Republicans. The line-up shows that a large coalition of both parties—the Republicans—combined on this measure. Therein lies the fallacy of the PAC technique. Democrats and Republicans are basically the same—political representatives of capitalism. Labor can expect no legislation really beneficial to it by supporting a "good" capitalist candidate against a "bad" one. The OPA legislation itself proved to have rubber ceilings and did not prevent the black market.

It is high time to break with capitalist politics—turn the PAC into a genuine Labor Party! Labor represents the majority of the population. With a progressive program and an independent political organization it can swing behind it the farmers and the middle classes. With a program that speaks for nationalization of industry under workers' control, and similar needs of the people, it can sweep the capitalist officeholders out and install a Workers' Government that really represents the majority of the population.

Roxas Wins Elections As Discontent Grows

By SAUL BERG

The long-awaited Philippines elections have taken place, and Brigadier General Manuel Acuna Roxas, darling of MacArthur, business crony of the leading Falangist sympathizers in Manila circles and hero of the collaborators, is the new President—the first President of the "independent" Philippine Republic to be proclaimed on July 4. His opponent in the Tweedledum-Tweedledee race was President Osmena, who, unlike Roxas,

was not a collaborator with the Japanese during the war. (After all, it's pretty hard to collaborate by remote control when you're sweating out the war in Washington.)

Both candidates have spent their entire political lives in the reactionary, corrupt Nationalista party, which has been the only major party in the country for the last forty years. This year the party split, Roxas brazenly calling his new party the Liberal Nationalists, while Osmena headed the Conservatives. Both candidates had the same social program, namely, no serious agrarian reforms to appease the impoverished peasant masses, but 100 per cent cooperation with the rich sugar planters by assuring continued preferential treatment by the United States for Philippine sugar after "independence." Likewise both candidates stood for an "independence" accompanied by permanent occupation of the country by American armed forces.

Under these conditions, the radical peasant movement, unfortunately influenced and led to a great extent by Stalinists, failed to put up its own candidate and endorsed Osmena on the ground that he was anti-collaborationist. It was the same Osmena who, with the help of the U. S. Counter-Intelligence Corps, forcibly disbanded the governments set up in the municipalities of Central Luzon by the revolutionary peasant army, the Hukbalahap, when it drove out the Japanese.

The peasant radicals (Hukbalahaps) face a bitter struggle in the coming period. With a disciplined army numbering many thousands, with a constant clamor for action from the hungry sharecroppers that they lead, they are going ahead with struggles against the rapacious absentee landowners. They are confronted with an open threat by the government to bring thousands of military police into Central Luzon to disarm the Hukbalahaps and to "restore order" (restoring order means collecting the landlords' half of the crop).

The legislative elections have blasted the falsehoods of the capitalist press in the Philippines, which claimed that only a minority of the peasants in the "disaffected" provinces were for the Huks. The Democratic Alliance, the new federated party made up of the Hukbalahap, Communist Party, National Peasants Union, Committee on Labor Organization and the Blue Eagle (Chinese) Guerrillas, swept Pampanga Province and the surrounding area, electing representatives to the Philippine Legislature from Nueva Ecija, Bulacan and Tarlac Provinces. Where the old pre-war "Socialist-Communist Party" never elected more than one or two representatives, and these exclusively from Pampanga, the Democratic Alliance, with seven representatives, is now undisputedly the largest party in Central Luzon.

The support the Democratic Alliance received was the support of peasants who knew the heroic record of the Huks in fighting the Japanese army and their native oppressors alike. These struggles can only be vitiated if the DA leaders nourish illusions among their followers as to the nature of the Osmena Nationalists. Instead of seeking allies in the camp of the capitalists, they must resolutely declare their full independence and push for an extension of the movement throughout the country, especially by bringing the tens of thousands of Manila workers, now almost entirely unorganized, into the ranks of the Committee on Labor Organization and into the field of independent class action.

Vote "Yes" - Say French Trotskyists

PARIS, April 26 (By Cable)—A call to the French working class to vote "yes" in the May 5 referendum on the Constitution was issued today in La Vérité, organ of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, French section of the Fourth International.

The struggle around the Constitution has become a test of strength between the working class and the capitalist class.

It is of course of Constitution which protects capitalist interests — the MRP (the Catholic party) saw to that before it bolted from its coalition with the Socialist and Communist parties and joined the anti-Constitution mobilization.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Constitution establishes a single Assembly, elected by proportional representation, as the supreme governmental authority, is what is driving the reactionary forces to a desperate mobilization of all possible forces. A single Assembly is a traditional major democratic demand of the workers' movement.

Unfortunately the majority leadership of the Trotskyists failed to understand the significance of this development. That was not surprising since, like the Socialist Workers Party majority in the U. S., they have been inveighing against those who "exaggerate the importance of democratic demands." Furthermore their leader, Pierre Frank, has the theory that France doesn't have bourgeois democracy but Bonapartism.

It logically followed from this that one doesn't support a Bonapartist referendum. Hence the April issue of La Vérité issued the slogan: "Against the Tripartite plebiscite, Boycott the Referendum."

Fortunately there was enough good sense in the party to overturn the majority leadership on this question. The normal "majority" Regional committee of this region and some of the branches (cellules) supported a resolution of the minority (which is approximately like the minority in the SWP) for a reversal of the majority leadership. A special session of the Central Committee at first voted 11-10 to uphold the majority leadership Tuesday night, but the next day two comrades switched, giving the minority a 12-9 vote for "yes" in the referendum.

Today's Vérité carries this position. On page 2, under the heading "Tribune Libre" (Discussion Column), it carries the position of the Pierre Frank group as a minority viewpoint. Both sides considered the question too important not to let the working class public know that there were two points of view in the party.

REUTHER, THOMAS EVADE RANK AND FILE MANDATE

Time to Get Up!



By DAVID COOLIDGE

During the recent meeting of the International Executive Board of the UAW-CIO two statements were issued: a "Policy Statement" by the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist bloc and a statement by President Reuther containing his policies for the UAW-CIO. The first statement was presented to the IEB by the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist forces as their program for the UAW. This statement of policy and program was voted on by the board and adopted against the votes of the Reuther supporters. In the first test, therefore, the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist bloc demonstrated that it has a voting control of the IEB.

The Reuther statement was announced near the end of the IEB sessions. It was issued as a statement of policy by Reuther as president of the UAW and was evidently not placed before the IEB for a vote.

UAW Heads Compromise On Offices

FORCED BY GM PROGRAM

The outstanding feature in the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist statement of policy adopted by the IEB is the clear attempt of this group to restore its prestige and satisfy the demand of the rank and file for a more militant policy than that followed by this bloc in the past. Their "Policy Statement" is, furthermore, an attempt to make up for the disgraceful conduct of this group at the recent UAW convention.

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, April 28—The first meeting of the international executive board of the UAW-CIO ended this week with a compromise on organizational posts between the Walter Reuther and George Addes-Stalinist forces in the auto workers union. Reuther obtained the position of educational director for Victor Reuther, his brother and lieutenant. He also retained directorship of the General Motors division of the UAW-CIO.

Addes kept control of the research department with the reappointment of James Wishart, a key Stalinist, as director. R. J. Thomas, vice president, took charge of the competitive shops division.

BEHIND THE COMPROMISE

The significance of this compromise, however, is what is important to the auto worker militants, not the posts themselves. After the Addes-Stalinist machine in a bloc with Thomas and Richard T. Leonard, the other vice president of the union, presented and won by majority vote the adoption of the full program for the UAW-CIO two events occurred which forced the majority to restrain itself

(Continued on page 2)

"Freedom from Want" Promised; But Starvation Stalks the World

By WILLIAM BARTON

The World Food Crisis has become the number one news item of the day. Political conflict in Iran, international intrigue in Paris and the Bronx, armed struggle in Manchuria are all subordinate. A broadcast of a baseball game is interrupted by the announcer's plea for everyone's help. Newspapers carry series of full-page ads appealing for immediate contributions to private relief organizations.

In a major part of the world famine is an ever-present danger and malnutrition a thoroughly established fact. Enemy, ally, neutral liberated, conquered, untouched—all are similarly affected.

How serious is this situation? Reports have been very incomplete, but there are enough facts and figures available to convey some idea.

Biologists long ago developed a unit to measure the energy yielding power of a quantity of food—the well known "calorie." This concept is related to the most essential and elementary function of food consumption—the acquisition of enough energy to carry on normal body activities. Experts have also devised a minimum health standard of 2,000 calories per person per day. Hard workers and those in special categories naturally require more. About 1500 calories is considered necessary for average subsistence; 1000 is the rock bottom below which starvation definitely begins.

EUROPE BY CALORIES

The average American intake is 3200 daily calories, and the British 2800. Now consider some estimated

calculations for the European continent—one year after VE Day. Herbert Hoover has publicly announced that there are probably millions of Europeans on a less than 1000-calorie level. (A typical Hooverism—so beautifully indefinite!) A more detailed idea is revealed by an informal survey by UNRRA. In the area between Russia and Great Britain there are only three countries with enough domestic supplies to maintain a general 1500 calorie diet—Denmark, Sweden, and Czechoslovakia. Five countries—Belgium, Norway, Austria, Greece, and Poland—can supply less than 1000 calories from their own stocks.

The others are somewhere in-between (excluding Spain, which is not mentioned in the survey). Except for the countries of north-

ern and western Europe, which are deemed to have enough foreign credit to buy what they need, and the peculiar "exception" of Occupied Germany, the deficiency has to be made up by UNRRA.

