

Housing Shortage To Become Even Worse Next Year

By MIKE STEVENS

More than 500 public works officials from all parts of the country attending the American Public Works Association's congress last week in Ft. Worth, Texas, were told that the full impact of the housing shortage will strike next year. This statement was made by Frank Herring, director of the land and public services branch of the National Housing Agency.

Herring brought out that the veterans' emergency housing program is being conducted on a very small scale. Then he proceeded to point out that very few homes will be built next year even if building materials are available. He added, "builders will have to go into the market for more land and the land price situation will induce them to acquire new, raw land rather than odds and ends of subdivisions." In a word, landlords who own slums and get high rentals will demand huge prices to sell their property, thus forcing builders to try and build outside the established residential areas. But this is next to impossible because, there are no sewers, gas inlets, schools, fire departments, sidewalks or other public works in those areas.

There are a number of reasons why these public works will not be built. In the first place, the landlords who own the slums and other real estate forces will put pressure on their local governments to prevent it. Second, the veterans emergency housing program which has a priority over other housing is all for privately-built individual housing. This means a lot of small houses scattered over a large area, requiring the outlay of large funds from local governments and utilities for public works. There is not a city in the United States which has as much as raised the question of carrying on this kind of necessary public works.

WHAT COMES AFTER THE NOOKS AND CRANNIES?

Mr. Herring said that house building during 1946, "has been generally speaking, filling up the nooks and crannies of our cities." These nooks and crannies were the only available vacant lots that were already provided with essential public services. What other vacant land exists within these areas is too expensive for house building. Now that the nooks and crannies are filled up, what next?

The cracker-box houses being built under the veterans' program are being put up at a snail's pace, with material purchased on the black market and on land bought at fantastically high prices. The idea that enough of these cracker-boxes can be built to house millions of veterans and thus relieve the housing shortage is preposterous. And if it was possible for millions of these houses to be built, and millions of veterans could buy them, the housing problem would still be very serious. There was a housing shortage and people were living in rat-infested slums even during the war when millions of members of the armed forces were in camps or overseas. There has been a serious housing shortage for the working class for the past 20 years, and with very little building going on during the past ten years, the situation will not be relieved by this individual cracker-box construction.

So long as the people of this country, and especially the labor movement, allow the issue to rest in the laps of the old party politicians and the private profiteering constructors, there will not be enough housing. Only the program of the Workers Party offers a bold and realistic solution:

For a \$250 billion dollar five-year program to provide decent housing at low rental for all and an extensive public works plan to provide schools, hospitals and other needed community facilities.

For a national plan to begin work immediately on the erection of 25 million permanent low-cost housing units!

New International On Many Newsstands

Last week, *The New International* announced a two-month campaign in behalf of America's leading Marxist theoretical publication. The months of November and December have been set aside for the purpose of achieving the following goals:

(1) 500 new subscriptions, to be obtained by January 1, 1947.

(2) A sharp increase in bundle order sales, based upon increased sales and increased newsstand coverage.

The New International is aiming at a monthly sale and circulation of 5,000 copies. Already, Local New York can report a substantial increase in its newsstand coverage. Henceforth, 700 copies per month of *The New International* will be placed on all leading newsstands in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx. Readers of *The New International* living in these areas can obtain the magazine at their favorite newsstand.

NEWARK STARTS

On the subscription front, in the drive for 500 new readers of *The New International*, more branches of the Workers Party have accepted their quotas of subs to be obtained. Other branches are busy at work laying plans for *The New International* Drive and we shall report on their progress from time to time. Newark Branch is already in the

forefront of subscription getters, thanks to the energetic work of the Newark organizer, Saul Berg.

Berg is not one to let the grass grow under his feet! No sooner had the campaign begun officially, at noon on November 1, than Comrade Berg walked into our office, proudly waving around a sub-blank—the first obtained in the campaign! This subscription will go to a reader in Maplewood, New Jersey.

After Comrade Berg had read, as is his custom, all the new foreign papers and the letters on the desk of the Editor of *LABOR ACTION* (with interpolations and criticisms) he brought his subscription to the Press Manager of *The New International* and proudly watched as it was entered and receipted for. Then, following the efficient routine by which subscriptions are handled, he again watched as Susan Drake, assistant Press Manager, made out a subscription plate and filed it away along with other regular subscribers to *The New International*. The first step in the obtaining of 500 new readers for our magazine had been taken, and organizer Berg had something to be proud of!

Next week we will report on additional campaign progress. Let's get an early start on making a success of the drive to expand *The New International*.

The New INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

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

Six Issues — Six Month Subscription — \$1.00

Enclosed is \$1.00 for the Introductory, \$1.00 Six-Month Subscription to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZONE NO. _____ STATE _____

Notice to New York City Readers of

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is now on sale on all leading newsstands in Manhattan and the Bronx. You may purchase your November issue, just off the press, from your favorite stand.

LABOR ACTION

NOVEMBER 11, 1946

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

FIVE CENTS

LANDLORDS START DRIVE TO BREAK RENT CONTROLS!

By EMANUEL GARRETT

On this page of *LABOR ACTION* you will read a story from Chicago revealing the plan of a group of Chicago landlords to raise rents. The same story also reports the activity of the Workers Party branch in Chicago which served to compel the landlords to postpone a meeting they had scheduled.

We ask you to turn to this story, for it is one of extreme significance. The scheme of the little group of Chicago landlords is one that will be repeated, and is already being repeated, on a national scale under various guises and with all kinds of devices. If we are not to suffer the final price swindle of uncontrolled rents, it will be necessary that we duplicate the action of the Chicago WP, but on a much grander scale.

Let us not be deceived. Rent controls are presumably still in effect. We have been deluged with assurances during the election campaign that the government will not yield controls on rent. But it is a pretty feeble-minded child who will put his reliance on the government in this matter, any more than in the matter of meat prices.

NAM Starts Slick Drive On Labor

Capitalists in the U. S. have begun sending their contributions to the National Association of Manufacturers' \$3,000,000 fund-raising drive to cover the cost of its 1947 anti-labor campaign by this association.

The NAM will not have much difficulty in raising the money now that it has promised to use more subtle propaganda than in the past. Up to now its propaganda hasn't been clicking, much to the dismay of the capitalists. Last year, for example, Tide, one of the magazines that goes in for finding out such stuff, conducted a survey among public relations men. These public relations men are hired by corporations to tell the public the wonders of capitalism, and especially the greatness of their particular company.

In the opinion of these guys, all NAM propaganda smelled. Their objections to the NAM propaganda was that it was too obviously in favor of big business and against labor—it wasn't sugar-coated enough. So the NAM decided maybe these hucksters knew what they were talking about. From now on the NAM will use subtle, streamlined anti-labor propaganda when it tries to convince the workers to "love the system."

To convince big business that it's on the ball, NAM has hired a high-priced public relations man by the name of Holcombe Parks. He has issued a 24-page outline of what he intends to do and how he is going to sell the capitalist system to the workers. It seems all the capitalists are excited about the program and the money is coming in heavily.

Well, \$3,000,000 is a lot of dough and the workers of the U. S. can now expect to be flooded with loads of drivel about how lucky they are to be able to sweat away their lives for their good-hearted boss. If you get sick to the stomach in the coming months from reading this stuff—don't say we didn't warn you. And maybe it would be a good idea to renew that *LABOR ACTION* subscription right now so you'll have a labor paper in which to get the truth, too.

It is a dead certainty that the landlord section of the capitalist class is going to demand the same favors given the industrial monopolists. After all, the government is equally well the government of landlords and industrialists. All informed opinion agrees that rent controls are the next to go—and in the not too distant future.

Unless we act now, we will shortly be paying double and, yes, in some cases triple, the rent we are paying now. Some of our readers may consider it a simple matter for *LABOR ACTION* to call for action, the doing of which is something far more difficult. But the pattern of action is not so difficult as it may appear. Of course, it will require something more elaborate and intensive than the action of the Workers Party in Chicago. Yet, that is an indication of what can be done.

Last week in this corner of *LABOR ACTION* we discussed the necessity of organizing Popular Price Control Committees composed of housewives and union representatives. We cited the formation of one such body in Seattle. We tried to explain how the people in any neighborhood can get together to start the machinery of gen- (Continued in editorial column, p. 2)

"Carry On!"



The press reports that Secretary of State Byrnes and Foreign Minister Bevin have agreed to open "exploratory talks" on the Palestine problem in "several weeks." These talks are to take up the problem of admitting the homeless Jews of Europe to Palestine.

There is a cynicism and mockery about this news that simply defies comment. Winter is coming. The Jews of Europe remain homeless, rotting in DP camps, driven by anti-Semitic hordes from the Eastern European countries. Many of them look, rightly or wrongly, to Palestine as a haven. And the British imperialists lock the doors of Palestine, shut them off to the barren isle of Cyprus, indulge in windy negotiations—but do nothing to alleviate the plight of the Jews.

The U. S. government indulges in noble gestures of

sympathy for the homeless Jews, but also does nothing concrete in their behalf. And now comes the announcement of exploratory talks. By the time these talks have begun, by the time Byrnes and Bevin have gone through the rigmarole of diplomatic protocol, the Jews of Europe will be in the midst of another freezing and hungry winter.

LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party, as revolutionary socialists, do not agree with the Zionist political program. But we support, without reservations, the right of Europe's Jews to emigrate where they wish to. That is why we demand:

Open the Doors of Palestine to Europe's Homeless Jews! Open the Doors of the United States to Europe's Homeless Jews! For Full and Unrestricted Immigration!

Chicago Workers Party Balks Landlord Meeting

CHICAGO, Nov. 4—On getting wind of a landlord's meeting to "set a date on which 5,000 South Side landlords would stop buying coal, refuse to furnish heat, lights and gas," the Chicago Local of the Workers Party swung into action on two days' notice and made plans to picket this reactionary gathering.

This landlord project to withhold all services to tenants in a concerted effort to break down rent ceilings, copying the successful tactics of the meat trust in scuttling price control in that industry, had been outlined the previous week at a meeting of the South Side Property Owners Assn. at the Parkway Community House, 5120 South Park Way. They planned to meet again there to perfect arrangements for their "landlords' strike," which would freeze out their tenants—all for the purpose of enriching themselves.

WP PROTESTS

Robert Ferguson, Chicago organizer of the Workers Party, immediately informed the Parkway Community House that the WP was calling upon all tenants to join with the Workers Party in picketing this meeting. Immediate consternation filled the staff of the Community House, which is a well-known center of Negro liberal activities on the South Side, because they had not been aware of the nature of the landlords' meeting scheduled, and did not relish the prospect of housing a crew of such unsavory character as these

profiteering landlords. Much less did the staff desire their Center to be ringed with protesting pickets, many of whom would be Negro workers who frequent the Center.

In the course of building up support for the projected picket line, the WP learned that many tenants who had heard of their landlords' intentions, had spontaneously determined to picket the meeting themselves. If the picketing had actually gone through, the WP is certain that there would have been a tremendous demonstration of mass revulsion against these landlords who are trying to grind further into the ground the already miserably exploited and wretchedly housed Negro workers and small people.

A telephone interview with George C. Adams, Negro attorney and head of the South Side Property Owners Assn., revealed clearly that there is no more RACIAL solidarity among Negroes as a whole than among white people as a whole when it comes to a question of property rights versus the human rights of poor tenants. Landlords, whether white or black, are business men, anxious to make more profits at the expense of their tenants. Mr. Adams cited the fact that all prices have gone up, saying that therefore the price of rent should go up. He felt that the Workers Party should picket OPA rather than his

landlords' meeting, since OPA was "oppressing" the landlords.

MEETING CANCELLED

When told that the WP had no intention of letting the landlords carry through unopposed their vicious and inhuman freeze-out of the tenants, Mr. Adams said his movement was spreading like "wild-fire" locally and nationally; that his group was affiliated with the National Property Owners Assn., which has already begun to act in Seattle to get rent ceilings removed.

He claimed, "When the national organization pulls the trigger, things will happen all over the U. S." He refused to say just when this date will arrive.

Late in the day when the landlords' meeting was scheduled, the WP learned that it had been cancelled for the Parkway Community House. Although Workers Party members were set to go on the picket line with banners reading "Protest Landlords' Plot to Strike Against Tenants," "Don't Let Property Owners Break YOUR Rent Ceiling," "Build Tenants' Unions—Stop Landlords' Threats" and "Billions for War—Why Not for Decent Housing?" the WP felt that its declaration of intention to picket the meeting had brought about the rout of the landlords for at least this occasion. But judging from the mounting national landlord agitation, those picket banners will still need to be used!

Labor Action Forum in N. Y. On the Palestine Situation

How does one answer the survivor of Belsen who told the Anglo-American Committee investigator that if he could not go to Palestine he preferred Hitler's death chamber? What is the role of Zionism? To what extent are Arab aspirations for independence to be regarded in the light of the traditional Marxist analysis of the colonial question? How do Marxists view the question of Jewish aspirations for a homeland?

These and a myriad of other questions arise that indicate not only the timeliness of the symposium on "Palestine" to be held in New York on Sunday, November 17th, but the extreme importance of a question to which glib answers or indifference must be shunned. This lecture, the first in the series of Sunday Evening Forums arranged by the Labor Action School, will be held in the headquarters of the New York Local of the Workers Party at 114 West 14th Street.

Albert Gates, member of the editorial boards of *LABOR ACTION* and *The New International*, will defend the view presented in the resolution of the National Committee of

the Workers Party on this question. Ed Findley will speak on behalf of a counter-resolution he is presenting. Both of these resolutions appear in the current issue of the N. I.

Albert Gates argues in favor of the right of immigration of the Jews to whatever country they may wish to go, including Palestine. However, this resolution opposes the aims of the Zionists as a reactionary utopia. It sees the central issue as the problem of the liberation of Palestine from the rule of British imperialism, and declares for the rule of Palestine by a Constituent Assembly based on majority rule.

Ed Findley, while arguing for the right of self-determination of the Jews through either cultural autonomy or through a territory of their own, sees the solution of the Palestinian question in the establishment of a "bi-national state." He proceeds from the view that the rise of Hitlerism and the consequent anti-Semitism make assimilation utopian.

On November 24th, the second Sunday Evening Forum will present Gunther Reimann, author of "The Vampire Economy" on "The Fate of Germany." Admission is 50 cents.

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

Published Weekly by the

Labor Action Publishing Ass'n

116 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

General Offices: 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117
Vol. 10, No. 45 November 11, 1946

EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD

ALBERT GATES

IRVING HOWE

HENRY JUDD

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada, Foreign). Re-entered as Second Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorials

Landlords Want to Hike Rents - -

(Continued from page 1)

ine price control, combining it with wage actions by the unions. Tenants' committees, as a function of the general Popular Price Control Committee in the given city or neighborhood, or as separate bodies, can be as easily constituted.

Tenants' committees are not a new thing. During the thirties there were many of them, preventing evictions and otherwise protecting the interests of tenants. There are reports today of tenants' committees in many localities organized for various special reasons. However, Seattle housewives bucking the milk gouge, and a scattered tenant or price committee here and there cannot do the whole job, though they can do much of it even on a local scale. It is the kind of thing that must have its counterpart in every community—organized exactly as it was in Seattle: a few housewives getting together, soliciting and getting the support of the local unions.

Nor should we wait until the rent swindle hits us with full force. Rents have been going up despite control! The dodges used by landlords have been elaborately documented in newspapers, without a thing being done except the occasional, very occasional arrest, of some picayune chiseller. There is the dodge of renting at ceiling price, but charging some outlandish sum for a few battered sticks of furniture. There is the dodge of putting a broken-down cot in an apartment, and renting it as a furnished apartment. There is the dodge of demanding a side payment, sized according to what the landlord or renting agent thinks he can extort. And there is the outright steal of compelling the tenant, desperate for an apartment, to agree to more than the ceiling price.

Rank and File Dissent in the CP

The Daily Worker, Stalinist organ, of November 5 prints a long statement announcing the expulsion of eleven members of the Prospect Branch of the Bronx Communist Party. These eleven are accused, as is the usual Stalinist procedure, of every crime in the book: from "semi-Trotskyism" to an "anti-party attitude." They apparently indulged in "leftist deviations" à la Ruth McKenney, Bruce Minton and William Dunne, Stalinist leaders recently expelled by the Foster leadership. These eleven rank and filers apparently took seriously some of the "leftist" talk of the Foster leadership and proceeded to propose genuine class struggle policies.

It seems likely that there are other individuals and little groups of members of the American Stalinist party who have similar illusions—they believe that it is still possible to transform the rotten, total-

itarian Stalinist party into a genuine and democratic revolutionary socialist organization. It is for this reason that occasional expulsions are being announced by the CP.

And, more important, it is for this reason that revolutionary socialists should turn their attention to those rank and file militants of the Stalinist party who, still sincerely believing that they are part of a Marxist movement, are seeking ways to clarify their thinking and activity. Contrary to the fatalistic misconceptions spread by tired ex-radicals, it is still possible, by sustained and patient work, to win over groups of Stalinist workers to the cause of revolutionary socialism. Many of these Stalinist militants are now groping toward political clarity and it is the task of the members of the Workers Party and the readers of LABOR ACTION to help them reach it.

Service, refusal to paint and repair and a million other things with which every tenant in the United States is fully acquainted. Well, not every tenant. The wealthy may find it difficult to find the exact duplex swank apartment to fit their idle selves, but a few dollars more or less for rent or meat or clothes is of little concern to them. We've yet to read of one of them spending the night in a park, though the newspapers have reported more than one veteran, among others, doing just that.

Obviously, the problem of rent is intimately linked with the housing problem in general. The housing crisis has not improved materially in the last year, it has in fact grown worse in many instances. Here, however, we wish to concern ourselves only with rents.

It is not something we can delay, lay aside until rent controls, such as they are, actually come off. The meat monopolists had their way. The landlords will have theirs. Now is the time to block them—by organizing NOW, by involving our unions, by getting together in committees that can make it clear to the real estate interests that a boost in rent will not be tolerated. Unorganized buyers' resistance is beginning to have an effect on prices. Organized action can accomplish infinitely more!

And, specifically in the case of rent, a threat to refuse to pay higher rents, BACKED UP BY SOLID ORGANIZATION, will go a long way toward cutting the ground from under the real estate profiteers. It will do more to impress the government with the urgency of keeping rent controls than a million vain appeals to Congressmen, Senators or Cabinet officials!

Humane Proposal from Notre Dame

The Catholic Church and Stalinist Russia are bitter enemies, as everyone knows, but really not so far apart when it comes to means of attaining their goals. This is not surprising since both Catholicism and Stalinism seek forms of society in which small groups and cliques rule over the "backward" or "heathen" mass of people. Stalinism and Catholicism meet on the field of totalitarian tactics and technique in achieving their ends.

The Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, leading American Catholic and the president of Notre Dame University, is a splendid specimen of the totalitarian Catholicism. This learned Jesuit, addressing an audi-

ence of 5000 in Oklahoma City, proposed that the United States answer those nations which deny the existence of God by "sky-high piles of armaments and bigger and better bombs."

In his speech the Reverend Cavanaugh was obviously advocating an atomic war against Russia. Catholic Missionaries used to visit the Dark Continent and Asia with fire and sword, to convert the natives; but Cavanaugh wants to visit Russia with Atom Bombs simultaneously to convert and send them to Kingdom Come. Perhaps the Reverend, together with Joseph Stalin, should be isolated on the planet Mars, with bibles and bombs to convert one another.

Stalinists Win at AVC Meet

Chicago Progressive Group Shows Inadequacy in Convention Fight

By ROBERT SHERMAN

The American Veterans Committee of the Chicago area has just completed its first convention. The Stalinists reinforced their previous stranglehold on the local administration by emerging completely victorious, their slate winning every office, plus the entire executive committee of ten members. This was possible for two reasons: the way the opposition to the Stalinists functioned, and the method of voting for officers and the executive committee that the Stalinists squeezed through, namely, plurality voting, rather than cumulative voting, for which the opposition fought. Interestingly enough, when the Stalinists were in a minority at the national AVC convention in Des Moines they fought for cumulative voting. Being in a majority here they fought against it.

Opposing the Stalinists was the Progressive Group, composed in the main of sincere liberals who in the entire pre-convention period seemed to be acting out a play entitled, "How Not to Fight the Stalinists."

The sad but familiar pattern was this. The Stalinists had been running AVC into the ground. They tried to tie their "line" around the neck of the organization, even if it meant choking it. Becoming aware of this, a group organized itself into a Progressive Group. Being tender liber-

als they seemed to be organically incapable of tackling any of the issues head on but confined themselves completely to characterizing the Stalinist administration as inefficient.

There were innumerable examples of where the Stalinists were subordinating the interests of AVC to the interests of their line. To cite just a few: they affiliated AVC to the Chicago Council of Labor Veterans, a Stalinist front organization which functions with the Stalinist split off from the regular Chicago Industrial Union Council; they did no AVC work among Negro veterans because, and this from their own mouths, the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America, another Stalinist baby, was taking care of that; they deliberately sabotaged the functioning of AVC on the Grace Hardy Defense Committee dealing with terrorism against Negroes because they weren't running the show and organizations like the Workers Party were involved. In the individual chapters where the Stalinists were in the saddle a policy of avoiding growth was followed so as to allow a firm consolidation of their hold on chapters; in their chapters meetings on Franco Spain were held, speakers from the Chicago Star, a Stalinist publication, were brought down, entertainment by the American Youth for Democracy was put on, pro-Russian resolutions were continually passed.

To all this our light-weight liberals—inefficiency. The Stalinists on the other hand immediately unleashed a barrage of choice Moscow trial language. Red-baiters, reactionaries, financiers, agents of the National Association of Manufacturers, agents of the American Legion, secret insidious caucus, and last but not least, Trotskyites, were a few of the milder epithets. The Progressive Group, as in past organization as at raising issues, came to the convention with its illusions, looking like the outs trying to get in.

The convention itself was a cut and dried affair. Everyone made speeches, even the honorable Mayor Kelly. Outside of the question of voting yes or no on the Illinois State bonus for veterans (which cut factional lines and on which the convention voted no) no real issue hit the floor!

The issue of Stalinism is becoming a burning problem inside the American Veterans Committee, and unless solved on a constructive basis—which means more than red-baiting or talk of inefficiency—the organization will be wrecked and the promising possibilities it now has will never be realized. Organization of the progressive anti-Stalinist forces within the AVC is a prime need; and such organization can look to Chicago for a lesson in what not to do.

How to Pay for a Vet Bonus

The Vets Want One—And the Cost-Plus Guys Can Pay for It

By CHARLES STEWART

General Omar Bradley, at the recent American Legion Convention held in San Francisco lashed out at advocates of restoring the cut in subsistence to veterans in on-the-job and apprenticeship training programs by saying that the veteran was "not for sale." He seemingly endorsed the slogan of the American Veterans Committee — "Citizens first, veterans second."

His interpretation of that slogan is not that basically the veterans aren't a separate class and that their problems, while special ones, could not be solved apart from other working class problems. Oh no! Bradley's idea and now that he has shaken hands with the new Commander of the Legion, Griffith, perhaps the Legion's idea too—is that the veteran be treated exactly like the civilian—no decent houses—no decent jobs—no bonus—no adequate training or subsistence.

The vet of World War II does not belong as does the old guard of the Legion to the upper 22 per cent in-

come bracket—he's interested in security, decent housing and a good job. He doesn't want a handout, but he does feel that in the face of high living costs with subsistence cuts, and few decent jobs available, he is entitled to a half-way decent break. The vet has given anywhere from 2 to 5 years of his life fighting a war. While he was away during those best years of his life, the big industrialists got plenty of guaranteed cost plus profits.

Had the veteran remained at home he certainly would have made some provision for training, amassing "experience" and have a claim to a decent job. It has been estimated that a \$1000 for every year in service would equalize the monetary deficit that the veteran incurred. This of course does not even take into account the psychological losses, the shrapnel wounds, the amputations, the malaria cases. What is wrong then with the vets demanding and getting such a "bonus"? It really isn't a bonus—it's what's coming to them.

Who would and could pay for this? The cost-plus guys—the same fellows who take the bread and meat out of the mouths of the workers by their continued profiteering.

Some weeks ago the veterans from Missouri organized a motorcade to Jefferson, the state capital, and demanded the state bonus and that the governor call a special session. These veterans from Missouri don't scare easily—they have "to be shown." Well, the governor, great De-mo-crat that he is, "showed them" the door.

It is not supposed that the veterans would forget that—they certainly would show it on election day if they had a party to vote for. New York's Re-pub-li-can Dewey has a \$515,000,000 surplus slush fund built up but he can't afford a real bonus. It's about time that the veterans let themselves be heard in their organizations. The AVC, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars can't sidestep the bonus issue any more. The vets would like to see some action on that score.



STUDS LONGAN, by James T. Farrell. Modern Library Giant. \$1.25.

Reviewed by IRVING HOWE

Studs Lonigan is one of the most terrifying novels written in America. It is the culmination of that series of bitter commentaries on American life which began at the turn of the century when Jack London, Frank Norris and Upton Sinclair, influenced by the powerful naturalist tradition of Europe, turned their attention to the social inequities which made a sham of all the talk about "the American dream." This realist tradition in American literature was continued by Sinclair Lewis, Theodore Dreiser and Sherwood Anderson—each in their different ways—until Farrell, in the early thirties, wrote his lengthy study of the life of a young man born in the environment of the "shanty Irish" in Chicago and eventually crushed by it. With Farrell's detailed, remorseless and powerful Studs Lonigan, the literary tradition in which he functioned seems to have come to fruition in America; it has not been as vital since.

Studs is a young boy when the novel opens—a rather frail and quite average chap brought up in a South Side Chicago family where superstition and ignorance prevail. The family is caught in the vice of conformity; its every move, its every habit, its every outlook, is determined for it by what is "right," by what is socially accepted in its lower middle-class environment. Studs, who feels in himself vague sensations of dissatisfaction—feels he is never to be able to concretize, finds this family environment stifling and escapes from it to the Chicago streets. There he is hardened and molded by the influence of the street gangs, the poolroom ethics, the side-of-the-mouth morality. Studs is not really interested in many of the things he does with his street friends; he has no particular desire to taunt and beat up Jewish lads; he has no particular desire to go to whorehouses; he has no particu-

lar desire to listen to lascivious stories.

A LIFE OF DESPERATION

But he feels above all else the compulsion to be "one of the boys"—above all else, to know himself accepted somewhere in this strange and alien world; and so he goes along with the gang, gradually becoming coarsened to the point where he accepts it with hardly a murmur. In the meantime, the depression comes: Studs' family is hit hard; he finds great difficulty in getting a job; his pathetic romance with a pale little creature (whose great virtue in his eyes is that she, perhaps alone in the whole world, accepts him as a human being of worth) is wrecked by poverty and the fear of an unwanted baby; and finally, Studs—by now worn, his health undermined by excessive drinking and debauchery—contracts pneumonia after a futile job hunt and dies.

And there, Farrell tells us, is the terminus of the American dream, there the end of the life of a little man who also wanted to taste some joy and security before going to the grave. This is life in America in the late Twenties and the early Thirties: a life of desperation and helplessness, of chaos and dissolution before the

assault of forces that are unidentified to Studs and therefore full of terror for him.