How well has the deficiency been overcome, even in the "opulent" first group of countries? Hoover told a Health Conference in Norway that much of the population was undernourished, thus paving the way for influenza and other ailments. France, the country with the second greatest pre-war food supply in Europe, and now in possession of a comparatively large reserve foreign credits; has to beg for Russian wheat. Paris residents were living on 1300 calories a day during the winter months.

(Continued on page 3)

SOME SHENANIGANS

result from a "partnership of industry and labor." The program repudiates "all plans attempting to link wage increases to increased manual productivity." This is an attempt to distort the GM program which tied the demand for wage increases to profits and prices. The only people in the labor movement, so far as we know, who have attempted to "link wage increases to increased manual productivity" were the Stalinists, with their piece-work incentive pay schemes during the war.

This program affirms "our historic position that capital is entitled to a fair return on its investment but that the worker must not be penalized" because of "shortcomings of management." It would be difficult to crowd more nonsense into a single sentence. It reads like a pronouncement coming from the board of Matthew Woll's AFL photo-engravers.

"We affirm our policy established at the 1943 Buffalo convention that

(Continued on page 2)

Regular 8-Pager in Six Weeks!

By IRVING HOWE, Editorial Board, Labor Action

Well, it looks as if we made that 5,000 sub quota. Not that anyone didn't expect us to make it, but still it's good that those subs are in the paper's office and that we have over 5,000 people who are now new regular readers.

And in just about 6 weeks, this 4-page paper will be doubled in size. That means that there'll be at least three times as much work involved in getting it out, and that it will cost nearly three times as much to publish as does the 4-pager. But it means something even more. It means that we will have four full additional pages to get across our ideas. You know, in a four page there's a certain amount of necessary routine that has to be printed: ads for meetings, notices of branch headquarters, editorial boxes, etc. But when we add 4 more pages, we can devote almost all of that extra space to meaty and interesting articles which will enable the paper to have a fuller coverage of what is going on in the world and will also enable us to provide explanatory background material about world events. The extra

pages are, so to speak, so much gravy for the paper. The 8-pagers we've put out so far testify to that fact. As one friend put it:

"When it's 8 pages, you really have to sit down and give some time to reading the paper, because there's so much in it."

One of the pet ideas is to devote a lot more space to letters and comments from readers. If it were necessary, in an 8-page paper we might give a full page each week to printing comments, letters and contributions from readers. In fact, it would be a good idea if in certain cities and towns, especially where there are no branches of the Workers Party, regular readers of LABOR ACTION got together once in a while to discuss the paper and its contents.

But all this means that we have to be sure to get that 8-pager started—and what is more important, to keep it going once it is started. Of course, that means a constant flow of subscriptions. The paper doesn't pay for itself of course; no labor paper, which doesn't have the financial buttress of capitalist advertising, can pay for itself. But a steady stream of subscriptions and

contributions would certainly help. Suppose you, a regular reader and friend of LABOR ACTION, were to say to yourself:

"This paper means enough to me, its ideas are important enough to me to do just a little work, make a little effort to keep it going. I'm going to set myself the goal of getting one new subscription each week from my friends or shopmates."

If a sizable group of our regular readers did that, the future of the 8-pager would be assured. It would mean steady revenue and it would mean a growing group of new readers.

There's nothing at all unreasonable about that, and nothing especially hard about it. At this end, we're preparing all kinds of elaborate plans for the 8-page LABOR ACTION. The two sample issues we've put out are only a mild forecast of what the regular 8-pager will be like. Now it's up to you at your end. Just one sub a week from each friend of the paper: that's the road to a stable 8-pager. And send your contribution to the \$15,000 fund drive for an 8-Page Paper.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

UAW Heads Sidestep Rank and File Mandate - -

(Continued from page 1)

piecework systems of compensation shall not be instituted or extended. The Stalinists who helped Adde...

Adde, Thomas and Leonard are for "union security" and not "company security" as they were in the case of the Ford Motor Co. These three have advanced a long way on paper since they counted the vote for president at the UAW convention.

THIRD PARTY NONSENSE

They want a "broad third party"; they promise to expose "the Republican and Democratic reactionaries"; they will tell Truman that he and his administration "are yielding and capitulating on issue after issue to the forces of reaction." Here the Adde-Thomas-Stalinist group attempts to pass ahead of Reuther, who was not so specific in his political platform in connection with the two capitalist parties.

At bottom there is nothing to choose between the two groups. Reuther is for electing those running on both tickets who are friendly to labor, while the Adde-Thomas-Leonard group agrees to "expose" reactionary Republicans and Democrats. Both want a "broad third party". It must not be organized too soon, however, and its base must not be too narrow. The working class is far too narrow a base for both sides.

This program calls for "collective security by the peace-loving nations." This sentence reads as though it came straight from one of Browder's ancient speeches. They urge the "Big Three—Britain, Soviet Russia and the U. S. A. (the 'peace-loving nations') to iron out their differences."

They are for price control but in holding prices down the union must concern itself with whether the corporations are protected in maintaining their high-profit levels. "The corporations are...capable of protecting their own profit levels." When did Thomas and Adde learn this? Above all, when did Leonard learn it? They all have certainly made rapid strides in their education since the first proposals on "company security" which they approved for the Ford Motor Co. Did they perhaps learn something besides mud-slinging at the Atlantic City convention?

They are for price control but they won't touch the "Open the Books" formula nor will they consent to have wage demands tied in with prices and profits. To them this is a scheme "to cut workers' wages if living costs decrease by a certain percentage." Thomas-Adde are stuck here just as Reuther was stuck. Neither Reuther nor the others can have an answer. The only answer is that given by the Workers Party in LABOR ACTION:

NATIONALIZE THE BIG INDUSTRIES UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL!

Reuther said in a press interview that if a corporation could not pay decent wages it should not be in business. We don't hear anything about this nowadays, however.

As we said above, this program is an attempt to drown the GM program and at the same time escape the wrath of the rank and file who supported that program and who want more of it. This program is put forward by a group who want power and offices. They could not hold power nor could they retain their offices beyond the next convention if they carried through with what they stood for at Atlantic City.

REUTHER'S REPLY

How did Reuther meet the Adde-Thomas-Leonard-Stalinist attack? What did he say about their program? He issued a statement on "Policy." We are handicapped in discussing the Reuther statement because we do not have the whole statement. For some strange reason the New York papers carried only an "abstract" of the statement. We do not know what they left out.

The statement as we have it is very tame indeed. Reuther accepts virtually all of the proposals of the Adde-Thomas program. There is nothing in his statement to differentiate him from his opponents except he wags to "be vigilant to protect the union against those whose loyalties to groups outside the union and to foreign powers cause them to take positions and from time to time shift such positions on union issues, without regard for the welfare of

either the union, its members or our country."

It is clear, of course, that Reuther is talking about the Communist Party. But how is Reuther going to protect the UAW against the Stalinists? The best way is to stand up and fight for the GM program; for integrating wage demands with demands about profits and prices. What does it mean to talk about protecting the union from the Stalinists so long as he tries to harmonize the GM program with the sly programmatic vapors of Thomas, Leonard and Adde, who are now in tow of the Stalinists?

Reuther, so far as we read, has abandoned his GM program. Not only this, but he is now piously calling for "unity" and "harmony." He expects harmony with those who are hell-bent on countermanding the mandate of the convention.

How does Reuther expect to protect the union from the Stalinists when his political platform is essentially no different from theirs? He wants to mobilize the union "in an aggressive program of political action to elect candidates who are pledged to fight for the domestic and inter-

UAW Offices - -

(Continued from page 1)

from a further head-on clash with Reuther.

The sharp attack by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on the UAW-CIO majority on the executive board, was a serious blow to the long-range plans of the Stalinists for a Third Party.

Unless prominent figures like Mrs. Roosevelt, Henry Wallace and others take a part in the Stalinist plans for a third party it is doomed in advance. Any policy calculated to antagonize completely these people is a tactical blunder from the Stalinist point of view, and that was recognized immediately. The Stalinists neatly refrained from a direct answer to Mrs. Roosevelt, and instead R. J. Thomas, as usual, was allowed to make the reply, and take the rap.

Secondly, in this same connection, the fact that Reuther is also inclined towards a Third Party movement—his brother Victor was one of the sponsors of the recent Chicago conference held on this question under the direction of Socialist Party and liberal forces—posed another difficult problem for Adde and the Stalinists. Their only attack on the Reuther move was that it was premature. But the fact remains that if any Stalinist strategy for a Third Party is going to succeed, it must include the UAW-CIO, and that means Reuther also. In program, the new line of the Stalinists tends to coincide with that of Reuther in the UAW-CIO. This is the dilemma and problem of both Reuther and the Stalinists.

STALINISTS GIVEN WARNING

The other major event that occurred while the UAW-CIO executive board was meeting, was the first open, direct and blunt attack on the Stalinists within the CIO by a major figure in the CIO. Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers, delivered a sharp attack against the Stalinists at the textile workers convention now being held. Coming on top of the crude exclusion of the Stalinists from the Southern organizing drive of the CIO, it is a storm warning signal to the Stalinists. The top CIO officialdom is opening up its fight against the Stalinists. Sidney Hillman's speech last week against a Third Party was another sign. Any further direct attack against

national policies championed by the late President Roosevelt." Here is another ancient shibboleth. Add to this "Support President Murray" and you have anything but a real fighting and militant program for labor in 1946.

SAVE GM PROGRAM!

The back-sliding of Reuther away from the GM program is a real challenge to the militants in the UAW. They and they alone can save the GM program with all its revolutionary implications. But they will have to rise from their slumber and their indifference. They will have to go far beyond the point they reached at the Atlantic City convention. They will have to move ahead politically; far, far beyond the "broad third party" stage. They will have to come to grips with the important truth for labor: that the working class is a broad enough base, and a correctly narrow base, for labor's independent political action. All others must fall in behind and be led by labor, which has demonstrated that it speaks for the WHOLE of the people, in a nation-wide Labor Party based on the trade unions.

Reuther by the majority of the executive board of the UAW-CIO would guarantee Reuther's unity with the "right-wing" forces in the CIO who want to intensify the fight against the Stalinists.

Reuther took full advantage of this situation by issuing another blast against the Stalinists on the last day of the executive board meeting. He called attention to the provision in the UAW-CIO constitution barring "Communists" from office. He declared that there would be no appointments on the union international payroll who were "Communists" (Stalinists). Of course, he had just voted to retain Wishart in the research department.

The point is that Reuther—in view of the national struggle developing within the CIO between the top leadership and the Stalinists—is sneezing every possible advantage from that situation.

RANKS MUST INTERVENE

The trouble with all these developments is that policy and program of the UAW-CIO are being developed in the machinations and maneuvers of the top leaders, and not by a powerful and healthy intervention of the rank and file. There still exists too much confusion over policy left unsettled by the recent convention for the ranks to intervene decisively, as they must sooner or later. And the sooner the better.

The action of the UAW-CIO executive board to authorize strikes at Ford and Chrysler was a maneuver, and nothing else. All Ford locals received wires from the executive board demanding that the contract, including company security, be ratified quickly. The demand for retroactive pay immediately at Ford is a tactic to assure ratification of the contract. The strike threat at Chrysler over discharge of men over 65 years of age likewise is a tactic in negotiations on this issue. Everyone expects Chrysler to shut down for a few weeks for parts shortages, and no one is anxious for a strike, because it means at least three-weeks without the unemployment compensation that a lay-off would bring in. The local unions weren't even sounded out by the executive board on strike sentiment.

WORKERS PARTY

Pre-Convention Discussion . . .

The articles that appear below are DISCUSSION ARTICLES published as part of the pre-convention discussion in the Workers Party. Because our space is limited, it will be impossible to devote more than two columns per issue to this material. Contributions will therefore have to be brief, not exceeding 750 words. Pre-convention discussion articles are also appearing in The New Internationalist and in the Workers Party Bulletin. Copies of the latter may be gotten by sending fifteen cents to the Workers Party, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Readers will understand that these articles represent neither the views of the party nor of LABOR ACTION, but are written with a view toward establishing policy at the coming convention of the WP.

Propaganda Versus Phrasemongering

LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party during the war showed how to translate the ideas of revolutionary socialism into terms of the real class struggle. A superlative example of our method was the insistent and continuous propaganda and agitation for simple slogans like: "Rescind the No-Strike Pledge" and "For a Progressive Caucus in the UAW."

Thousands of active unionists were against the no-strike pledge. The highly placed bureaucrats of the CIO and AFL, however, believing that American capitalism is the best and only possible social system and rallying to its defense in the crucial struggle for domination of the world, gave up the fight against the capitalist class in the name of "national unity" and struck out instead against those very militants who insisted upon class struggle action to defend the conditions of American labor.

Opposition to the pledge was our point of agreement with these militants and by using this agreement as our springboard we were able to clarify the irreconcilable nature of the class struggle in modern society, the need for the working class to carry on its struggle despite the war. We were able more easily to expose the imperialist nature of the war and the pro-capitalist character of the present labor leadership.

Coupled with our propaganda on the pledge was the call for the formation of a rank and file group in the UAW to combat the top leadership and to replace it with a new militant leadership. We were the first to popularize this slogan and it was in part through our efforts in this connection that a rank and file group was actually organized and a tiny handful of socialists was able to play a decisive role at the UAW convention in 1944. The UAW militants began to see the need for rank and file organization against the old leaders.

As the war continued and the labor officialdom exhausted the possibilities of winning concessions within the rules decreed by the WLB and the national administration, a deeper and deeper rift developed between the ranks and leadership. . . .

LABOR ACTION appealed for a conference of shop stewards and committees. If the union leaders have no program, we said, then let the direct representatives of the rank and file take over.

The end of the war released the union leaders from their dilemma and gave them elbow room for maneuvering. With their slogan of a 30 per cent wage increase, they shifted

back into the good graces of the ranks. But the fact remains that LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party by agitation on the no-strike pledge and for the progressive caucus brought revolutionary ideas to the workers which will under proper conditions again surge forth into class action.

TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM

Comrade Johnson refuses to recognize this. In his typically confusing and contradictory fashion, he writes: "Agitation for the revocation of a no-strike pledge or for withdrawal of labor members from a government labor board are necessary and useful at all times, particularly in wartime. But concentration on this as a means of developing into a party has turned to the masses IS IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION WITH THE WHOLE AIM AND METHOD OF THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM. "It is on the basis of propaganda for revolutionary action that the propaganda group builds itself into the mass revolutionary party."

By rejecting the emphasis of the party during the war, Johnson reveals that all his talk about "revolutionary action" and "self-mobilization of the masses" is mere phrasemongering.

In 1943 Johnson wrote: "What is decisive in all political agitation is the stage of consciousness of the masses and the particular organizational form and direction in which their minds are concretely moving." That is exactly what we considered when we spoke of "Rank and file caucus" instead of "revolutionary self-mobilization."

One glaring omission is evident in Johnson's resolution on the American question. Johnson is highly critical of our party and insists that we have abandoned a revolutionary perspective on all important questions. But this false contention is refuted by our program and activities during the war, when we alone in this country upheld consistently the banner of the "Third Camp" against both imperialist war camps.

That is why Johnson is unable and unwilling to deal with our record during the war. For example, he groups four pages of his resolution on America under the heading "The American Proletariat During the War" but one reads with amazement NOT ONE word about the working class during the war or our party's connection with it. Instead we learn that Johnson predicted a great crisis AFTER the war. Strange oversight? Not when you realize that a balance sheet of the party's role during the war would annihilate Johnson's thesis.

WAR PROFITS ISSUE

Johnson errs not only in omission. His resolution on America is a rambling and discursive distortion and falsification of our activities during the war. I cite one illustration not because it is most important but because it is typical, tricky legerdemain. He says: "Unable to appeal to the revolutionary instincts of the workers, it (LABOR ACTION) dissipates its revolutionary energy in attempts to stimulate the combativity of the workers by wearisome repetition of the large profits and the criminal conduct and deceptions of the bourgeoisie."

But the party exposed war profits not as a means of "stimulating" but as one means of exposing the imperialist character of the war. Was that right or wrong? BEN HALL

Raw Deal for Steel Local After Sixty-Six Day Strike

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 15—After the longest strike in the history of Local Union 1693, USA-CIO, the workers of the Henry Vogt Mach. Co. returned to work today. The strike had lasted sixty-six working days, from January 21 to April 15.

From the beginning, it was apparent to the workers that most of the cards were stacked against them. According to Kentucky State law, no unemployment compensation can be paid to a striking worker. The city Department of Welfare dodged the issue of relief to the strikers. The Federal Government was supplying the company with its strike fund in the form of "kick back" tax refunds. Despite this vicious POLITICAL opposition, the Vogt workers fought on.

The strike was a part of the national steel strike. The Vogt workers were unfortunate in one respect. Even the inadequate 18 1/2 cents "proposal" of President Truman did not apply to them! That "proposal" was made only for basic steel. It did not apply to fabricating industries.

When this proposal was made the CIO's Wage Policy Committee reversed its position on the conduct of the strike. The Committee had been against piecemeal settlements. But when Truman made his magnanimous offer, the Committee sent basic steel back to work and left some 250,000 CIO members in the fabricating locals completely out in the cold. This action taken by the leadership of the CIO was inexcusable! At this point, Local 1693 faltered, and began slowly to lose its confidence and militancy. The leaders of the CIO are

responsible. They treated their fabricating locals like stepchildren.

At a mass meeting held April 10, Local 1693, after hearing statements from District Director Robb, two staff representatives, and one Negotiating Committeeman to the effect that "13 1/2 cents is the best we can do now, but if you want to stay out for an indefinite length of time, 18 1/2 cents can be achieved," decided by a vote of approximately 4 to 1 to return to work.

The majority of the Negotiating Committee favored fighting on for the 18 1/2 cents. But it could not combat a situation wherein one of the Committeemen and the International men were encouraging settlement for 13 1/2 cents. A solid front was not presented to the membership. Had the leadership been unanimous in staying out for 18 1/2 cents, there is every reason to believe that the membership would have voted to continue the strike, and that victory would have come soon!

The company succeeded also in inserting a "no strike" clause in the supplemental agreement. This is another setback for the local.

The 13 1/2 cents has been accepted. The 800 workers of the Vogt Mach. Co. are back to work. They must not allow the company to make capital of its victory in the strike. They must not allow discrimination, in any form, by the company against the militant strikers! They must resist, and resist vigorously any new "pressure" the company may try to impose on the workers.

SPIRITED MAY DAY CELEBRATION BY NEWARK BRANCH

NEWARK, N. J.—Over 35 friends and members of the Workers Party branch of this city celebrated May Day at a rousing meeting in which the spirit of the great socialist holiday was evident. The beautiful headquarters of this newest branch of the Workers Party was decorated with banners, posters and displays. A buffet supper was served before the brief speeches began and labor songs were sung by the audience in a spirit of socialist comradeship.