One of the reasons for the essential success of this novel is that it was written by a man who came within a shade of falling into the pits in which Studs could find no light. Most first novels are usually autobiographical in a direct sense: a painful account of the painful ascent to maturity of the very sensitive young man. Farrell was later to write in this vein and, I think, with much less success. But Studs Lonigan was written with the advantage of its creator being able to establish a certain distance from it, of being able to say: "There, but for the grace of what-you-will, go I." And it is because of that distance that he is able to write with complete objectivity and an essential though subterranean compassion; he is able to allow the characters to develop according to the internal logic of their own personalities rather than as pitied objects of manipulation. After a while one forgets Farrell altogether: the novel has a compulsion, a direction, a movement and an inexorability of its own.

WON'T FORGET IT

Many of the passages are rather barren and dreary. Many of the individual sections seem repetitious. But the reader should understand that the perceptivity of the novel derives from its totality, unlike other novels, where individual passages, paragraphs and phrases bear more perceptivity than the work as a whole.

For, whatever one's ultimate judgment of the value of Farrell's method or the significance of the philosophical assumptions on which his book is based, no one can deny its unity and integration—and that is why most readers acknowledge that its impact after reading is somehow greater than had previously seemed possible. For it has a force and strikes an imprint on the memory which make it an ineradicable experience.

OFF LIMITS

By

James M. Fenwick

THE STALINISTS WOO THE VET

Like the average militant worker, when the veteran begins to think seriously about politics, and the hypnotism of the Democratic and Republican parties wears off, he will often turn to the Communist Party. For him the Communist Party embodies that unclear but earnestly desired vision of a better world usually summed up in the word "socialism."

Thanks to tradition, the anti-capitalist role of the "Communists" in Europe, certain seemingly progressive aspects of the CP program, and the crude election propaganda with which the nation was doused during the recent election campaign, the Stalinists have been made to look like very radical fellows.

And, indeed, on paper at least, it would seem to be true. In their pamphlet "Who Ruptured Our Duck?" they come out for the following immediate demands: low cost housing, maintenance of OPA rent ceilings, jobs for all, decent wages, a 65 cent minimum wage, a permanent FEPC, \$25 a week unemployment compensation, a bonus, cash terminal leave payment, abolition of the draft, withdrawal of U. S. troops from all countries except Germany and Japan, cessation of the manufacture of atomic bombs, etc. The program is certainly nothing startling but it is beyond that of the capitalist parties.

For the realization of this program the creation of a third party is proposed. The final objective is stated to be socialism.

That would seem to be a pretty progressive program. It is—on paper. But that's the program for the sheep. What the program is in practice is entirely another matter. It can be clearly seen in the events surrounding the recent Stalinist-led occupation of the State Senate chamber at Albany, New York.

Seventy-two veterans demanded in this demonstration that Governor Dewey call a special session of the legislature to appropriate \$800,000,000 for desperately needed housing. Dewey naturally refused. The veterans then lamely concluded the demonstration by condemning Dewey and congratulating Mead, Dewey's Democratic opponent for the governorship, "for his promise that if elected he would use most of the \$517,000,000 state surplus for veterans' housing."

OFFER MEAD IN PLACE OF DEWEY

Thus the veterans who had marched from the railroad station chanting "No more promises, we want homes" wound up supporting a promise—an election promise, at that!—by Mead on behalf of a party whose record on housing is not a whit superior to that of the Republicans.

This policy of support to the Democratic Party is a national one and is persisted in even where the very much embarrassed candidates repudiate the CP support in the vilest terms.

In other words, for all its avowed turn to socialism, guaranteed by the expulsion of the "right-winger" Browder and the elevation of Foster to the party leadership, the CP today serves as one of the props of one of the main capitalist parties of this country.

How did this come about?

Two facts have to be understood: (1) the CP is not a revolutionary socialist party, and (2) it serves only the interests of the bureaucracy in Russia. That is why it should be referred to as a Stalinist Party and not as a Communist one.

Right now the Russian bureaucrats, for all their apparent bluster, are interested in avoiding war against Russia. To achieve this they will use any forces of whatever character who may be opposed to current U. S. foreign policy or who are less ferocious in their attitude toward Russia than the rock-ribbed reactionaries.

That is why they support persons like Pepper, Ickes, or Wallace, and large sections of the Democratic Party. This explains their current anti-war stand. They are not opposed to war; they are opposed to the U. S. waging it against Russia. They're not opposed to the use of the atomic bomb; they're opposed to its exclusive possession by the United States. They are for the withdrawal of United States troops from abroad—but not of Russian troops. And so on....

For the welfare of the United States vet they have very little interest. For them, their program of immediate demands which has been drawn up for the vet has nuisance value in mobilizing opposition to U. S. foreign policy in regard to Russia. And little more.

TOOL OF RUSSIAN BUREAUCRACY

The Stalinist Party is the tool of the Russian bureaucracy. In the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact the CP was opposed to the war. For the soldier they raised the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming!"

"When Germany attacked Russia they overnight became the most brazen patriots. Now that the U. S. is orienting toward war with Russia they are again in opposition. At no time have the policies of the Stalinists served the interests of the American worker."

They do not fight for socialism.

They fight for bureaucratic collectivism, whose régime is as brutal as that of any capitalist one which has ever existed.

"Kennst Du Das Land . . . ?"

Life in modern Germany as revealed by Dr. Ernest Beutler, describing the reconstruction of the house where the great poet Goethe was born, which was destroyed during three American air attacks:

"To get wood for the roof," he recalled, "we had to supply a belt for a band saw. To get the belt we had to promise some cement in exchange. To get the cement we had to promise some wine. To get the wine we had to promise to help the wine merchant find an apartment. And we were able to find an apartment because I knew of a woman who had committed suicide because of an SS man."

"At present the library roof is covered with tar paper, but Gen. Joseph-Pierre Koenig has promised to send tiles from the French Zone."

(New York Times, October 31, 1946)

IN LABOR ACTION:

It has been necessary to omit many articles from this to make room for the statement on unity (pages 4 and 5). In addition to an article analyzing the elections by Emanuel Garrett, the next issue will contain "The Woman Question" by Susan Green and another in the series on the West Indies by J. R. Johnson.

The DP's of Europe - - Forgotten Victims of a Rotting Society

By HENRY JUDD

STATEMENT OF COMMANDING OFFICER OF 572nd AAA AIR WARNING BATTALION, U. S. ZONE, GERMANY:

"Displaced Persons (DP's) will perform those deeds and serve those interests we prefer. They will serve, prepare meals, wash dishes, floors, windows, latrines, dispose of garbage and perform other unskilled, disagreeable and toilsome tasks that we may direct. They will perform those duties to our satisfaction or we will throw them out and obtain Prisoners of War as laborers. They will not be permitted to attend the 6:30 show although there are adequate seats. They will not eat at the table with American soldiers. Girls will not enter the Enlisted Men's Club except on Saturday evening. We are not concerned with their entertainment. We are not running a nursery. This is an army base. We are in charge and want them to know it. DP's will receive for their basic 48 hours of service the standard wage rate of 120-150 marks a month. (\$12-\$15 per month—Editor.) Furthermore, we expect them to do a full day's work in exchange for the food, clothing, shelter and considerate treatment extended them by the authorities. Tell them to take the lead out of you know where, or there will be some disagreeable changes taking place TOUT DE SUITE."

In January, President Truman proposed that 3900 DP's be admitted to the United States each month. Actually, until October, the figure admitted each month did not reach 1000.

The expression "Displaced Person" (DP) was first created by the American military authorities. It was a characteristically cold-blooded term, meant to apply to those haunted and bewildered hundreds of thousands whom the American armies drove before them as they advanced into Germany. It has already become one of the self-righteous myths of American benevolent imperialism that only this country tried to handle the DP problem in a humane way and did not treat these people as cattle. With the exception of the repatriation of the French prisoners of war—a comparatively simple problem—this is untrue.

The fact is that 2,885,000 persons were repatriated from the American zone in the eight months from the war's end to January, 1946. A democratic repatriation in which these close to three millions would have been prepared for a resumption of life in their former countries, would have been economically fitted out and readjusted for future work, or would even have been given the elementary democratic right to decide whether or not they wanted to return to their native country—all this was ignored in the haste to get rid of the DP's. Get them off our hands was American policy. As any GI witness to the events will readily relate, these victims of war and repression were herded off the American preserves and dumped onto the hands of broken-down and unstable governments.

THE DP PROBLEM IS STILL NOT SOLVED

Again, contrary to popular belief, the problem and tragic plight of the DP's is still with us. These victims of capitalist social decline occupy an important place on the agenda of the present General Assembly of the United Nations. The end of UNRRA, scheduled for January 1, 1947, demands that concrete measures be taken, but it is unlikely that the UN will provide anything but temporary continuation of the UNRRA camps and techniques. There are actually

three categories of DP's today: those still remaining in Germany who refuse to return to Russian-occupied lands; the Jewish refugees; and the whole new category of DG's (Displaced Germans) expelled from lands long ago occupied by German settlers. Here are the latest available facts on these three categories of human beings, declared by society to be excess and unwanted:

(1) The State Department, on October 25, estimated a total of 1,000,000 DP's in Greater Germany—700,000 located in UNRRA DP camps; 300,000 not in camps. Half of this 1,000,000 total—532,000 to be exact—are in the American occupied zones of Germany and Austria. The other half are scattered over the remaining zones. By far the greatest group of these—353,000—are Poles, the group on which the greatest pressure to return home (to Stalin's Polish stooge régime) is now being put. Many Poles, convinced by their experience that to remain in their present state is to stagnate and sink lower, are reluctantly returning to their occupied land.

Their total possessions, aside from the clothing on their backs, are food supplies for 60 days. In addition, there are tens of thousands of homeless, hopeless people from other lands under Russia's heel—Lithuanians, Estonians, Slavs, Russians, etc. The Russian principle is, of course, that these people must be returned to their lands, to swell Stalin's supply of available labor. The Russians state, in effect, "These are our slaves. We want them back." With the coming collapse of UNRRA, will it be long before these people are swept up in Stalin's labor net?

THE FLIGHT OF EUROPE'S JEWS

(2) UNRRA does not classify Jews as DP's, but rather as refugees. This false distinction is doubly wrong since the bulk of DP's are actually refugees from the Stalinist régimes of Eastern Europe, and since the Jews of Germany, Poland and White Russia are certainly displaced persons without homes or the prospect of absorption into economic-social life. The exodus of Polish Jews to the UNRRA camps is well known, and continues. During September a new peak of 28,000 refugee Jews fleeing into the American occupation zone was reported. An all-time high of 117,000 is now in the zone, hoping for a Palestinian solution to their problem. Altogether, there are 143,000 Jews in Germany and 33,000 in the Austrian UNRRA camps. One out of every five DP's is a Jew, constituting the group next in size to the Poles. The plight of these people has often been described in LABOR ACTION and we will not repeat it.

(3) Finally, there is the enormous, million-numbered category of the dispossessed Germans, thrown out of Russian and Polish-seized German territories (approximately 6,000,000); plus 2,377,000 Germans scheduled for expulsion from the Sudetenland; plus many more hundreds of thousands expelled from Rumania, Hungary and the Balkan countries. By June of this year, 477,000 Sudetenland Germans alone had arrived in the American zone, three-fourths of them women and children. To be more accurate, they were dumped there, much as the 6,000,000 who were driven out of their lands by the Russians and Poles.

In fact, there is little doubt that the fate of these 9,000,000 Germans—scattered at will about this defeated and economically destroyed land—constitutes, in the long run, the most extreme and greatest example of the entire problem.

At the approaching discussion on the problem of Europe's DP's we will again have the opportunity to see how little capitalism, along with Russian totalitarianism, has to offer in the way of hope or relief to these categories of people.

magazine ACTION

November 18, 1946

A Paper in the Interests of Labor

Page 3

Nations Talk Disarmament But Prepare for New War

By J. R. JOHNSON

Once more the slogan of disarmament is being used to disguise the preparations for war. The debate at the Assembly of the United Nations is a cynical and shameful farce.

Said Mr. Molotov: "The time has come to effect measures to carry out a general restriction of armaments... Disarmament will, indeed, respond to the pacifist strivings of our peoples."

Following after him Mr. Austin, representing the United States, says

"The United States is prepared to cooperate fully with all other members of the United Nations in disarmament. It advocates effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means."

We have called the debate a cynical, shameful farce. It is more than that. It is an imposition upon the good sense and patience of the people. For, here, as always, each politician is for disarmament in general. But the moment you get down to disarmament in particular, the lies and excuses begin and the result is always—more armament.

THE THREAT OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

Today humanity fears the atomic bomb as the greatest destructive force that the world has ever known. But the atomic bomb is the result of industrial processes. To disarm, to get rid of the atom bomb in warfare, would require the destruction of the mechanism by which atomic bombs are produced. That is ridiculous. For even if it were destroyed, it could always be rebuilt. Any fool knows that, and the capitalist politicians are not fools. The whole debate about the atomic bomb is one huge bluff, a transparent disguise of the struggle for power.

The United States has the bomb. Russia has not got it yet. Whereupon Bernard Baruch in the name of the U. S. proposes an international atomic authority, an international system of inspection, punishment for those who break the regulations, and the gradual release of America's monopoly.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE BARUCH PLAN?

This plan is fakery from beginning to end. They talk about inspection. What they really want to inspect is the amount and location of raw material in Russia which can be used for the construction of atomic energy. There are conflicting reports. Nobody knows for certain. They want to find out. Then will come "gradual" release of the atomic secrets by the U. S. Who will decide how "gradual" will be the release? With its fat majority on all international bodies, U. S. imperialism will have the last word. And, in any case, in a few years, Russia may possibly have an atomic bomb, too.

But Russia? Russia's proposal is for immediate destruction of all atomic stock-piles, that is to say, it aims at getting rid of America's advantage. But it wants no international inspection or pun-

ishment. Thus the Russians hope to be able to catch up in secret, once they have got rid of America's initial advantage.

Each one of these gangsters knows the aims and plans of the other. But each keeps up a deafening propaganda about its peace aims. It is the universal distrust and wrath of the people which they fear. They led us into World War I with talk of peace, disarmament, war to end war, democracy, and all the old lies. They led us into World War II with the same slogans doctored to fit new circumstances. Here they are again with the same old talk about peace and disarmament. Unless the peoples of the world rise and rid themselves of these greedy, monopolist cliques and install workers' governments, nothing can save us from another World War.

Serious workers must also explain to their fellow workers the long and painful history of all this disarmament talk.

There can be no disarmament under imperialism. It was the imperialist struggle for colonies, spheres of influence and markets that caused

World War I. It was the same rivalry that caused World War II. Never was the imperialist rivalry so sharp as it is today between the U. S. and Russia. How then can there be any disarmament?

SOME HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE

As far back as 1907, to fool the people in preparation for World War I, the imperialist powers held a conference at the Hague about disarmament. Between 1907 and 1914 the armaments piled up and exploded in the War of 1914.

The Congress of the Second International at Copenhagen in 1910 was concerned with the drive to war. But all it could do was adopt a resolution for compulsory courts of arbitration, and general disarmament. In 1912 at Baisle they adopted a resolution calling upon the workers to struggle against war. But as we know, in 1914 they betrayed the struggle. And the whole discussion at the Baisle Congress showed how timid and afraid of revolutionary struggle were these leaders.

It was Lenin during the war who pointed out how hollow and deceptive was all this talk about disarmament under capitalism. Said this great leader of the workers:



"Only if peace is obtained through the pressure exerted by the masses—and not through a conspiracy of greedy diplomatists and reactionary cliques after general exhaustion—will socialism and democracy be able to assert their influence upon the conditions of peace and upon the future constitution of Europe."

He denounced all ideas of the imperialists being able to disarm. The revolutionary workers must seize the power.

"Only in that case can our propaganda in favor of disarmament and the extensive application of arbitration and democratic organization of military forces have the sphere of a pitiful and unproductive illusion."

That is what all imperialist talk about disarmament is—a pitiful and unproductive illusion.

IMPERIALIST BLUFFS CONTINUE

The world struggle of the people did not conquer in 1918. But as soon as the war was over the imperialists founded the League of Nations and began the old bluff about courts of arbitration and universal disarmament. Lenin described

(Continued on page 6)

Can an Authority of "Tough Mugs" Bring Security to America's Writers?

James M. Cain Plan for Authors a Totalitarian Inspired Scheme

By ALBERT GATES

Several weeks ago, James M. Cain, popular novelist and movie writer, proposed a plan to protect the writer, any writer, against unfair exploitation at the hands of book publishers, the movie and radio industries. Arguing correctly that the writers are annually cheated out of thousands of dollars by these enterprises, the Cain plan envisaged a new system of control over authors' copyrights so that they might always retain control over their own creations. His plan, however, has produced a sharp struggle among writers and their various organizations. The cause for the disension lies in the nature of the Cain plan, which is essentially bureaucratic and contains within it dangers that in some respects are as great as or greater than the present evils which confront the creative writer.

Cain proposed the establishment of an "American Authors Authority." This Authority, according to the original plan, would be presided over by a committee of five "tough mugs." The committee would have complete control over the copyrights of all writers. All writers would be forced by the job control of the Authority to join it and turn their copyrights over to the committee; the chief force of "compulsion" over writers would be the Screen Writers Guild in Hollywood. Once the Authority was organized and the Committee of Five established, the Authority itself would have no visible control over the activities of the "tough mugs." The Committee of Five would operate with an "estimated one million dollars" to be raised by a tax on the licensing of copyrights and this fund would be completely at its disposal without the possibility of rank and file supervision.

WHAT IS THE SET-UP?

What will be the means of establishing the Authority and Committee? In exchange for "protection," all writers would join the AAA and turn their copyrights over to the Committee. Each section of the Authors League of America (there are four of them) would select one member of

the Authority Board and these four would choose the fifth member to act as chairman of the Committee. He would be the supreme boss. He would have the power to appoint representatives of the AAA, lawyers, publicity agents, and set salaries, determine expenses, etc.

In this way, claim the advocates of the AAA, the exploitation of writers by Hollywood, the radio industry and the book publishers would be ended; the writer would retain control of his writings through the Authority and remain in a position to earn money constantly from his or her creative work. Explaining



the reason for his own interest in this problem, Cain cited the fact that Hollywood grossed \$13,000,000 on three pictures based on his books which it bought for only \$45,000. In this citation, Cain described a condition which is widespread and there is no question but that something must and can be done about protecting the writer from exploitation by the three main enterprises mentioned above.

Why, then, the severe objections from all quarters, the "right" and the "left"? And why are the staunchest supporters of the plan the Stalinist writers, the organizations under their control and their "action committees"? The answers to these questions lie in the essence of the plan itself which has already been altered several times since it became subject to criticism. Under the blows of many writers, the plan has been revised to eliminate both the element of force to be used against writers and the complete control of copyrights only by the Committee of Five. It now proposed to create a joint trusteeship between the writers and the Committee of "tough mugs." This "voluntary" change is an expression of at least two things: the Stalinist nature and backing of the

proposal, and the thoughtlessness in the original conception of the plan.

THE PLAN'S CRITICS

The most trenchant criticism made of the plan comes from James T. Farrell, who is a writer most conscious of the inequities which exist in the writer-publisher relationship. Farrell has written extensively on the commercialization of writing in this country, the domination of the profit motive in book publishing and the exploitation of the writer. The basic criticism made by Farrell is that the plan proposed by Cain is anti-democratic, i.e., it is a bureaucratic plan which would deprive the writer of independence of action and thought in the defense of his rights. Behind this plan, he pointed out, stand the Stalinists, whose interests in it flow from their political aim of controlling the writers of this country. In the concrete circumstances, the Committee of Five would be controlled by the Stalinists, or at worst they would have a fifty-fifty relationship in it. Knowledge of what Stalinist control of thought and writing means indicates what great harm would be done to creative writing in this country.

Farrell, as well as other writers, points out that the Committee of "tough mugs" saturated with Stalinist ideology could manipulate writing in this country to the advantage of world and domestic Stalinism; it could initiate punitive measures against anti-Stalinists. The reverse would hold if reactionaries were in control. Worst of all, by control of the copyrights of authors, it would attempt to create a totalitarian mold for writers, thus sterilizing all creative talents. The attempt of Cain and his supporters to describe the struggle over the plans as a contest between progressives, i.e., the plan's advocates, and reactionaries and fascists, the plan's opponents, is an example of the mode of thinking of the sponsors of the plan.

But that is not all. The original plan was endorsed by the Screen Writers Guild, although it was "created" at the top or, more precisely, by Cain and the Guild lawyer, Morris

Cohen, a former partner of Maury Maverick, Texas Democrat. Since then the plan has been changed in important respects. Were these changes endorsed by the Guild or discussed by it? Obviously not. The Radio Writers Guild of Chicago accepted the plan "in principle" although it did not see it or read it. It merely acted on a report of the plan. Its acceptance of the plan "in principle" also means that it accepts the changes made in it by Cain and his associates, also without seeing the plan.

The Stalinist writers in New York, through their "action committee," have also adopted the unseem plan and its changes without participating

By MIKE STEVENS

Political developments in Kansas City clearly indicate that the notorious Pendergast machine has been resurrected and that the miracle man behind this revival is none other than the President of the United States, Harry Truman.

Truman owes a lot to the Pendergast machine. The late Tom Pendergast started Truman on his political career. Pendergast controlled Missouri politics with one of the most notorious and crooked machines this country has ever known when he chose Truman for the Senate. Pendergast merely pointed to Truman and Truman was made a senator.

NEVER FORGET A FRIEND

Truman did not forget his benefactor. When Pendergast and 259 of his henchmen were sent to jail in 1939, Truman stood up in the U. S. Senate and defended Pendergast and the whole corrupt political machine. The fact that evidence sky high was public property at that time did not prevent Truman from trying to protect Pendergast.

When Truman was Vice-President he used all his influence to push out

of office all those who had helped cripple the Pendergast machine. Since he became President, he has been giving presidential pardons and restoring citizenship rights to those of the Pendergast machine that had been jailed. He has been doing this for the past 15 months. But to avoid public reaction, he does this very carefully: He pardons only a few at a time.

When Maurice Milligan came up for reappointment as U. S. Attorney, Truman made sure that the reappointment was blocked. And the reason for Truman's objection to Milligan is that Milligan was the prosecuting attorney that sent Pendergast and his cohorts to jail.

"This plan has been sponsored by the screen writers and the radio

writers. While they are the most highly rewarded writers in America, they are also the most unfree. While it is true that the screen writers and the radio writers have struggled to defend their economic interests, it is not also true that they have a good record in the defense of rights of free expression. They have very little free expression in their own work. The bureaucratic board of "tough guys" which they want is to be one which, in the main, concern themselves with monetary questions. The most important money issues arising will be those involving the motion picture rights of books, and concerning the financial rewards from film and radio in general. These facts led me

strongly to fear that Mr. Cain's board of "mugs" will be strongly influenced by attitudes and conditions prevailing in the motion picture and radio industries, and among the motion picture and radio writers. The conditions of their long servitude as hired writers causes me to feel alarmed lest this board would also be too much a Hollywood and radio board, and that it would absorb the ideas that prevail in these industries. Because of this possibility, I am strongly fearful that this board will not offer much hope and promise for poorer and more independent writers.

"In his article sponsoring this plan, Mr. Cain did not offer any valid reason."

(Continued on page 6)

Truman's Political Gang in Missouri

By MIKE STEVENS

Political developments in Kansas City clearly indicate that the notorious Pendergast machine has been resurrected and that the miracle man behind this revival is none other than the President of the United States, Harry Truman.

Truman owes a lot to the Pendergast machine. The late Tom Pendergast started Truman on his political career. Pendergast controlled Missouri politics with one of the most notorious and crooked machines this country has ever known when he chose Truman for the Senate. Pendergast merely pointed to Truman and Truman was made a senator.

NEVER FORGET A FRIEND

Truman did not forget his benefactor. When Pendergast and 259 of his henchmen were sent to jail in 1939, Truman stood up in the U. S. Senate and defended Pendergast and the whole corrupt political machine. The fact that evidence sky high was public property at that time did not prevent Truman from trying to protect Pendergast.

When Truman was Vice-President he used all his influence to push out

of office all those who had helped cripple the Pendergast machine. Since he became President, he has been giving presidential pardons and restoring citizenship rights to those of the Pendergast machine that had been jailed. He has been doing this for the past 15 months. But to avoid public reaction, he does this very carefully: He pardons only a few at a time.

When Maurice Milligan came up for reappointment as U. S. Attorney, Truman made sure that the reappointment was blocked. And the reason for Truman's objection to Milligan is that Milligan was the prosecuting attorney that sent Pendergast and his cohorts to jail.

MORE TO IT

All this may seem to be just a machine politician helping out a bunch of old cronies for old times' sake and as payment for old favors. This is considered pretty legitimate among capitalist politicians, and they do it every day. But Truman has more than that in mind when he gives citizenship rights back to a group of people who are experts at fraud, preventing people from getting to the

polls, and stuffing the ballot boxes with votes from ghost voters. Truman is getting these people to revive the old machine, because now it would be Truman's machine.

Truman intervened in the Democratic primaries in Missouri to purge R. C. Slaughter, who was running for Congress from the Fifth District. Slaughter's only virtue is that he was against the Pendergast crowd. Truman helped defeat Slaughter, and to do it he had the organized and mobilized strength of the old Boss Pendergast machine. And this means a crooked and rigged-up election. In the primaries, the machine also won the nominations for county judge and prosecuting attorney.

Truman's boys did so well that in some precincts the opponents did not get a single vote. But in a few precincts there were signs that some of the old Pendergast boys had gone soft while in jail because when the votes were counted the opposition had as many as three and four votes.

GATHER EVIDENCE

The Kansas City Star, a newspaper which has been in opposition to the Pendergast régime, has been doing

some investigating. It hired a group of law students who interviewed some 8,000 people to see how they voted in the primaries. The reports show that hundreds of people have signed sworn affidavits that they voted in precincts where their votes were not counted, or that they did not vote at all and yet they are checked off as having voted (for Truman's men, of course).

This evidence created enough of a stir that the Governor of Missouri promised to investigate and take action, the Election Board of Kansas City carried on an investigation and the Attorney General had his agents gather evidence.

Not one of these individuals or agencies have come out and said that Truman's boys really won the election. They can't do that because the evidence is pretty damning against the Truman-Pendergast crowd. But neither have these individuals and agencies arrested anybody or publicly announced that the primary election was dishonest and a fraud. Because, after all, Truman is the boss and they just can't go around embarrassing the boss and expect to keep their meal tickets.

To the Convention of the SWP

To the Delegates of the Convention of the Socialist Workers Party
To all Members of the Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

The leadership of your party has finally taken a clear-cut stand in opposition to the fusion of the Socialist Workers Party and the Workers Party into a united section of the Fourth International. Its position is set forth in the statement by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, "Revolutionary Marxism or Petty-Bourgeois Revisionism?" (SWP Internal Bulletin, August 1946.)

In this letter to you we intend to take up, point by point without evasion or diplomacy, all the questions directly relating to unity which are dealt with in the statement of your PC, as well as those which it fails to deal with. We ask you to give patient attention to this letter even though it is a long one. We feel no need to apologize for its length, however, not only because the statement of your PC is likewise extensive but because the problems involved in the unity question are of the most vital importance for building up in this country, and, indeed, throughout the world, a strong, healthy, proletarian, democratic revolutionary Marxist movement. Before we can seriously establish an attitude toward each other, it is indispensable that we each know the positions of the other on the fundamental questions involved. That requires a knowledge of the positions, not as they are said to be, but as they actually are. Whatever the merits of your PC statement may be, it gives

us a welcome opportunity to state or restate the position of our own party on all the important questions that relate to our proposal for unity.