The main speaker of the evening was Irving Howe of LABOR ACTION's Editorial Board who spoke briefly of the background of the holiday, the situation of the working class in the world today, the danger of a new war and the program of the Workers Party to find a solution to the problems of humanity. The organizer of the Newark branch, Sol Berg, made a short appeal to friends at the meeting to join the ranks of the party in order to build a better society, and the affair ended with dancing.

SAN FRANCISCO ORGANIZER MAKES NATIONAL TOUR

Gordon Haskell, prominent member of the Workers Party and organizer of the San Francisco Branch is making a speaking tour on "World War III" and "Who Rules America?" with the following itinerary:

- Kansas City, May 10-11. Minneapolis, May 12-13. Hibbing May 14-18. Milwaukee, May 21. Madison, Noon May 21 to Noon May 22. Chicago, 2 P. M. May 22 to 9 A. M. May 24. Detroit, 5 P. M. May 24 to 10 P. M. May 25.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

British Miners Cold To Nationalization

Editor: The program of nationalizing British industry is meeting with some serious snags. The most serious one at the moment is the lack of enthusiasm of the British coal miners. The coal industry is the first large one to be nationalized under the Labor Party administration. Last fall, Emmanuel Shinwell, Minister of Fuel and Power, set a quota of 8,000,000 tons increased coal production for this winter but he ended up with a million and a half tons. How come?

A New York Times reporter, surveying the coal mine situation in England, reports as follows: "For decades the miners' union agitated for nationalization seeing in it the answer to all their grievances. But nationalization has come without having changed anything yet and the miners have not been able to understand that their hopes can only be realized by greater production." Matthews, the reporter, assumes that the miners will benefit if more coal is exported. But the miners judge by concrete results, as can be seen by another quote from Matthews's report. "Pending further developments one must deduce that the promise of nationalization and its commencement has neither affected the miner's life nor wages

nor has it altered his attitude toward his work."

In other words, the productive relations really remain the same; the miners remain wage slaves under the domination of capital. Just as the transfer of ownership from one boss to another does not affect the workers, so the transfer from the mine owners to Mr. Shinwell's supervision is not changing the British miner's life.

"But," one may protest, "they have a Labor Government which represents them and runs the mines for them; that's socialism, isn't it?" Yes, that's socialism — Attlee's socialism, Bevin's socialism, but not the kind of Marxist revolutionary socialism that really changes the miners' relation to production, that ends his life as a wage-slave, that gives him a new lease on life. Where does the difference lie?

First of all, there is no miners' control of production in Britain. That is, control from the bottom up, and not from the top down as in Russia. Nationalization, without workers' control of production by democratically elected workers' committees, is a hollow thing. Socialism can only be built by workers, actively participating through their committees, in the management and control of production and the state. Secondly, industry must be expro-

riated by the workers' government and not paid for with government bonds as the Labor Party is doing. Otherwise, the working class continues to work in order that government bonds will pay interest to the ex-owners of industry. They have been repaid many times for the risk of their initial investment. Only those who work have a right to a share in the national income.

The present leaders of the Labor Party are nationalizing British industries in order to run them more efficiently for the capitalists of Britain. This is true whether they are aware of it or not. Their reactionary imperialist foreign policy proves that they are aware of their role. When the British miners and the rest of the working class in England move toward workers' control of industry, when they expropriate industry, and when they break completely with the bourgeois state apparatus, then they will find Messrs. Attlee, Bevin and Shinwell on the bosses' side of the fence—where they really belong.

HERB MASON

Calls for Support Of Columbia "31"

Dear Editor: Our American government is very busy in every war torn country of

the world administering democracy (so called) yet here in America, Columbia Tenn., there are 31 Negroes that have been arrested and are awaiting trial before a southern lily white jury, charged with attempted murder, when actually they were defending themselves against brutality by the whites.

I think we democracy-loving people should rally to the support of these 31 Negroes. For they are doomed to legal lynching and the government isn't doing anything about it. But we, the working class, can do something about it. We can protest against such injustice, and see to it that brutality, vandalism, and legal lynching, terrorizing and the KKK don't count. We can have a workers' government that will give justice, peace, and security to all.

E. L. N. April 22, 1946

CIO Vets Snub Red Cross Collection

Dear Editor: The report this week that the CIO withdrew its support from the American Red Cross brings to mind an incident that happened in the shop concerning the Red Cross. Recently, the foreman came down

the line, carrying white envelopes which he passed out to the workers along the line. When he hit a section where a lot of ex-GIs were working, you could hear the howls and cursing above the noise of the plant.

So I went over to see what was going on. One GI showed me the envelope, and it was marked with a Red Cross label. You were supposed to put your contribution in it.

This particular veteran was cursing and telling the foreman how much nerve he had to ask a former enlisted man to contribute to the Red Cross. All the other ex-GIs felt the same way. Out of the many reasons, one thing stood out clearly. The ex-GIs saw the Red Cross as a symbol of the brass hats, officers' privileges, etc.

"I've waited a long time for this," one of the GIs said as he threw his envelope away.

So the foreman kind of apologized and went to some of the older workers. One of them handed back the envelope empty and said: "You see what the vets think of the Red Cross. Their opinion is good enough for me."

Out of around forty vets in my department, only one kicked in, and he was shamefaced about it. In other departments similar incidents occurred. J. W., Detroit.

With the Workers Party

AKRON For information, write to Bill Ford, Box 221, Akron, Ohio.

BUFFALO HEADQUARTERS at 639 Main St.

CHICAGO LABOR ACTION, 1703 West Madison St., Room 3, Chicago 12. Telephone: CHESAPEAKE 6798. Office Hours: 3-5:30 p.m. daily, except Sunday, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings.

DETROIT LABOR ACTION HALL—3773 Gratiot (at Mt. Elliott). Office hours: Monday-Friday, 11 A. M. to 3 P. M.; Saturday, 1 to 5 P. M.

LOS ANGELES LABOR ACTION headquarters at Mason Theatre Building, 127 So. Broadway, Los Angeles 12, Room 310. Office open daily 11 A. M. to 3 P. M., except Friday and Sunday. Open evening: Wednesday, 6:00-8:00.

NEWARK LABOR ACTION HEADQUARTERS in Newark at 248 Market St.

Labor Action Hall is available to organizations for meetings. For rental terms and arrangements, write R. Shaw, Labor Action Hall, 248 Market Street, Newark, N. J.

Forum, Friday, May 10—"Famine—the Truth Behind the World Food Crisis." Speaker—Saul Berg, Newark Organizer, Workers Party.

Time: 8:30 P. M. Place: Labor Action Hall, 248 Market St. Admission free. Meeting will be followed by questions, discussion and refreshments.

NEW YORK CITY CITY OFFICE—114 West 14th St., —open all day until 7 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday —open until 10 p.m.

PHILADELPHIA HEADQUARTERS, 1105 Walnut St.

For information of other Workers Party branches and LABOR ACTION offices, write to the National Office, 114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

The Socialist Youth League, youth section of the Workers Party, has youth units in the following cities: Manhattan, New York; Brooklyn, New York; Philadelphia, Penna.; Baltimore, Maryland; Boston, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland, Ohio; Madison, Wisconsin, and Seattle, Washington. If you live in any of these cities and desire to attend the youth meetings, write to Socialist Youth League, 114 W. 14th St., New York, N. Y.

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

Published Weekly by the

Labor Action Publishing Ass'n

114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. CH. 2-9681 (Third Floor)

Vol. 10, No. 18

May 6, 1946

EMANUEL GARRETT, Acting Editor

ALBERT GATES, Editor

MARY BELL, Ass't Editor

Subscription Rate: 60c a Year; 35c for 6 Mos. (75c-40c for Canada, Foreign, New York City, Bronx) 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

WORKERS PARTY PROGRAM FOR ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE RECONVERSION AND POST-WAR PERIOD

FOR THE UNEMPLOYED AND VETERANS

1. Full Unemployment Insurance Full unemployment insurance beginning with \$30 a week for single men and women and graduated upward for dependents to all workers for whom government and industry do not find jobs.

2. Less Hours—More Pay Absorption of all workers thrown into unemployment during reconversion by reduction of the work-week with no reduction in weekly take-home pay.

3. Jobs and Full Opportunities for Veterans Two years' base pay grant to all demobilized veterans, with the option of trade school and higher educational facilities at government expense, guarantee of adequate family maintenance and guarantee of decent jobs.

FOR THE POST-WAR WORLD

4. Jobs For All at a Guaranteed Annual Living Wage A job for every worker with a guaranteed minimum annual wage of \$2,500 per year. A rising standard of living, by means of government planning to insure the highest national production and income.

5. A Planned Rise in National Income A guaranteed \$5,000 annual income to all workers' families by means of a planned rise in the national income and a thirty-hour maximum work week.

6. For a Democratic Peace Against peacetime military conscription of American youth! For a truly democratic peace, which means no land-grabbing under any pretext; no reparations; no slave labor. Complete independence for all colonies and subject peo-

ples and the right of all people to decide democratically their own future.

7. Full Social, Political and Economic Equality for Negroes

Complete democratic rights. The right to vote, to run for and hold any elective or appointive office, North or South. The right to equality in employment; to hold any job, skilled or unskilled. The right to be free from insult, segregation and Jim Crowism; anywhere and in any place, North or South.