The Trotskyist movement in the United States split into two parts immediately after the national convention of the Socialist Workers Party in April, 1940. The two principal differences which caused the split were, first, the slogan of "unconditional defense of Russia" in the war, upheld by the then majority and rejected by the Minority, and, second, the régime in the SWP which the Minority criticized as bureaucratic conservatism.

Rightly or wrongly—that is not the question at the moment; we shall return to it later—the Minority was profoundly convinced of the tremendous harm that would be inflicted upon the movement by the exclusive presentation of the position of the majority on the Russian question. It was just as much convinced of the correctness of its own position and the need of presenting it to the radical working class public. That is why it insisted upon the right of publishing an organ of its own, after the convention, which while defending the party and its line in every sphere would diverge from it on the question of defense of Russia. This demand, while extraordinary, was not, however, unprecedented. The convention majority rejected it.

Under ordinary circumstances and given a normal party régime, the Minority would undoubtedly have submitted to the decision of the Majority. However, the Minority believed that the circumstances were not ordinary and the party régime not normal. In its view, the avowedly exceptional demand which it made was being converted by the Majority into a convenient pretext for ridding itself of a substantial body of inconvenient and very embarrassing critics. The events that followed immediately after the convention only served to confirm the opinion of the Minority.

best interests of the party. To grant any group of comrades the right to a public organ of its own and every time it decides that it wants one, merely in order to try to preserve party unity or some measure of party unity, in contrast to a definitive split, would obviously be absurd. We take no such position and we never did. It is necessary to weight the choices with the most scrupulous objectivity.

To go by the pure party statutes in a case where a Minority insists on its special demand and the Majority rigidly insists upon the letter of the statutes, obviously means a definitive split, probably of long duration. Obviously, this is an evil. To yield on the formal aspects of the statutes in the same case, certainly means a loosening of the party cords. Here too obviously there is an evil. But such a loosening may, given a wise and politically self-confident majority, avoid a complete disruption of those bonds and lay the basis for re-examining them at an early stage. The weighing of the two must be undertaken in order to arrive at a scrupulous decision on which is the greater evil and which is the lesser.

Can any serious and objective comrade say now—especially now in the light of the six years development of the two groups—that the 1940 majority arrived at a scrupulously objective decision? On the one side there was a decision which could have healed the breach in a round-about and even painful way; on the other side was the split of the Trotskyist movement into almost two equal parts. Surely, you cannot deceive yourselves into really believing that the Minority was composed of "worthless petty-bourgeois scum." Naturally, we had some petty-bourgeois riff-raff in our ranks. Every minority that launches a fight against, among other things, bureaucratism attracts to its side a certain amount of petty-bourgeois or dilettante camp followers. Whoever knows the history of the Trotskyist struggle against Stalinist bureaucracy knows this to be a fact. We get rid of these camp followers without much difficulty. But the overwhelming bulk of the Minority was made up of devoted revolutionists, capable of enduring struggle against the class enemy and for revolutionary socialist principles; it was made up of comrades who played no small role in founding and building up the Trotskyist movement in this country and elsewhere and in acting as its most loyal and not least competent defenders. It had the support of what your PC now acknowledges to have been almost 50 per cent of the party—and even a greater percentage of the youth, a support which it was not easy to gain in the face of the great authority enjoyed by our only real opponent, Comrade Trotsky. Faced with a choice of trying to retain unity with this considerable and important section of the Trotskyist movement, on the one hand, and a split with "a line of blood between us," as your leader said, on the other hand, the Majority did not hesitate. It decided on the cold, calculated split.

Those are the facts of the split, for which we are ready to take our share of the responsibility, even though it is now a more or less outlived question—but only our share.

New Minority in the SWP Fights for Unity

The attitude of your leadership toward a possible reunification, which has not varied in any respect from the day of the split down to the present day, was expressed with brutal candor by your party leader in his article of January, 1945 (SWP Internal Bulletin, April 1945, p. 19):

"If we keep thinking without stopping half-way we must recognize that our estimate inexorably leads us either (1) toward reconciliation and unity, or (2) toward a deepening of the split. The discussion is not completed until that question is decided and reasons given for the decision.

"We, on our part, assume that the course toward deepening of the split is necessary and correct; our attitude flows from that."

The conduct of the SWP leadership throughout the past year and a quarter since the question of reunification was first raised can be understood—and all its maneuvers, evasions and diplomatic tricks can be understood—only if you understand the real line of the SWP leadership as expressed in the above formula: "The course toward deepening of the split is necessary and correct; our attitude flows from that."

All the letters sent us on the unity question by the SWP leadership, all the motions and resolutions it adopted on that question, the two discussion meetings in which it engaged with us—all these, from start to finish, were nothing but "tactical maneuvers" calculated to serve "the course toward deepening of the split." This is not hard to demonstrate.

The initiative in reopening the question of unity between the two parties was taken more than a year ago by the SWP Minority led by Comrades Goldman and Morrow. The proposal to take so much as the first steps toward eventual unity was harshly and promptly rejected by the party leadership. In his speech to the New York SWP on July 25, 1945, Cannon dealt the proposal the following categorical rebuff:

"The proposal for 'unity with the Shachtmanites' is not a concrete and realistic proposition for our party at the present time. The attitude of the Shachtmanites—an attitude which springs from political considerations—rules it out. And the formula of the Minority is especially inept, untimely and unrealistic." (SWP Internal Bulletin, August 1945, p. 25.)

The Detroit plenary meeting of the National Committee of the WP reacted quite differently to the initiative taken by the SWP Minority. Without diplomacy or evasions or equivocations, it adopted by unanimous vote a resolution in favor of discussing the question of unity with the SWP. In doing so, it did not find it necessary to do violence to any position it had taken in the past.

Why not? What had changed? The resolution of our National Committee declared frankly that "our estimate and criticism of the official régime maintained by the representatives of the Majority in the SWP has not been changed." But, as we reminded you before, it was not the question of the régime in the SWP, or rather not that alone, that caused the split in 1940. The question of the régime assumed decisive importance in causing the 1940

What was the course of the two parties' and their respective leaderships after the split? We did not conceal our old differences with the SWP. We did not artificially create new ones; nor did we artificially suppress those new differences or extensions of old differences which arose in the course of the class struggle. We sought at all times to engage your party representatives in public discussion; without, it is true, much success. With due regard for loyalty in debate, such as we always insist upon in our inner party discussions, our polemics against your party position were often very lively and even bitter. Yet, at all times, we sought to maintain a fraternal attitude toward the SWP as an organization of the Fourth International. Regardless of how you judge the practical expediency of our proposals, you must know that we repeatedly proposed to your party leadership practical collaboration and united fronts on one question after another even though nine times out of ten your leadership did not find it necessary so much as to reply to our proposals. We never engaged in picaresque maneuvers or cheap diplomacy toward the SWP. We never concealed our views or our criticisms, and all our proposals for united activity, be it in the Minneapolis case, the fight for second class rights of THE MILITANT or a dozen other cases, were forthright and unequivocal. We bent over backward to avoid the intensification of a hostile relationship between the members of the two parties.

Your party leadership took the opposite course. It tried to ignore our existence altogether, but without much success. It studiously ignored every proposal for collaboration as much as it possibly could. It sought (and still does seek) to create the most bitterly hostile personal attitude between its membership and ours. For all practical purposes it instigated and encouraged the odious system of "non-fraternization" between comrades of the SWP and of the WP. It felt so unsure of its own ideas and of the "infectiousness" of our ideas for any SWP comrade who came in contact with them, that it left few stones unturned to prevent such contact. Apprehension that such fraternal contact would cause a reconsideration of the split and the differences that caused it, also prompted the SWP leadership to pursue this course of deepening the hostility toward the WP.

At the October, 1941, Plenum conference of the SWP, in pursuance of the same course, which we readily acknowledge has been a consistent one, your leadership adopted a resolution declaring that the condition for winning the Stalinist workers or any other group of workers "is the prohibition (!) in our own ranks of any sentiment of conciliation toward the degenerated petty bourgeois clique of Shachtman and company." Where did your leadership borrow the language and method embodied in the phrase "prohibition of any sentiment of conciliation"? Where did it borrow the method which resulted, only recently, in bringing four young New York comrades up on charges for the crime of "fraternizing" with members of the Workers Party? It is only where ideas are weak and hard to defend that their proponents find it necessary to resort to "prohibitions" against ideas which are strong and easy to defend.

A Bureaucratic Demand on Minority Group

At the very first meeting of the PC after the convention—after the newly elected National Committee had assigned the various comrades of the Majority and Minority to their various posts and responsibilities—the Majority confronted the Minority with a resolution which has no precedent whatsoever in the history of our movement. To find its equal you must look in the annals not of the early Stalinist movement but of the Stalinist movement in its worst period. This resolution did not charge the Minority with any overt act against the party, not even with any act of indiscipline, not even the violation of the most insignificant rule or statute of the party. The first part of the resolution of April 16, 1940, provided "that the Committee accepts the convention decisions and obligates itself to carry them out in a disciplined manner." We did not vote for this resolution and we did not vote against it—we abstained from the vote.

It is not necessary for us to justify our abstention here. You may consider that we were entirely wrong in abstaining. But who can contest our inviolable right to have voted on this motion as we saw fit? Any member of the party at all times has the right to vote for or against a proposition or to abstain in the vote. If a majority can at any time dictate to a minority that the latter must vote for any proposition of the former, then obviously you no longer have a party but a mechanical voting machine operated from above.

Yet, it was precisely this elementary right that was contested by the majority at the same meeting of the PC. The second part of the resolution it submitted provided that anyone who fails to vote "for," is automatically suspended from all party posts and rights in such a manner as to make the "suspension" equivalent, to all intents and purposes, to an expulsion—an expulsion or "suspension" without so much as a trial or hearing! And inasmuch as the Minority in the PC failed to vote "for" the first proposition it was declared automatically suspended from all posts and rights in the party. The same procedure was immediately practiced against all the supporters of the Minority in the party branches. The SWP was effectively split!

Have you ever heard of such a procedure in all the history of our movement? Have you even ever been told by the party leadership that this is the procedure it followed toward the Minority in 1940? You know the answer to both questions. The first part of the infamous resolution was finally made public by the SWP leadership in the introduction to Trotsky's "In Defense of Marxism" by Hansen and Warde. Why did they stop with the first part? Why didn't they make public the text of the second part in that introduction? Why has it never been made public anywhere else? Does your leadership feel a sense of shame at this blatant aping of the Stalinist principle that the price of membership in the party is a vote "for"? Does it feel that the publication of the second part of the resolution would give a truer picture of how the split in 1940 actually came about? That its publication would help dispel many of the legends which it has woven around the circumstances of the split?

Your PC statement speaks at great length about the 1940 split. Why does it not give all the facts? Why does it not quote from its April 16, 1940 resolution, or even refer to it? He who does not have the whole of the relevant facts cannot reach the whole

of a relevant judgment. Demand that the resolution be made available to you in full! You are entitled to it.

We have already spoken of the two main causes of the split. But it was the April 16, 1940 resolution which actually precipitated the split. The plan of the Majority to get rid of the critics of the party régime was clearly evident before then. The course and tone of the Majority reflected a predetermined line for our expulsion. This required no special perspicacity on our part to anticipate an attempt to get rid of us on one pretext or another, although, we admit, we did not anticipate that the measure would take such an outrageous form. We have no desire, therefore, to conceal the fact that we prepared for any eventuality so that no measure taken against us would catch us by surprise. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that this effective expulsion of the Minority took place without any charge whatsoever of indiscipline; that it took place before we had published the first issue of LABOR ACTION; that it took place before we published the first issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL under our own auspices. Our expulsion was clearly the result of a plan to get rid of critics of the party régime on one flimsy pretext or another.

As we saw it, and as we said at that time, an expulsion or split of the party should have and could have been averted if the Majority had been genuinely and intelligently concerned with maintaining unity. That is the case even if every characterization of the Minority held true—that it was "petty bourgeois," that it was "yielding to the pressure of bourgeois public opinion," etc.

During the Brest-Litovsk period of the Russian Revolution, the so-called Left Communists, headed by Bukharin, Radek and others, published their own independent press and attacked the party and its leadership in the most violent and unrestrained terms. That was at a time when the fate of the revolution literally hung by a hair. Lenin characterized the Left Communists as "petty bourgeois phrase mongers" and the like. He had good grounds for this designation. They formed a bloc, for all practical purposes, with the Left S. R.s, a non-Marxist, petty bourgeois current. He spared them as little as they spared him, but he proposed no organizational measures against the clear violation of the party statutes by the Left Communists. He did not propose a formal banning of their independent press and party committees. Although not an advocate of unity-at-all-costs, Lenin was sincerely and wisely concerned with unity. He had confidence in the power of his own views, confidence that they would persuade at least the bulk of the Left Communists in good time. When Bukharin refused to serve on the Central Committee because of the differences, Lenin insisted that he remain a member, right in the face of the fact that Bukharin had set up a "rival" press and "rival" party committees. Before too long not only did Lenin's views triumph but his method triumphed as well. The breach was healed; party unity was restored; the crisis was overcome with a minimum of damage.

Naturally, the situation in the SWP in 1940 was not identical with that of the Bolshevik Party in 1918. Everything must be examined with due regard for the differences in proportion. But if anything, Lenin's method was even more clearly indicated for 1940 in the United States than for 1918 in Russia. The fate of the revolution in the United States did not hang by a hair in 1940!

An Indictment of the Cannon Regime

Why was the Minority so insistent in its proposal that, if defeated at the convention, it have the right to publish a periodical of the kind we have described? In a letter of February 20, 1940, to the Cleveland conference of the opposition Comrade Trotsky wrote us that "the future Minority can ask for certain reasonable guarantees for its ideological existence and we believe that the future Majority should grant these reasonable guarantees in order to prevent a premature and not unavoidable split." The difficulty, however, lay in the fact that the Minority believed that the presentation of its point of view on the vital question of the Russian defense slogan to the radical working class public was necessary in order to moderate the disastrous consequences of the Majority position on this question; that only in that way could the Minority remain loyal to its ideas and the interests of the working class and thereby to the Fourth International itself. But not only that. The trouble lay further in the fact that the Majority not only offered no "reasonable guarantees," but that our bitter experience during the dispute in the party had already removed any grounds that we may have had for placing confidence in any "guarantees" of genuine party democracy that the Majority might give us. The reason for this conclusion cannot be better stated than by quoting from a document issued by the Minority on March 9, 1940:

"Is there the slightest ground for believing that the Cannonites would grant us, if we prove to be in the minority at the convention, those 'reasonable guarantees for ideological existence' of which Trotsky speaks? For what reason should any party member place the slightest confidence in the loyalty or in the adherence to the principles of party democracy of the Cannon clique? (1) It sought at the very beginning to prevent a discussion entirely, calling it a 'luxury we cannot afford.' (2) When it was finally compelled to open a discussion, Cannon moved that it be confined to one membership meeting of the New York local. (3) Although the last Political Committee meeting steam-rolled through a motion 'recommending' another discussion-debate membership meeting of the New York local (we proposed to refer the question to the City Committee, whose record in organizing the fullest and most democratic discussion is flawless, and which has since organized the meeting 'recommended' by the PC), the same Cannonite PC has never voted to 'recommend' the holding of a discussion-debate membership meeting of the Minneapolis or Flint locals. Just the contrary. The Cannonite controlled Michigan-Ohio District Committee has just sabotaged to death the district membership meeting at which official representatives of the two groups were to debate before the

Youngstown-Cleveland-Toledo-Detroit-Flint membership. (4) The Internal Bulletin has been progressively 'weighted' against the Minority's documents and articles, especially in the latest issues. Now the Bulletin is, in effect, completely suspended. (5) The Socialist Appeal was denied to the Minority in the pre-convention period on purely Stalinist grounds. Instead of a discussion in its columns, the Cannonites have devoted themselves in editorials and articles to a dirty, insinuating, underhanded and disloyal polemic against us without our having the opportunity to reply. (6) A petty, typically Stalinist censorship of articles has been introduced against the Minority in the Appeal, specifically against the column of Comrade MacDonald who was not even allowed to quote the official Stalinist statement that the Kremlin does not aim to Sovietize Finland. (7) Even the New International was closed to the Minority, on the most hypocritical and dogmatic grounds. The last issue was filled with the Cannonite demagogical without a word appearing from our side. At the last minute, a decision is made to make the coming issue of the New International a 'discussion' number, which will appear just in time to greet the delegates after they have been elected. In this 'model' discussion number, at least two-thirds of the space is to be given the Majority position. This decision is presented as a 'concession' to the Minority. Fraudulent claim! Its purpose is not the preservation of the democratic rights of the Minority, but the preparation of the split. On the eve of driving us out of the party, the Cannonites are 'preparing the sympathizers' of the party by making public, among other documents, Trotsky's fierce attack on the Minority, 'From a Scratch to the Danger of Gangrene.' Trotsky's authority and prestige are being used in the hope of 'discrediting' the Minority, of psychologizing the party sympathizers into accepting the already-prepared expulsions.

"Who can seriously ask the Minority to place the slightest confidence in the Cannonites after this? What are the 'reasonable' guarantees they offer? Their reply to our resolution on Party Unity simply does not offer any. Trotsky speaks of the 'exceptional' situation. Cannon replies: Submit and shut up!

"That is one of the main reasons why the Minority insists on the right of either group, if it is not victorious at the convention, to publish a political organ if it so desires."

No, we did not contend then and we do not say now that the regular statutes of the party provide for the issuance of any public organs by a Minority of the party. Statutes, however, do not exist as an end in themselves. They should be enforced, at all times, but enforced intelligently and always with an eye to the

How They "Opened the Door" to Unity

After the receipt of our resolution, your PC wrote us its first letter on the question. It boiled down to the following: It is in favor of discussing the question of unity; it would like to hear from us "more precisely and more concretely" our view of "how the unification should be brought about and what form it should take"; it would like to know if we would abide, in the united party, by the principle of subordination of a minority to a majority; and it would like to have some assurances that the unity would be serious and durable and would not be followed by another split.

Was your PC aware then, as it is now, of the theoretical and political differences between us and the SWP? Of course! Aware of every single one of them! Aware of the depth and scope and significance of every single one of them! They know our positions from our press and our political documents which they carefully read, and they knew them then. They have known them so well all through the past six years that they have repeatedly attacked them and dissociated themselves from them—rightly or wrongly, ably or badly. If this is true, and it cannot but be true, it is decisively important to bear the following point in mind:

Knowing these differences, knowing their significance and, what is no less important, knowing that we had no intention of abandoning our positions merely upon request, your PC nevertheless considered it possible to open up discussions with us on the question of unity.

What is the meaning of this? It clearly means that your PC

split only in connection with the vital important political question of the active propagation of the slogan of unconditional defense of Russia in the war. As has been indicated above, the Minority would have been quite prepared to subordinate itself without question even to that régime, which it characterized as bureaucratic if the political question at issue was an "ordinary" one, one that did not have in its eyes the decisive importance of the Russian question. What was new in the middle of 1945 was precisely the fact that the slogan of unconditional defense no longer had the same decisive significance so far as the SWP was concerned—at least that is how it appeared to be formally. Our resolution took note of this fact when it said:

"The principal ground given in the resolution (of the SWP Minority) for unification of the two parties is that the main political question in dispute in 1939-40, which led to the split in the SWP and the formation of the WP, namely, the difference over the slogan of 'unconditional defense of the Soviet Union,' is today no longer as acute and topical as it was when the dispute first arose; and that the two parties today have a similar position on the main task in Europe, namely, defense of the European revolution from the threat of Stalinism and Anglo-American imperialism."

"(2) The National Committee also takes note of the fact that the SWP itself has officially taken the view that the slogan of 'unconditional defense of the Soviet Union' does not, at the present time, occupy the prominent position it was given at the beginning of the war, that it has receded into the background."

At the same time that we noted the diminution in the antagonism between the two positions, we also noted, with the same frankness that has characterized our conduct throughout this whole question, that

"... We still have important differences with the SWP on a number of political and theoretical questions. However, the range of these differences does not go beyond what is permissible within the ranks of a single revolutionary party."

Consistent with the above, our resolution concluded that "... The interests of uniting the Fourth Internationalists in the United States on a sound foundation are more important than the régime in the SWP."

"(5) The Workers Party is therefore prepared to discuss the question of unity with the Socialist Workers Party."

In the face of this clear-cut resolution, which we immediately communicated to the SWP, its leadership could no longer evade formal measures—or, more accurately, formal and empty gestures—in response to the initiative of the SWP Minority and the support given it by the Workers Party. It opened the door to a "discussion" of the unity question by a thin little crack only in order to slam it all the tighter when it seemed convenient to do so, only in order to "deepen the split." When you see how this was done, you will understand that the latest statement of your PC against unity is a document of such political hypocrisy, misrepresentation and malice as has few equals in the history of the movement.

This is further confirmed in the speech to the New York SWP on September 2, 1945, in which Cannon, speaking for the PC, declared:

"But now, when the Shachtmanites write us a letter and say that they want to discuss unity, and that the very basis upon which they justified their split for five years—the kind of a party we have, our so-called 'regime'—could be subordinated; then the PC could not do otherwise than say: Very well, we will examine your propositions; we will discuss unity with you.

"Are we for unity, Goldman demands, or against unity? We say, we will see. We will see what develops from this sudden change of position of the Shachtmanites after five years. If it is sincere, if it represents a real change toward us, and a really serious and honest approach toward reunification, on the basis they rejected before, we will reexamine it closely before giving a definite answer. That

What Are the Facts on Unity?

is the only attitude the party leadership can take at this stage of the developments." (SWP Internal Bulletin, September 1945, p. 18.)

Read this twice over. Compare it with the latest statement of your PC which so categorically rejects unity with the Workers Party. Why is unity rejected in this statement? Because the WP holds a position on a whole series of theoretical and political questions, the sum of which makes it a "petty bourgeois organization both in its composition and the class roots of its ideology" and therefore incompatible with membership in the Fourth International or any of its sections.

It is simply necessary to ask: When did your PC discover all this? Only a few weeks ago—or has it known this horrible fact all along? Has it known it at least since it received our resolution in favor of discussion of unification more than a year ago? We will not belabor the obvious. Our position and our activity in the past six years is not a recent discovery by your PC. We have not cancelled out this activity in the last few months nor have we liquidated our theoretical and political positions in that time. Is it not clear that the reasons now given by your leadership for the undesirability and impossibility of unity were likewise present and known a year ago? If these reasons are valid now as conclusive

arguments against unification, they were, they must have been, just as valid a year ago and more. If your PC is so categorical against unity now, why was it not just as categorical a year ago? Our "betrayal" of Russia does not date from yesterday but from 1940. Our "crime" of "splitting" was not committed in the last year but more than six years ago. Our "betrayal" of China (and India and half of the rest of the world) is a "crime" of long and well-known standing. Our alleged abandonment of the revolutionary socialist perspective in Europe is not something new, is not something recently dug up by the archeologists of your PC. The same holds true of all of the other sins listed to demonstrate the impossibility of fusion.

Why, then, we repeat, was your PC ready to sit down to discuss the question of unity with us a year ago, but now finds it absolutely excluded from the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism? Why did Cannon a year ago find it impossible to answer Goldman's question as to whether he was for unity or against it, and replied instead: "We will see"? What was there to see a year ago? Our theoretical and political positions? Our record of activities during the war? They were already "seen," your leadership knew exactly what they were.

as well as against us, that these were practiced—is a typical bureaucratic crime.

If the Trotskyist movement in the United States today continues to be divided into two rival sections, the responsibility for that rests solely and exclusively upon the shoulders of the leadership of the SWP. That conclusion is inescapable.

To all that has been outlined above, the statement against unity adopted by your PC (28 printed pages) does not make one single reference. The record of more than a year of discussions and proposals on the question of unity, embodied in numerous documents, is not only not evaluated but is simply not mentioned. So far as your PC statement is concerned, this record just does not exist. This silence is inexcusable but not incomprehensible. We understand it perfectly.

The statement confines itself to a presentation of the theoretical and political differences between the two parties. It attempts to establish the conclusion that "the Workers Party is a petty-bourgeois, centrist, ingrown sect, moving ever swiftly away from Marxism toward left social democracy." For your PC, this conclusion is meant to be synonymous with a categorical rejection of the idea of unity with the WP.

For all our criticism of it, we welcome this presentation of the differences. It is indeed high time that your leadership attempted to come to grips, directly and systematically, with the views of the WP. It is high time that you, the membership of the SWP, become acquainted with the views of the WP. Up to now our views have been concealed from you by your leadership, or else your leadership has grossly misrepresented them to you. For this we require no more proof than is amply provided by your own leadership. It is a fact that we establish with deep regret but it is a fact.

In its letters to the Workers Party of April 10, 1946, your National Secretariat presented us with a list of questions on our position, drawn up in motions adopted by your PC on April 9th. These questions, eleven in number, are aimed to elicit from us a statement of our position on a whole series of questions in dispute between us for the past seven years. We responded readily to the request of your Secretariat, as you can see from our letter of April 30th, which is reproduced at the end of the bulletin containing the anti-unity statement of your PC. But in this connection the question arises: Why did your leadership require from us a statement of our position? Doesn't it know what our position is? Naturally, it does. One of the motions of your PC refers to the "above list of questions which in our opinion are in dispute between our party and the WP." A statement of our views, therefore, is not required by your leadership, inasmuch as it knows what these views are and knows that there is a dispute between us on them. Obviously, then, the statement of our views is necessary for the clarification of the membership of the SWP. If that is the case, and we certainly believe it to be, it follows clearly enough that the membership of the SWP is unacquainted with our position. Its failure to be informed about our views is not due to any lack of effort on our part. It is due only to the persistent efforts of the SWP leadership to conceal our views from you.

And if the SWP membership requires a statement of our views for its clarification, how shall we regard the argument made by your representatives in the two discussion conferences we held with them? There they indicated that it was not they who were hostile to the idea of unity but rather the rank and file of the SWP. If that is true, we must ask what is the basis for the hostility—that which we know really exists as well as that which is merely alleged—toward unity with the WP? Is the hostility based on a violent dis-

The Struggle for Unity Continues Nonetheless

We urge upon you as careful an examination of the document that we are preparing as you should give to the statement of your own PC. Thus we will fulfill our duty toward you and you will fulfill your duty toward yourselves as thinking revolutionists.

In this document you will find a reiteration of the views that we have put forward since the question of unity was posed and which we repeat here:

In spite of these differences, we of the Workers Party believe that unity is possible, desirable and necessary. Unity of the Trotskyist movement in the United States would give a great impulsion to the self-confidence and growth of our still very weak Fourth International. Unity here would make it possible for the new party to take a leap forward in the class struggle in this country, which has opened up such splendid opportunities for the growth of the class consciousness of the proletariat and of the influence of the revolutionary Marxists in that proletariat.