THESE AIMS TO BE ACHIEVED THROUGH

8. Slum Clearance A \$250 billion five-year program to provide decent housing for all, extensive public works, rural electrification and modernization.

9. Nationalization of Big Business Nationalization of the banks, big industrial monopolies and transportation systems, and no handing over of government-built and owned plants and facilities to private ownership.

10. Taxing the Profiteers A 100 per cent tax on all war profits above a five per cent maximum on invested capital; a \$25,000 ceiling on total individual income, and a graduated capital levy on all accumulated wealth over \$50,000 to cover war costs and provide post-war security for labor.

THIS PROGRAM TO BE CARRIED OUT BY

11. Workers' Control of Production Control of production by democratically-elected workers' committees.

12. An Independent Labor Party and a Workers' Government—For a Socialist America with Plenty for All!

Make the machines that now produce only for war and capitalism produce for the needs of all the people!

WORLD POLITICS

By IRVING HOWE

Since the end of the war, the international Stalinist movement has adopted a more aggressive "left" political line, to the point where certain superficial observers have seen a return to the "policy of world revolution." Nothing of the kind is true.

It would be a serious error to identify the current "left turn" with the notorious Stalinist Third Period in the early thirties, when it was really pursuing an ultra-left policy. At that time, before Hitler came to power, though the Stalinist parties were thoroughly dominated by the Russian bureaucracy, the full weight of degeneration inside Russia had not yet been felt and the Stalinist parties still functioned more or less as revolutionary working class movements. They made scandalous errors, they were already bureaucratized, but they still had a certain connection with the Marxist tradition and were still somewhat responsive to the needs and pressures of the workers.

THE MOTIVATION OF STALINIST POLICY

If one sees in the first Moscow Trial the final culmination of a process of degeneration inside Russia; or if one chooses the failure of German Stalinism to resist Hitler's rise to power as the point in time where Stalinism as a parasitic bureaucracy can be seen to have been transformed into a new ruling class; or if one chooses any other time—this much is clear: Stalinism can be understood only by accepting the proposition that it functions today essentially as a vassal of the Russian collectivist bureaucracy and all of its basic policies are determined by the needs of that bureaucracy. The various Stalinist parties may have interests and aspirations of their own, but thus far these have been subordinated to the requirements of Russian foreign policy.

In view of this characterization of Stalinism the terms "left" and "right" as traditionally used in the Marxist movement are really inapplicable to Stalinism. When, for instance, one says that the Norman Thomas Socialist Party has recently moved to the right, there is a specific meaning which that description suggests to people acquainted with politics. But the terms "left" and "right" are in that sense not very useful when considering a totalitarian movement like Stalinism which is a new and unique historical phenomenon, and to which the descriptive-terms of the traditional working class movement apply only in a most limited and analogical sense. When one says that the needs of Russian foreign policy makes the Argentine Stalinists first with dictator Peron, or that the needs of Russian foreign policy make the American Stalinists criticize Truman; then we are talking about something that is much more clear than if those policies are described as "left" or "right."

During the war the American Stalinists were bitterly opposed to any strikes, because they feared that strikes in war industries might hinder Stalin's military campaigns. And no considerations for the needs of the American workers could force them to change their policy.

Now that the war is over, Stalin has allowed his parties to become more belligerent, to talk more "radical" politics, to revert to the language of socialism. There are two main reasons for this shift: (1) The major international conflict is no longer the imperialist war, but rather a struggle among the victors of that war on how to divide the spoils. Serious quarrels have arisen among the Big Three. These quarrels are simply about one proposition: who is to get what? and how much? Resultantly, Stalin utilizes his puppet-parties in the Allied countries to apply pressure on his erstwhile war allies in order to gain a larger share of the war booty. That is the basic reason for the "left" turn of Stalinism, and it can be said that if some agreement on the division of the war spoils satisfactory to Stalin were worked out and the present strain between Russia and the Anglo-American bloc eased, then the Stalinist parties would become much

more docile and would cease talking so "revolutionary."

(2) The other and secondary reason for the "left" turn is that the Stalinist parties are aware of the moods of the masses of workers which is, especially in many countries, extremely restive; they know that a certain amount of "leftish" demagoguery is essential if they are to retain their followers. As it is, this need fits in very nicely with the first reason we have given for their turn is that the Stalinist parties are aware of the mood of a conflict between their loyalty to the Russian bureaucracy and their political requirements in the capitalist countries will not become very great until the present diplomatic crisis sharpens to the point where war seems really imminent.

THE "LEFT ISSUE" IN PRACTICE

But even this so-called "left" turn is still severely limited. In several European countries, such as France, Austria and Italy, they either are now or have recently participated together with capitalist parties in coalition cabinets which function within the framework of capitalism. They have participated in the same French government which brutally suppressed the Indo-Chinese nationalist revolt and have never said a word of criticism against "their" government on this matter. In America, they continue to play around with capitalist politicians; they supported O'Dwyer in New York City and are now fiddling with the idea of a third party to be formed together with the "liberal" section of the capitalist politicians.

In Argentina they have tacitly supported dictator Peron, merely because he, for his own reactionary reasons, was hostile to America. In Brazil they have flitted back and forth between the dictatorial Vargas political machine and its reactionary militarist opponents.

They have continued their wretched chauvinism in Europe by which they violated the ABC principles of socialist internationalism and even simple democratic rights. In Italy the Stalinists demand that Trieste be returned to that country; in Yugoslavia they demand that Trieste be annexed to Tito's terrorist regime. On a basic question of European politics, the problem of the disposition of the Ruhr, their sections have pursued contradictory policies. The French Stalinists urge that the Ruhr be separated from Germany; the German Stalinists urge that it be retained within the German borders. Each thereby appeals to the narrowly nationalist sentiments of the most backward sections of the European populations.

For a hair-raising example of Stalinist policy in this connection, we refer our readers to the March 30 issue of La Victoire, a New York French language paper, in which Genevieve Tabouis interviews Karl Ulbricht, German Stalinist leader. Tabouis asks Ulbricht if the German Stalinists do not have to take indirect responsibility for the brutal uprooting of 8 million Germans from that territory which Poland is to annex from Germany, since this annexation is to be made at the instigation of the Russians. And Ulbricht answers with a reply worthy of a true Prussian nationalist or a rabid Nazi:

"Certainly not! The country really responsible for this is Poland, THE ETERNAL ENEMY." (Our emphasis—Ed.) It is this wretchedly chauvinist poison which German Stalinism feeds.

In a sense, then, international Stalinism is in a period of transition: it may move to either a more reckless and aggressive role if relations among the Big Three become worse, or if some reconciliation satisfactory to Stalin is patched up, it may return to its old war-time docile self. But in either case, its policies will not be based on working class needs; in either case it will not hesitate to utilize legitimate working class aspirations or reactionary chauvinist prejudices to further the program of the Stalinist bureaucracy. That is the fundamental fact to be remembered in connection with its so-called "left" turn.

OFF LIMITS

By JAMES M. FENWICK

DEMOCRATIZING THE ARMED FORCES

A great deal of attention has recently been focused upon conditions within the armed forces. Even Hanson W. Baldwin, the New York Times military expert, confesses that "the scope and intensity of the present feeling are unprecedented."

When Baldwin says, however, that "thousands of ex-enlisted men—and many ex-officers—hate (and the word is used advisedly) the systems which they served with a furious rancor" he is guilty of misrepresentation. It is not thousands of enlisted men who hate the military routine but millions.

That the capitalist class is aware of this feeling and is very concerned about it is evident. It is this awareness which causes articles such as Baldwin's "GI Grips—Causes and Cures" to be written, it is this which induces the War and Navy departments to set up investigating commissions, it is this which causes the chatter in Congress about raising soldiers' pay, changing the cut of GI uniforms, and otherwise bettering the lot of the enlisted man.

BEHIND THE REFORMS

It is not compassion which is the compelling motive behind the interest of the capitalist class in the welfare of the enlisted man. It is an interest based upon the bed rock of economic and political realities.

The most far-seeing of the leadership of the capitalist class understand that, unlike after the last war, our huge standing army will not be demobilized. It is no longer sufficient that United States domination of the world be maintained solely by economic power—armed might is needed also. And since the area which the United States intends to police includes virtually the whole world with the exception of Russia, the army and navy must be large.

Unfortunately for the capitalists, whose golden torrent of profits tapered off at the war's end, the overwhelming majority of the enlisted men in the army and navy are fed up with that dangerous, boring, and brutal slave's life.

Hence the guilty haste to make the military life look like the Earthly Paradise.

United States capital recognizes that eventually there must be war with Russia for the right to control and exploit the entire globe. The war-weariness of the American people, and the similar war-weariness of the people of Europe and Asia plus a variety of other factors, dictate the necessity of delaying this catastrophe for a while. Russia, in her turn, recognizes the condition the U. S. finds herself in, and bulldozes from the world economic, political, and military bases in preparation for World War III, which is inevitable, unless socialism intervenes.

It is, therefore, from the longer term perspective of a Third World War that the talk of army reforms must be viewed.

That the brass hats will fail in their attempt to make the armed forces popular institutions is a foregone conclusion. Even when it is animated with socialist convictions, as was the Red Army under Lenin and Trotsky, the military life is hardly a pleasant one. But under conditions of modern warfare, in any army which is caste-ridden, filled with inequalities, and is fighting for obscure or invisible aims, life becomes almost unbearable.