We can be and are in favor of unity, in spite of the differences that exist between our parties, because we have a different conception of the party than your leadership has. We do not deny it. On the contrary, we want to underline this difference. We are consciously trying to build a party which is based firmly on the principles and traditions of revolutionary Marxism and which, precisely because of that, provides for the most genuine and not merely formalistic party democracy. Party democracy, from our point of view—and we consider that point of view to be in absolute harmony with the best traditions of the authentic Marxian movement—calls for the strictest observance of discipline in action precisely because, given the firm principled foundation of the party, it provides for the freest interplay in the party of all opinion which stands on the basic principles of Marxism, and consequently provides for genuinely free and critical expression, discussion and debate.

We reject categorically and indignantly all those who hold that Bolshevism was not democratic, that the genuine Bolshevik Party was in the remotest way comparable to its present day Stalinist antithesis. That is why we aim to build a Bolshevik party, for only in a Bolshevik party is it possible to have that free and fruitful interplay of ideas even when those ideas take the form of tendencies and even factions. That is all that is meant by those of our comrades who employ the term an "all-inclusive revolutionary party," that is, an utterly Bolshevik party in which true party democracy is cherished with the same passion that monolithism is abhorred.

Your leadership, on the other hand, is opposed to unity with us precisely and above all because of our conception of the party which, we do not hesitate to say, we would seek to instill into the very blood of the united party if it came into existence. It is nonsense to think that the opposition to unity is based on the differences between us on the Russian question, the national question, or the other questions which are dealt with in the statement of your PC. We do not say this because these questions are not important. They are of tremendous importance, they are of vital importance, but in the eyes of your leadership they fade into unimportance compared with the question of its conception of the party. It has the conception of a monolithic party. That is what it means when it speaks of a "homogeneous" party. That conception acquired currency and supremacy in the Communist movement after the usurpation of leadership in it by the Zinoviev-Stalin faction, after the death of Lenin, after the launching of the reactionary struggle against "Trotskyism." The Zinovievist preaching of a "homogeneous" and "monolithic" party marked and symbolized the beginning of the end of Bolshevik Party democracy—and what that end is we all know. We cannot consider it a mere coincidence that the leader of your party, the one who sets its tone and course, was one of the principal "Bolsheviks" in the Zinovievist style in the Communist movement of a score of years ago. It is not his course then that is so reprehensible; it is his repetition of his course today in the Trotskyist movement that is reprehensible.

The statement of your PC continually sneers at our party for being a "discussion club," not because it is against a discussion club but because it is against discussion which upsets the comfortable routine of the party bureaucracy. It sneers at the fact

agreement with our views? But you can disagree, or agree, only with those views that you know. Otherwise, it goes without saying, you cannot be a serious revolutionist, but only an instrument in the hands of leaders who simply tell you what to do for and what to be against. Unfortunately, the request of your Secretariat for a statement on our position on all the questions in dispute to serve "for the information of the party members" and for the "clarification" of the differences, leads to the absolutely inescapable conclusion that the membership of the SWP has not been informed of our views and is not clarified about them. We repeat, this is not merely our assertion, but an avowal made by your own leadership.

So we ask again: How can comrades who are not informed or clear about the views of another group be hostile to these views and be opposed to unification with the group that holds these views?

We recognize unhesitatingly that many comrades of the SWP today are opposed to unity with the WP. We know that this position is due primarily and above all to the prejudices systematically instilled into the membership by the SWP leadership, and to the equally systematic concealment and misrepresentation of our real views. That is why, comrades, both the SWP Minority and our WP proposed, at the very beginning, that before the actual unification is undertaken we go through a preliminary period of close collaboration between the two parties, their leaderships and their memberships in all fields of practical work in the class struggle, so that all the false prejudices and antagonisms, no matter where they exist or who holds them, might be dissipated in joint comradely activity and so that the unification, when it did take place, take place under the most auspicious and promising conditions. This proposal too, we remind you, was rejected by your leadership.

Our readiness to unite with the SWP in spite of the differences that exist does not, of course, mean that we are not ready to discuss these differences. The very contrary is the case.

The statement adopted early this year by your PC on the resolution on unity of the European Secretariat (January, 1946) declared:

"We want to emphasize right at the outset, so that there can be no possible misunderstanding, that we are and have always been for the most thoroughgoing discussion with the SWP on all theoretical and political questions that are in dispute between us. We welcome such a discussion, whether it is conducted in accordance with a 'list' or not. We shall participate in it, to the best of our ability, in order to make clear, again, just what our position is on the questions in dispute and just wherein we differ with the positions of the SWP. As in previous discussions conducted in the press of the two organizations, this new one will once more make clear not only wherein we differ but also the framework of our agreement."

An adequate presentation of our views on all the questions dealt with in the statement of your PC, and consequently a refutation of the views officially espoused by the SWP on these questions, would take us beyond the compass of this letter. However, we consider such a presentation and refutation of the highest and most immediate importance. Upon receipt of the statement of your PC, our party promptly set itself the task of drawing up a comprehensive document in which all the questions in dispute will be dealt with exhaustively so that everyone concerned and interested will have before him in a single document a statement of the views of the WP and its criticism of the views of the SWP. This document we hope to have in your hands, and in the hands of our international movement as well as in the hands of the militant working class public, in a very few weeks.

Cannon's Duplicity in the Negotiations

The answers to our questions are obvious and annihilating. Ostensibly your leadership was ready to discuss unity with us only for the purpose of learning whether it was practically feasible. Actually, your leadership was ready to discuss unity a year ago only for the purpose of going through the motions, only for the purpose of warding off the pressure for unity which was growing inside the SWP and throughout the Fourth International. In other words, only as a deceitful maneuver.

Is further confirmation of this utterly obvious fact required? The two conferences between the representatives of your PC and ours, held in September, 1945, provided further confirmation. At no time during these conferences did your representatives ask us to state the political and theoretical differences we have with the SWP. Why should they? They knew them then as well as they know them now. At no time did the representatives of your PC so much as hint that what stood or might stand in the way of an eventual unity was the position that we had taken on the theoretical and political questions in dispute. At no time did your representatives suggest even in the remotest way that they considered us a group or tendency whose political and theoretical positions or activities in the class struggle made unity impossible or undesirable. We repeat, at no time!

What was discussed at these conferences? Almost at the very beginning your representative, Cannon, said and repeated: "We can consider the differences frozen." That is, the differences between the two parties are known; in the united party they may eventually be reconciled or take different forms, but right now it is pointless to discuss them inasmuch as there is no practical possibility of either side convincing the other of the correctness of its position—the differences are frozen."

We agreed with this formula unhesitatingly.

What was discussed, and what the SWP representatives asked us to present, was our concrete program of proposals for effectuating the unity.

Cannon's first question dealt not with differences but with our concept of how the national committee of the united party would be constructed, the proportion of seats allotted to each grouping, etc.

The SWP representatives made no proposals—concrete or general. We did. What were our proposals? We acknowledged out of hand the numerical superiority of the SWP. We left open the question, for discussion, of alternative proposals for the physical achievement of the unity, whether by a joint representative convention or by the members of the WP entering the branches of the SWP. We declared in advance, without being prodded, that in the united party, and for the whole next period up to the first regular convention of the united party, the date of which would be agreed upon in common, we considered ourselves in advance to be a minority. We would therefore lay claim only to minority representation in the National and Political Committees and all the other bodies and institutions of the united party. We acknowledged in advance that in the united party, the present SWP would have decisive control of party policy, party work, party press and all other party institutions. We declared our readiness to dissolve our own party; to give up our independent work and institutions; give up LABOR ACTION, THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and all our public activity. We pledged ourselves to the principle of the minority subordinating itself to the majority. We gave all the necessary assurances that following the unity there would be an intensive and indefinite period of common work to build the party, that we would

not and were not so stupid as to think of opening up on the morning after the unity a factional fight, let alone planning a split. If for no other reason than that such a plan would irretrievably discredit its authors.

What more could we offer as assurance of the possibility and desirability of unity and of our seriousness with regard to it? What more could be asked of us?

Did your representatives, upon hearing this specific and concrete program of proposals, state or even suggest or even hint that these proposals had no importance? That what stood in the way of the unity was our social composition or our "petty bourgeois ideology"? That what stood in the way of the unity were our views on Russia, or Europe, or the Stalinist party, or the trade union question, or the labor party question, or military policy, or our concept of the party, or our attitude toward the Fourth International, or any one of the rest of the questions which form the sum and substance of the arguments against unity contained in the last PC statement?

No! Not one word! Not one hint of all that!

What then, produced the only subject of serious discussion at these conferences? None of the points listed above. The only point which your representatives suggested or declared would constitute an obstacle to the unity was the only demand we made, namely, that inside the united party the Minority would publish an internal educational bulletin of its own in which its views on the disputed questions would be set forth. That is all that was discussed between us at these conferences, that and nothing else. Your representatives indicated that it was not so much that they would consider it an obstacle to unity as it was the membership of the SWP itself that would regard it in that light. Here, too, we did not diplomate, we did not pretend. When we were asked why we felt it necessary to have a bulletin printed in the united party, why we could not be content with a regular party bulletin edited and controlled by the Majority, we replied frankly, in line with what we had already openly indicated in our plenum resolution, that rightly or wrongly, the leadership of the SWP did not enjoy our confidence as an adequate protector of the democratic rights of a minority; that we based this lack of confidence upon past experiences which had not yet been eliminated.

In return for our frankness, our readiness to answer any and every question and to answer it to the point, we received from your representatives only evasions, diplomatic formulas, quarter-commitments, back-passing along the line of "We are here only to explore, we have no authority to say anything, we must refer this to the NC, it is the membership alone which has authority to speak, etc."

Was our demand to publish an internal bulletin of our own a real obstacle to unification? It is impossible to take this seriously. During the dispute in the SWP Trotsky and other comrades, in the interests of maintaining the threatened unity of the party, proposed that the then Minority be allowed to have just such a bulletin. A hundred times before in the movement minorities have issued internal bulletins of their own. Even Cannon pointed out in the conference with us that in the old Communist League of America in this country the Oehlerite faction had an internal bulletin of its own. No action was taken or proposed against it on this account; action was taken against it only after the Oehlerites distributed their bulletin in public. No, the reaction of your representatives to this demand of ours was nothing but the seizure of a pretext for breaking off the discussions on unity and sabotaging its achievement.

Twenty Eight Pages of Political Evasion

This too can be proved. Following these two conferences, the SWP Minority again took the initiative to remove any obstacle, real or pretended, to unification. It addressed a letter to the Workers Party asking us to withdraw the demand for an internal bulletin and to confine ourselves to the perfectly elementary demand that the right of any minority to issue a bulletin of its own be recognized on both sides. We acceded to the proposal of the Minority. We were determined to remove any real obstacle to unification, especially provided it appeared to be such an obstacle in the eyes of the membership of the SWP. We thereupon communicated to your PC our decision withdrawing the demand to publish a bulletin of our own in the united party. We requested instead that the right of any minority to issue a bulletin be recognized, pledging ourselves at the same time not to exercise this right in the united party, at least for the first long period of its existence, in order to give the united party the benefit of the most favorable conditions conceivable for its smooth, harmonious development and growth. This communication was ignored by your leadership, that is, it ignored our decision to remove the only obstacle to unity that it had indicated to us in the discussion conferences. It goes without saying that the withdrawal of our demand, like so many other pertinent and revealing points, is likewise ignored in the anti-unity statement of your PC. It is another one of those many facts of the unity period that not even the most skillful demagogue can exploit for his own purposes.

Let us recapitulate the whole period of the attempt to unify the two parties.

Our party proceeded, from the time the SWP Minority first raised the question formally, with a clear-cut position in favor of unity and a clear-cut program on how to achieve it. Your party leadership proceeded from the very beginning with an intransigent opposition to unity, along the course of deepening the split, and without relenting in their systematic efforts to instill into the party membership the most violent prejudices and antagonisms against the Workers Party and against the idea of unity with it.

Our party responded promptly and unambiguously to your leadership's demand that we "indicate more precisely and more concretely your view of how the unification is to be brought about and what form it should take." You will nowhere find indication toward this end by your leadership, concrete or general, precise or vague, because it never gave any.

In order to eliminate the most deep rooted but honest suspicions about our intentions, apprehensions that all we meant by unity was a vulgar maneuver, our party offered to give up every single aspect of its independent existence and to accept in advance the status and obligations of a minority in the united party. If this had been a maneuver not seriously meant by us, it could have been exploded and we could have been hopelessly discredited by the simple de-

vice of taking us at our word and demanding that we make good in practice. That is precisely what your leadership did not do and it did not do it precisely because it knew that we could be taken at our word and that we were ready to make our word a reality. Your leadership, on the other hand, began with the conviction that it is necessary to deepen the split and it has ended with the proposition that it is necessary to deepen the split. What it did in between, in the name of an avowed readiness to discuss with us the unification of the two parties, was therefore only pretense, only a maneuver, only a stalling for time until a more propitious moment would arrive for it to restate categorically its fierce hostility to the establishment of a united party.

Our party at no time assumed the hypocritical air of naive ignorance about the existence of differences between us and about the significance of these differences. It knew what they were at the beginning and it knows what they are now. But it likewise knew the points of agreement between the two parties in the field of theory, program, tradition, methods. Knowing all this it was able to say at the very beginning that "on this plane, the plane of basic program and principle, the two parties are close enough in their positions to require and justify immediate unification, on grounds similar to those which made their membership in one party possible and desirable in the period prior to the split." (Letter of the WP to the SWP, September 15, 1945.) No evasion there, no equivocation, no artificial magnification of differences, no concealment of differences, no concealment of the estimate of these differences in the light of the unity proposal. Your party leadership, from the very beginning, went through an elaborate but pitifully transparent pretense. This is a harsh accusation but the facts leave us no alternative. Either your leadership did not know what the differences were between us, or it did know. If it did not know, then surely the conferences between us were intended to establish what these differences were. You know that this is not what the conferences took up. Your leadership made it plain there that they not only knew what these differences were but that they considered them "frozen." If they did know what the differences were, then it was possible and necessary for it to say frankly and openly and without hesitation that given the breadth and depth and significance of the differences as it understood them, unity was out of the question and discussions on the proposal for unity were entirely superfluous, time-wasting, and dangerously misleading. That is, your leadership could and should have said from the very beginning what it has found the courage to say now in the statement of your PC, because so far as our theoretical and political differences are concerned, they know no more about them today than they knew a year and more ago. Diplomacy and maneuvers are required in dealing with the class enemy. Diplomacy and maneuvers practiced against the membership of a revolutionary party—and it is against you, comrades,

With best party greetings,

MAX SHACHTMAN,
National Chairman.