The fight for a democratic army is synonymous with the fight for socialism, which alone can bring peace, and make military science a lost craft, and war a subject exclusively for history books and weapons exhibited in museums.

Editorials

Socialism or Atomization

Since V-E Day, representatives of the big powers have been unsuccessfully attempting to arrive at a peace agreement—at Potsdam in July, at London in September, at Moscow in December. And now the foreign ministers of the Big Four meet again around the customary baize table in the Luxembourg Palace in France, trying to allocate the spoils of war. The United Nations, whose action without the agreement of the big powers is null, has wrangled for five weeks in New York over the same issues. Meanwhile, at least 150,000,000 people scrounge for food around corpse-ridden, rubble-strewn, epidemic-scourged Europe. An untold number do the same in the Orient—all victims of the war fought, among other things, for "Freedom from Want."

In a report stating that international relief requirements would still be needed for the third of the world that is now "ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed," Isador Lubin, U. S. representative on the United Nations Economic and Employment Commission, declared:

"If the world is to have economic stability and full employment, the various national economies must be integrated into a world economic system." (N. Y. Times, April 28)

Not only the food crisis, but the advent of the Atomic Age, bring forth similar adjurations that we must have "one world," a single economic unit. The food crisis starkly emphasizes the economic interdependence of the world. All attempts of the United Nations to establish a world organization—the UNO, the Bretton Woods monetary agreement, UNRRA, and all the other political and economic agreements—underscore the drift to a world federation that inheres in our society.

DIVIDING THE WORLD IN TWO

But the organization of the world cannot be accomplished by the imperialists, either under the Anglo-American capitalists or the Russian Stalinists. Just as Hitler was unable to unify Europe under his totalitarian control, so the Big Two occupation will generate movements of national resistance against the new conquerors.

First, the reorganization of Europe is undertaken without any regard for the wishes of the peoples themselves. Even their formal representative in the UN, capitalists and imperialists themselves, can decide nothing without the prior decision and agreement of the Big Two. With the "iron curtain" drawn between the respective spheres of the United States and Russia, and England occupying the role of a very junior partner of the

United States, the Big Two set out to apportion the world between them. Each attempts to organize its own half, and also to penetrate the territories of the other, not in accord with the needs of the peoples involved, but in accord with the needs of the monopoly-capitalists of the United States on the one hand, and the bureaucratic rulers of Russia on the other. Each attempts an "integrated economic system" in its own behalf. Russia loots, destroys or expropriates properties in the interests of increasing the revenues of the Russian ruling class. The United States attempts to do business everywhere, to secure the right to "free trade," to fill the coffers of big business.

These motivations underly the discussions on the "ethnology" of the people of Trieste, the trusteeships of the Italian colonies, the proposal to occupy Germany for twenty-five years, Franco and Spain, Iran, etc. They underly the matter of feeding the starving peoples. In order to do business, in order to prevent mass revolt and the military suppression of it, in order for each side to gain the allegiance of the people against the other, rations will be increased.

But the basic antagonisms of the two imperialist giants, each lusting after more and more of the fruits of exploitation of the little people, will eventually lead them to the third, atomic war.

The world moves toward economic unity, but cannot achieve it under capitalism or Stalinist collectivism. A genuine, stable world unity requires the socialist transformation of society, the elimination of exploiting classes, the assumption of leadership of each nation by the working class which is the majority class and the class directly exploited.

Under socialism, we can achieve world planning, instead of the international competition which exists now. There would be no consideration of profits, but only of human needs. Eliminating the heritage of starvation and scarcity of present society, we should build a world of abundance. In a world socialist society, war would be unknown.

As the big powers of the world scramble for the booty, ration starvation, engage in the atomic armaments race, as they bring all the world under the domination of one or two big powers, the task of the little people, the working people of the world, becomes more nearly the same fight against a common enemy: against the imperialist colossi, the United States and Russia, and at the same time for socialism.

That is the only thing worth fighting for.

Is Browder After a "New" Line?

It's tough to be a leader of a Stalinist Party. Here are William Z. Foster, and all the little leaders of the American Stalinist Party. Why, it was only yesterday that they were appointed as the new heads of the Party. Most of them had to beat their breasts so hard that, according to reliable medical testimony, they'll be years recovering from the purely physical effects. Stalin had called for a new change in line, Browder was picked as a scapegoat for carrying out the line dictated to him by the Kremlin bureaucracy, and the CP was handed a new leadership.

They stormed about Browder's revisionism (with which they had agreed until the new revelation was handed down) denounced him as a rat, a traitor, and a general no-gooder—which, of course, he, no less than they, is. Browder was expelled, and it caused all kinds of turmoil. Most of the Stalinist lickspittles held on to their posts by trying to outshout each other on how they had been misled by Browder. But there was trouble and dissension. They lost one of their principal

money angels. Some of their stooges in the labor movement like Curran of the National Maritime Union, tried to kick over the traces. The boys on the cultural front whooped it on Browderism in art, jumped all over Albert Maltz as a malicious Browderite (Maltz finally "confessed" and was accepted back into the fold), and generally went to town.

Now comes disturbing news for the Stalinist gang. BROWDER IS ON HIS WAY TO MOSCOW!

Whether Browder or Stalin took the initiative, this much is certain: nobody gets a visa to enter Russia unless the Russian Foreign Office has a reason to let him enter. It is therefore possible that Browder may come back with a "new" line—the war-time line of super-patriotic collaboration with the "liberal" capitalists. Pending further reports we shall not speculate. But if Browder does come back as bearer of a changed line, heads will roll, and breasts will rattle under the punishment of self-inflicted blows. Is it a wonder then that those who wait you hear from the CPers are cries of anguish.

"Freedom from Want" - -

(Continued from page 1)

For the bulk of Europe, those living on UNRRA bounties, the situation is, of course, not so good as this. Despite UNRRA aid, which is sometimes all the food there is, consumption in more than a third of Greece is currently about 900 calories a day, with an expected immediate reduction to 700, and a likely further drop to 500 within a few months. Parts of Yugoslavia, with native foods enough to provide only a 200-calorie limit, face imminent starvation conditions because of a cut in UNRRA shipments from March to April by more than half, with even less anticipated in May. The average food ration in Austria is planned at 1200 calories, probably much less in certain areas. This is officially justified by Hoover because it is supposed to put the people at the same level as the Poles! And so on, with slight variations in other countries.

The depth of the German "problem" is fully recognized by occupation authorities. General McNarney's declaration that food shortages may mean longer occupation has been widely quoted. The U. S. Zone ration has been decreased to 1270 calories, probably about a hundred more than in the British Zone. General Clay, American representative to the Control Commission in Berlin, has declared that existing supplies, plus imports on the way, were merely enough for a 915-calorie ration. The Russian Zone reports a 1600-calorie standard, but, despite the fact that they occupy the breadbasket of Germany, this figure is not trustworthy. The organized Russian looting, the number of refugees driven from neighboring countries as well as eyewitness accounts by those returning from that area make this seem very unlikely.

OTHER SHORTAGES

This brief survey has been in terms of calories, which express only the most basic, fundamental, elementary purpose of food consumption. This need can be satisfactorily fulfilled by cereal products, particularly wheat. But, as everyone who listens to radio advertisements knows, also necessary are fats and body-building proteins, minerals and vitamins. These are particularly important for children and heavy workers. Fats and allied oils, a little less im-

portant now than in winter, are conspicuous by their meagerness in the food-deficient European countries. The accepted normal minimum standard is 20 pounds of fat per year per person. For the U. S., it is generally almost 50 pounds. For Europe, estimates are from 13-20 lbs. in France to 5 pounds in Italy, and 3 pounds in Poland. The White Russian and Ukrainian Republics, while admittedly possessing sufficient grain supplies, have frantically appealed to UNRRA for immediate shipments of fats and meats. UNRRA accounts of its operations, of which work in Europe is the most important part, announces that 46% of fat requirements were met in the second half of 1945, 3% in the first quarter of 1946. The record for animal and vegetable protein foods is not much better, except for a very fortunate small improvement in dairy shipments. A few statements from a recent advertisement by a Quaker relief organization gives some idea of the results: "Vienna and Lower Austria—Fats, meats, milk, vegetables available only on black market at exorbitant prices; Budapest—no flour, no fats, no milk; Poland—practically no meats or fats, 1/4 pint milk daily for children under three.

Determining lack of minerals and vitamins is less simple. But the results of improper supplies of all these items are readily apparent. The aforementioned remark by Hoover about Norwegian susceptibility to disease almost seems minor. Tuberculosis, sometimes called the "poor man's dis-

ease" because of its close connection with living conditions including nutrition, is rampant everywhere. In Poland, 30% of children have TB. In Prague, Czechoslovakia, which suffered less than most countries in the war and has a better food supply, 40% of a sample group of school children examined had lung disorders. Rickets, the vitamin D deficiency disease, is extremely prevalent in Germany. Infant mortality rates are 25% in Germany; 20-27% in Austria; 25-39% in Poland; 40% in Hungary. Serious epidemics of typhus, influenza, etc., have been thus far prevented only by the sufficient use of DDT powder, inoculations, and to some extent, sulfa and penicillin. (To Be Continued)

1945 BOUND VOLUME LABOR ACTION \$2.50 Each

A permanent record of Marxist analysis of the year's outstanding events.

Order from LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

ORDER FROM: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE STALIN—By Leon Trotsky Price—\$5.00 Per Copy

THE LIVING THOUGHTS OF KARL MARX With Introduction by Leon Trotsky Price—\$1.50*

*Last week's LABOR ACTION by error quoted the price at \$5.00. Please note correct price.

Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14th St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.

DEFEND THE "31"! Arrested in Columbia, Tennessee charged with attempted murder for the "crime" of defending themselves and the Negro Community. Come to The New York Workers Party Defense Meeting SUNDAY, MAY 18, 1946 8 P. M. IMPERIAL HALL 160 W. 129th Street (near 7th Ave.) Room No. 1 SPEAKERS: DAVID COOLIDGE, Labor Secretary, Workers Party NATHAN GOULD, Chairman Veterans Committee, Workers Party PROMINENT GUEST SPEAKERS Admission 25c — Proceeds to NAACP Defense Committee

NEW YORK FORUM: REVOLTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA Indo-China, Burma and Thailand May 10, 9 P. M. Guest Speaker: MILTON MILLER BOURGEOIS CRITICS OF MARXISM May 17, 9 P. M. Guest Speaker: F. FORREST THEODORE DREISER—HIS PLACE IN AMERICAN LITERATURE May 24, 9 P. M. Guest Speaker: JAMES T. FARRELL LABOR TEMPLE Second Avenue near 14th Street

X-Raying the Menace of Anti-Semitism

Its Destruction is the Task of Labor

By JESSIE KAAREN

In this second article of the series on anti-Semitism, we will deal with specific instances of anti-Semitism in the United States and analyze the work being done by various groups to combat it—where they fail and where they can be successful.

Anti-Semitism strikes at the individual Jew in three main spheres of life—employment, education and society. No sooner does the Jewish boy or girl get ready to graduate from high school than he finds his road ahead blocked with signs reading "No college entrance" or "No jobs for Jews here." There is scarcely a large company owned by non-Jews that does not bar Jews. There is scarcely an employment agency that does not insist on the word "Jewish" going down on the application. In the white collar field, the situation is particularly bad. Large utility companies, banks, insurance firms and railroad companies will not employ Jews in their offices. Government offices also restrict the number of Jews whom they employ. One Washington official started an open discussion in the press a few years ago on the necessity for excluding Jews from government offices so as not to exceed the proportion of Jews employed in the population as a whole. This "rationalization" is used very often, as we shall see later on, in order to give a more refined tone to anti-Semitism.

Schools, colleges and universities are among the worst offenders. They refuse to hire Jewish teachers and professors, and only in exceptional cases do they let the bars down. Jewish doctors are hardly ever admitted to practice in any but Jewish hospitals.

During the last depression, an investigator making a study of anti-Semitism in employment applied for 100 jobs as stenographer; secretary and accountant. She was told in 91 cases that as a Jew she was unacceptable.

Quota restrictions in colleges and universities have been an open scandal for many years. Several months ago the Mayor's Committee in New York, which is headed by Charles Evans Hughes, Jr., made a study of anti-Semitism in the schools. The conclusions which were released in a newspaper story and then quickly withdrawn were that in the last decade preceding the war the percentage of Jewish students admitted to undergraduate colleges dropped by fifty per cent. The dean of one of New York's dental schools admitted to the committee that he had repeatedly been ordered by the president of the school to reduce the number of Jewish students admitted. Other college heads admitted to the committee in private that their schools rigidly adhered to a numerous clauses, or quota system.

DANGEROUS ARGUMENTS

Dr. Ernest Martin Hopkins, president of Dartmouth College, makes a frank statement on the subject: "I was in Europe almost immediately after the last war and practically all with whom I talked were discussing the danger of racial antagonism which had been so accentuated in Germany by soldiers on their return finding all of their institutions and all of their professions dominated by a race which numbered only one per cent of the population. . . . So it seems to me will be the case if, in the vehemence of agitation on the part of the Jews of the country for a conferring of rights which, if granted would really constitute special privilege, aggressiveness continues to

be carried to the extent that in the present it is being carried. . . ."

This is the same "logic" employed by Prime Minister Bevin in his statement, ". . . if the Jews, with all their sufferings, want to get to the head of the queue you have the danger of still another anti-Semitic reaction through it all." Another example is the remark made by Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick E. Morgan, head of UNRRA in Germany: ". . . the Jews in Europe are growing into a world force. . . they all tell the same monotonous story about pogroms. . . ."

This mailed fist in the gloved hand type of anti-Semitism is at present more common than the kind practiced by Coughlin, Smith, et al. It is the refined way of saying, "Dirty Jew!" The men who utter these "friendly warnings" are the same who keep Jews out of schools, factories and offices. They are the theoretical leaders of the philosophy of anti-Semitism, the men who could become the Alfred Rosenbergs and Robert Leys of the United States.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

The American Council on Race Relations estimates that there are over 400 agencies for the promotion of better race relations, not to speak of hundreds of community committees, Mayor's committees, etc. A study of the effectiveness or non-effectiveness of these groups leads to the inescapable conclusion that the manifold activities of these organizations are without lasting results.

The reason is very obvious. With very few exceptions, these organizations attempt to base themselves on all layers of the population—to "teach" equality. They attack the outward manifestation of anti-Semitism and not the root of it. There have been some excellent investigations made by liberal and special groups, investigations which revealed that atrocious housing conditions, poverty, unemployment, etc., were the cause of the trouble. But once they expose the condition, the task of these special groups seems completed. For none of them is equipped to attack the evil that causes anti-Semitism and Jim Crowism. The most such an all-inclusive group can attempt is to rectify individual instances of rowdyism.

During the last several years many plans have been proposed to teach "tolerance" in the schools—the Springfield Plan, etc. "The fatal flaw in most arguments, that we leave to the schools the elimination of race conflict," writes Ruth Benedict in her book, Race, Science and Politics, "is that they pose education instead of social engineering. Nothing but hypocrisy can come of that program."

"Whatever is done to fasten fear on a people of a nation, to humiliate the individual, to abrogate civil liberties, to deny opportunities, breeds increased conflict. . . one of the great political advantages of racist slogans is that the underprivileged may use them."

"Until housing conditions of labor and the needlessly low standards which prevail are raised, some scapegoats will be sacrificed to poverty." Another area where liberal, Jewish and Negro organizations spend a great deal of effort is in the legislative field. There have been some very militant campaigns waged on behalf of FEPC and other anti-discrimination laws. But the trouble with these campaigns is that they tend to sow the illusion that the government will actually cooperate in eliminating this social evil.

The temporary FEPC is a classic

example of failure. Not only did the committee find it impossible to enforce its orders, but in a very short while it found itself without a Congressional appropriation. The way the bill for a permanent FEPC was handled in Congress should also show us how much confidence we can place in our liberal "friends" in Washington.

What else can be expected of a government that has its own policy of Jim Crow in the Army; sends out an anti-Semitic lecture as part of the Army's education program; bans such pamphlets as "Races of Mankind" which was issued by the Public Affairs Committee from circulation in the USO and from Army distribution, etc.? It took a few years of agitation before the Great Lakes Naval Training Station stopped segregating men by race, not to speak of hundreds of more serious instances of racial discrimination by the government.

Many more examples can be produced to prove that anti-Semitism and race prejudice will not be outlawed by a government which is itself based on the exploitation of man. It is also obvious that very little can be accomplished by preaching good will or by teaching school children to be "tolerant."

SOLUTION UP TO LABOR

What effective weapons are there, then, for fighting anti-Semitism and racial discrimination, short of overturning the system and setting up a socialist democracy?

The answer is implied in the results obtained from certain direct actions of labor unions and labor organizations. Racial prejudices tend to be erased as men work together for common goals, for in such action they learn that they all have the same class enemy. Unfortunately the CIO and the AFL do not have strong enough programs for rooting out race prejudice and tend to leave the initiative in this work in the hands of those very liberal and racial groups which are by their organizational set-up weaker than the unions are. In those instances where the problem has been attacked vigorously and directly, there have been some very good results.

Though the Mayor's Committee in Philadelphia was ineffective in handling the anti-Negro riots in the transit strike, the CIO was able to educate its membership to a point where six months after the strike, Negro drivers were taken for granted and a Negro was elected to union office. This does not excuse the union for having neglected to correct the trouble before, but it does prove what can be done. The National Maritime Union also does its "educational" work directly on the job. If a seaman refuses to sail with a Negro, he must either let himself be persuaded or give up his union card. When anything unpleasant occurs on the ship, a meeting is called and again either the offender is won over or leaves the union.

The PAC is also successful in getting Jewish, Negro and other workers to forget their prejudices and work together. But the trouble with that group is that it is interested only in getting out the vote for old-line parties and lobbying for legislation. It doesn't take advantage of the excellent opportunities that exist for welding all working class groups into one solid whole, into an independent Labor Party which could aggressively fight all forms of race discrimination. But the fact remains that it is only

within labor unions and working class political parties that workers learn their first big lesson in class solidarity. One strike action that brings Negroes, Jewish and other workers together in the fight or one joint picket line in front of a fascist meeting can do more to erase the "Jews killed Christ" fiction than a million-dollar good-will campaign.

The militant picket line in front of the hall where Gerald L. K. Smith did his rabble rousing in Los Angeles last July—a picket line in which the Workers Party had a proud share—is a good example of class solidarity. Its message was direct. It exposed anti-Semitism as the catch-all employed by fascists and their capitalist backers to sell the workers Nazi terrorism and a lower standard of living.

It is from actions of that type that we can draw optimism for the future. For, if workers can be aroused to the danger of fascism on such short notice as they had in Los Angeles, we know they will understand the need to organize workers' defense guards against the fascist anti-Semitic hoodlums when worsening conditions call for that action.

Seeds of World War III in UN Quarrels

By WALTER WEISS

During the week before Easter the propaganda war in the United Nations Security Council between the American-British bloc and Russia was resumed full blast. So heavy was the barrage of noble sentiments and legal technicalities on both sides that many ordinary citizens had their attention diverted from what the shooting was about.

THE IRANIAN CASE

By the time the Security Council was ready to discuss the Russian demand for dropping the Iranian affair, a new Russian ambassador in Iran had, after a drawn-out process of "persuasion," induced Premier Ghamvani not only to grant Russia oil concessions but also to "cooperate" in many other ways. Finally under Russian pressure, Ghamvani even reversed his former position to the extent of withdrawing the Iranian complaint before the Security Council.

The American and British governments, seeing in this development a triumph for Russian political influence in Iran that meant far more than any oil concessions, decided to win at least a "moral victory" before world public opinion. They came up, therefore, with the theory that the parties to a case, once it had been submitted to the Council, could not withdraw it.

The Russian representative on the Council, Gromyko, thereupon took the noble position that the American-British attitude violated the sovereignty and independence of Iran. He argued in all seriousness that the Iranian government had the right to make up its own mind to be "friendly" with Russia. He accused the Americans and British of trying to use Iran as "a pawn to be placed according to moves in a game." It is all too clear that Gromyko's accusation is true, but true of the Russian side as well. It is clear, also, that the game is being played on a world scale and that Iran is only one of many pawns.

On the intervention of the Russian-backed Secretary General of the

Petition to Nuremberg on Trotsky Gains Thirty-Four New Signatures

John Dos Passos, novelist, Harry Lundberg, president of the Seafarers International Union, Professor Maynard C. Kreuger of the University of Chicago and N. Chanin of the Jewish Labor Committee are included among thirty-four additional prominent signatories to the petition, already published in LABOR ACTION, which is being directed to the International Military Tribunal conducting trials of the Nazis at Nuremberg, Germany.

The petition, also signed by representatives of the Workers Party and the editor of LABOR ACTION, requests a hearing on the frame-up charges made by the Russian government during the Moscow Trials that Leon Trotsky and others were conspiring with Rudolf Hess, one of the Nuremberg defendants, to provoke war with Russia. A similar petition has been sent to the Nuremberg Tribunal by the Revolutionary Communist Party (Trotskyists) of England. The letter containing the second list of signatures follows:

Chief Justice Sir Geoffrey Lawrence International Military Tribunal Nuremberg, Germany Esteemed Chief Justice:

We respectfully wish to call to your attention our petition of March 26th, requesting the interrogation of Rudolf Hess and the presentation of documents relating to the charges made in the Moscow Trials of 1936-1938, alleging that Leon Trotsky and other de-

fendants had dealings with the leaders of the German Government with the aim of inciting war against the Soviet Union.

Permit us to inform you that we have the additional signers to our petition listed below; and also to call to your attention that we have received no reply from you.

Respectfully,
Allan Nevins Professor of History, Columbia University; Alex Rose, Secretary, Liberal Party; Mark Starr, Educational Director, Int'l Ladies Garment Workers Union; John Dos Passos, writer; Katherine Anne Porter, writer; Harry Lundberg, President, Seafarers Int'l Union; William E. Woodward, writer; Helen Woodward, writer; Eugene Lyons, writer; V. T. Thayer, Director, Ethical Culture School; Dr. Paul M. Lambert, President, Springfield International College; Jean Stafford, writer; Professor Maynard C. Kreuger; Elinor Rice, writer; Elizabeth Bishop, poet; Lucy P. Carner; Sarah Cleghorn, writer; N. Chanin, Jewish Labor Committee; Dr. Howard A. Hintz, Brooklyn College; Elsie L. Picou; Margaret B. Malone, Women's Int'l League for Peace and Freedom; Professor and Mrs. Horace A. Eaton; Devere Allen, Socialist leader; Israel Knox; McCullister Coleman, writer; Allen Tate, writer; Dr. Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; Witter Byner, writer; Rev. Henry H. Crane; E. E. Benedict, Woodworkers Union; Irving Salert, Jewish Labor Committee; Lionel Abel, writer; Mary Felton; David C. DeJong, writer. (Titles given for identification only.)

Let's Reach 75% Of Goal Next Week

By NATHAN GOULD, National Organizer, Workers Party
Streator is a small town in the southern Illinois coal mining fields. The Workers Party Local there dates to the founding of the Workers Party. Streater is the kind of a branch which does a great deal of party work and which says very little about its accomplishments. For two months of the Fund Drive we heard nothing about the drive from our Streater Local. This week, the branch came through with 100 per cent fulfillment of its quota. With the check for \$25 came a list of ten workers who had contributed toward the \$15,000 drive. Streater now joins Hibbing, Baltimore and Newark—all 100 per cent branches.

This week brought us a total of \$762 toward our \$15,000 goal. Total receipts to date: \$9,817.18 or 65 per cent of our quota. One month remains.

The most spectacular rise this week was made by the Cleveland and Seattle Branches. Cleveland, Ohio, with a contribution of \$58, advanced 29 per cent to 50 per cent fulfillment, and moved from 18th on the list to 13th. Seattle, with a \$92.82 contribution, advanced 30 per cent to 83 per cent of fulfillment.

San Francisco kept the West Coast pot boiling with a contribution of \$115, taking its place among the branches which are ahead of schedule. Detroit's contribution of \$136 for the week carried that branch forward 11 per cent to 42 per cent of its quota, and Chicago's \$60 contribution inched Chicago forward by 6 per cent.

One month left of the drive. If your branch percentage is under 67 per cent of fulfillment, your branch is behind schedule. Every branch should be 75 per cent fulfilled by the printing of the next issue of LABOR ACTION. Only \$5,182.82 to reach \$15,000.

Table with 5 columns: Branch, Quota, This Week, Total Contribution, Per Cent. Lists various branches and their progress towards the \$15,000 goal.

Totals \$15,000.00 762.00 9817.18 65

*CORRECTION: Last week's listing of the total contribution of N. Y. should have read \$3996.50 instead of \$3966.50. Since this was a typographical error, the total in the column remains unchanged since that total does include the \$30 omitted from the N. Y. "total contribution" listing.

Trotsky Book Critic To Be Subjected to Criticism by LA

After several years of suppression, Leon Trotsky's book, STALIN, a biography of the Russian dictator, has at last been published. The reviews of this book in the capitalist press were the usual mixture of ignorance and prejudice, but one of them went beyond the bounds of simple critical decency. In the newspaper PM, Frederick Schuman wrote a completely Stalinist review of Trotsky's book. We have no space in this issue of LABOR ACTION to comment on it, but in the next issue there will appear an article by Irving Howe on Schuman's review. Watch for it!

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO "THE NEW INTERNATIONAL"

NEXT WEEK: WORLD FOOD CRISIS

By William Barton

17 Quotas Topped Near Drive End

By REVA CRAINE, Press Manager

As this column is being written there are just two more days to the close of the LABOR ACTION Subscription Drive. In the next issue of LABOR ACTION we shall have a complete round-up of the grand totals and the achievements of the Workers Party Branches in the drive. Right now we are waiting for the final scores to reach us.

The New York Local has achieved the largest quota, over 2,000 subscriptions, and its Subscription Drive director assures us that more subscriptions are on the way so that by May 1 the Local will have gone over the top by a substantial margin. At its May Day meeting, the New York drive will be officially closed and the prizes to the highest sub-getters will be presented at a special ceremony. The San Pedro Branch this week

fulfilled its quota and informs us that one comrade alone obtained 81 subscriptions in the drive. Los Angeles wired us that its quota has been achieved in a final LABOR ACTION mobilization.

Special mention must be made of the Newark Branch, which last week had already gone over its quota by some 25 per cent and in the closing week of the Subscription Drive came in with 66 additional subs, thus bringing it to nearly twice its original quota. The newly organized Newark Branch has every right to be proud of its achievements!

In closing the Subscription Drive we are not in any way relinquishing our intention of continuing to boost the circulation of LABOR ACTION—we are merely ending a period of intensive activity organized by the branches of the Workers Party. Sub-

getting remains an everyday function of every member of the party as well as every reader and supporter of the paper.

In the coming weeks, while we are making the final preparations for the NEW LABOR ACTION, the Eight-Pager, we are going to concentrate on getting renewals from those whose subs are expiring or are about to expire. As soon as the enlarged LABOR ACTION appears regularly in June,

Table with 5 columns: Branch, Quota, April 29, Total, Per Cent. Lists various branches and their progress towards the \$15,000 goal.

the subscription rates will be raised to 50 cents for six months and \$1.00 for one year. Until June 15, however, the old rates of 35 cents for six months and 60 cents for one year will remain valid, and subscribers who renew between now and that date can take advantage of this offer. Send in your renewals promptly! Make sure that the new Eight-Page LABOR ACTION gets to you every week!

LABOR ACTION 114 West 14th St., N. Y. 11, N. Y. SUBSCRIPTION: 35 Cents for 6 Mos. 60 Cents for 1 Year Good Only Until June 15. Includes a form for Name, Address, City, Zone, State.

WE ARE GOING TO HAVE AN EIGHT-PAGE PAPER! The thousands of dollars required to make this advance must come from our readers. We appeal to every reader to send us a contribution to make the expansion possible. Fill out the blank below and send it to us at once. Make all checks and money orders payable to LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Includes a form for Name, Address, City, Zone, State, Amount \$.