ERNEST R. MCKINNEY,
National Secretary.

For the Political Committee of
the Workers Party of the U. S.

IS THERE A NEW CLASS STRUCTURE IN U. S.?

The rise of U. S. capitalism has indeed been a phenomenon. It reached its zenith of growth at a time when world capitalism was already disintegrating. This factor of strength in a decaying world gave rise to a number of theories all centering around the idea that American capitalism was different from the capitalism of the old world.

The crisis of the Thirties, however, shattered all the false theories about the nature of capitalist society in this country and showed the domestic social order to be subject to the same laws of all capitalist nations, the same growth and decline, the same periods of boom, depression and crisis. Marxism has always been the object of scorn of the capitalist economic theorists, particularly that part of his socialist doctrine which analyzed and forecast the decline and decay of the capitalist system.

The power of American capitalism, which today rests fundamentally upon its ability to exploit and dominate the world, deludes many economic theorists who defend capitalism. But if the crisis of capitalism in this country forced these hardy souls to cover, where many of them remain silent to this day, there are still harder souls, curiously enough coming out of the radical and labor movement, who have taken up where the apologists of capitalism have left off. With new words and seemingly new theories, they have discovered once again where Marxism is wrong. They demand "new approaches," a new language, and a "new science" to discover the more recent phenomenon of capitalism. The following article takes up one of these innovators and subjects his new theories to Marxist criticism. The fact that the author whom Lawler criticizes is a former editor of "The New Leader" bears out the contention stated above.—Editor.)

By GEORGE LAWLER

Daniel Bell, formerly of *The New Leader*, and now on the faculty of the University of Chicago, wrote an article this summer ("The Changing Class Structure of the U. S.," N. L., June 15, 1946) which continues to be advertised by its editors as "important" and which has aroused some interest among liberal and labor circles. Instead of the old Daniel Bell who used to keep his readers informed on the monopoly state, on business oligarchy, on power politics, etc., we now have a new one who reads almost like the statistical anemia which passes for "objectivity" in our learned periodicals on sociology or political science. I say "almost" because there seems to be enough left of his former self not to be content with flat figures, but instead to go beyond them to interpretation and prediction. I question, however, whether he has not already been so compromised by academic apologetics as to reduce his comments to questionable validity.

What threw me off were the first two paragraphs which inform us that the terms "working class" and "middle class" have been too loosely employed; that "left wing sectarians" are responsible for having published "sweeping and reckless generalizations" concerning "proletarianization," "sharpening of class lines, the growing rigidity of the class structure and similar clichés"; and that his statistical material is going to present a "totally different picture." The key to his whole approach is indicated in his gratuitous remark regarding "left wing sectarians." I do not know whom he is referring to, since he makes no specific references to groups, periodicals, statements, etc. What he does sound like is one of those perennial "refutations" of Marxian critique and prediction. It is this initial premise which explains his accusations of an alleged loose

terminology and a distorted socio-economic picture on the part of others, as well as his promise to present something new. I find a complete disparity between the introduction and the rest of the article.

BELL'S CONCEPTION OF A CLASS

Specifically, so that we may see just for whom Bell is tolling: (1) It is a very simple matter to state, as he does, that there is "a relative decline in the proportion of the working class to the total gainfully employed," if you arbitrarily draw a distinction between manual and non-manual workers, a distinction necessary perhaps for certain statistical analyses, but not justified when we are dealing with all those occupying a definite relationship to the means of production and forced to sell their labor power for their existence. (Bell's simplistic criterion of a class seems to be the amount of money its members earn.)

(2) There is a decline in the proportion of industrial workers to the total working class, but Bell did not have to resort to the economist Colin Clark whose discovery of "tertiary" occupations (services, transport, commerce) in highly industrialized countries Bell refers to for verification of this fact; he could have found this decline predicted and explained by Marx in Vol. 1 of *Capital*. It is important, however, to note that the emphasis here is primarily upon the manufacturing industry.

If we include (as do the reports, for instance, of the Bureau of Census or of the Bureau of Internal Revenue) among the industrial workers those in mining, water transportation, railroads, municipal traction, electric power, telephones and telegraphs, they constitute a majority of all wage workers, and if we add to those all other workers except those in government service and the clerical groups, the wage workers are still a majority of the population.

In minimizing the number and importance of the "working class" or the "industrial workers," Bell is merely echoing the opinions of those like Chase, Cole and others who already in the early '30's saw the catastrophic demise of the proletariat with every new "photo-electric cell." What these gentlemen thought of the "vanishing" working class during the war is not recorded. Moreover, how "totally different" can Bell's presentation be when he admits that the so-called new middle-class is a "fuzzy concept" (he would apparently include in it only the "technical-managerial" group) or that this class, "as well as the worker is at the mercy of the labor market," and when he is forced to use the material and ideas already in *Capital* (Vols. 2 and 3) and in *Theories of Surplus Value* discussed the socio-economic development of the "new" middle classes.

(3) A fundamental weakness in Bell's static analysis is that he seems to be unaware of the relative importance and potential power of a class in relation to our economy as well as to future political developments. In our type of economic structure, it is not those in services, the clerical or the managerial groups which occupy the pivotal positions, but those in industry; and it is not office personnel, but miners and transport workers that can paralyze the economy of the nation.

(4) This analytic weakness is most clearly revealed in his exclamatory statement that there has been an "increase in small business enterprises" (20 per cent since 1910.) This bit of startling news (it has also been presented by others) is supposed to refute, I gather, the theory concerning the disappearance of small business. I have never read any Marxian class analysis which predicted the absolute disappearance of any class at a given date. In the works already referred to and

in *The German Ideology*, *The 18th Brumaire* and others, Marx stressed the instability, dependence, and inviability of the petty enterprises. The old middle class of small independent producers which occupied a dominant position in capitalist economy a century ago and which Marx predicted would become a dwindling force as capitalism developed has declined. Statistical verification for this can be found even in one of Bell's sources, viz: Corey who mentions this in his *The Unfinished Task*, as well as in his earlier works.

THE SHIFT OF ECONOMIC POWER

One has only to examine the criteria employed by various statistical agencies and congressional committees in designating "small business" to realize the contrast between the actually small enterprises of the 19th century and the small "giants" of today. Granted even a numerical increase, what is more significant to point out is (a) the shift within this class of economic power from the more basic field such as manufacturing to such peripheral businesses as garages, entertainment, etc.; (b) the weakness of this class as a whole in relation to the powerful forces of economic concentration and monopoly. It is a dubious "independence" indeed for the small enterprises when one examines the factor of concentration as revealed, for instance, in the recent report by The Small Business Committee of the Senate.

Among some of the disclosures: 175,000 small companies have been reduced to 30 per cent of the nation's manufacturing output; more than 500,000 small business concerns disappeared during the war; the 250 largest corporations possess about two-thirds of the country's manufacturing facilities; 63 of the largest manufacturing corporations have sufficient liquid assets to buy all the usable government-owned facilities, or to purchase the assets of 71,000 small corporations (during the latter part of 1945 there were more mergers in manufacturing than at any time in the previous fifteen years) monopoly all along the line in control of raw materials, plants, industrial research, technology, etc. And Bell, of course, who knows these facts, as well as those disclosed earlier in connection with small business by the T.N.E.C. monographs, *The House Com. on Small Business report*, *The American Business Congress complaints*, the *Senate Committee findings regarding the national defense program*, the statements issued by the *Department of Commerce*, by *Reed, Colonel Johnson, Wilson*; the material in the works of *Simpson, Brady and others*, remains content (in an article ironically titled "Futures") to state merely that small business has increased 20 per cent since 1910.

It would appear from Bell's whole orientation to the problem of the "changing class structure" in this country that the Workers Party has been employing an erroneous approach in attempting to emancipate the working class, and therefore society. What we need are not a party, a program, a press, tactics, etc.; we require merely the streamlined techniques of artful definitions and bald statistics... and a slogan to match: Workers of the World, Unite! You Have Nothing to Lose but Your Overalls and a Small Business to Win!

P. S. to the Reader: Some of the above comments were submitted over a month ago to the Letter Department of *The New Leader* as likely to be of interest to those who read the Bell article. Thus far, and for reasons not yet made known to me by the Editors my commentary has not appeared in their columns—and this in spite of their invitation, "We welcome a variety of opinions consistent with our democratic policy."

How Labor Can Surmount Its Obstacles in the South

By DAVID COOLIDGE

In this, our last article on the South, I want to continue the discussion started in a recent LABOR ACTION. We discussed the question of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South. We took the position that in the scientific and theoretical sense the bourgeois-democratic revolution was completed in the South with the overthrow of the slave régime and the triumph of Northern industrial capitalism. The 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution are the juridical expressions of this triumph. To these should be added the equal rights amendment of 1875.

Not only was the triumph of INDUSTRIAL capitalism a victory over the slave economy but also a triumph over Northern COMMERCIAL capitalism which was allied with the slaveocracy. Since this time Southern economy has essentially been an integral part of American capitalism. The South is not "semi-feudal" but completely capitalist. The peons, where peonage exists, are not slaves and the tenant farmers and share-croppers are not serfs or peasants.

The basic conflict today in the South is not between Negroes and whites, but between the protagonists of the plantation system and the advocates of industrialization; between the land and the factory. This attempt to supplant the domination of the planter is not new. But where formerly his main antagonist was the "poor white," today it is the modern industrialist.

In the designation "plantation system" is included not only the big cotton planters but also the tobacco, rice, sugar cane, and lumber growers. Also there are the extractive and chemical industries. It is in these enterprises that most Southern toilers are employed. Virtually all of the Negroes are employed here with the exception of those in service occupations which are the most laborious, undesirable, lowest paying and often the most dangerous and unhealthy. Negroes are today virtually excluded from the manufacturing, processing and fabricating industries.

WHAT IS THE SOUTH?

It is this peculiar complex of social relations in the South which has misled so many persons into the position that the big task today is what they term "the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution." The Communist Party has been the chief exponent of this notion. At one time the Stalinists developed the notion that the Negroes are a nation and organized their political propaganda around the slogan of "Self-Determination in the Black Belt." By a process similar to the gerrymander, they carved out an area in the "Black Belt" whose population was overwhelmingly Negro. It was for this area that they advocated separation and independence.

Although the Stalinists still contend, if only in a whisper, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution has not been completed in the South they do not say what its economic system is today.

It must be emphasized that the two main groups in the South: the planter group and the industrial group, are two capitalist groups contending for capitalist profits. For this reason each group seeks political domination. The political demagogues such as Bilbo and Talmadge are in the main the political representatives of the planters (and of the power companies). It was their predecessor demagogues, Tillman, Bleasie, Vardaman and others who after the Civil War became the champions of the "poor whites." Their chief weapon was the threat of "Negro domination," and the doctrine of "white supremacy." With this the "poor whites" who had formerly been the enemies of the planter group were won over against the Negro. What is known as a "liberal" in the South, is found in the ranks

of the industrializers: the Arnalls and the Peppers. It is in this group also that one finds the individuals and groups who are willing to tolerate or collaborate with union organization.

This group is for better educational facilities for the Negroes and "poor whites." It will support the abolition of the poll-tax and a slight improvement of the conditions under which Negroes live. This group is well-aware that the kind of industrial and technical progress which they advocate for the South cannot be attained, at least for the present, without an increase in bourgeois-democratic rights for all the working class. This is the real meaning of the struggle which goes on between the two groups. Both Northern finance-capitalism and the most reactionary Southern landlord know that increasing industrialization and increasing mechanization of agriculture will transform the social scene in the South and bring it into more conformity with the North.

Negroes in the South and the country at large have a far better grasp of the problem facing them than do most of the theory builders. It is interesting that the Negro slave militants did not develop nationalist, separatist or colonial "Back to Africa" movements. They had no notions about human beings have acted in all of history and struggled for freedom and for those rights and privileges which were the lot of other people in the population of the country in which they lived. Negroes continued this struggle after emancipation and that in fact is the struggle they carry on today. Garvey discovered this when he attempted to give an answer to the dissatisfaction of the Negro with his condition by organizing the extremely chauvinistic Back to Africa nightmare of the twenties known as the Universal Negro Improvement Association.

The AFL discovered how Negroes are thinking today when at its first Southern organizing conference at Asheville, this Jim Crow trade union federation provided for the seating of all Negro delegates on one side of the hall, as is the custom in the South. The Negro delegates refused to be segregated and all delegates took seats according to their individual preferences. For its recent convention the United Mine Workers attacked the "race problem" correctly. This union purchased 900 Pullman tickets and brought the Southern delegates, white and black, to Atlantic City together in Pullman cars.

The last question is the often-

heard statement that the South is "fascist." This kind of very dangerous loose talk is the kind which has been spread around from time to time by the Stalinists. In 1930 the AFL was "outright fascist." Later there were the "right social-fascists" and the "left social-fascists." Later of course fascism became merely a "matter of taste." Today, it is the Republican Party which is fascist. Dewey is the head of the fascists and his group is "the same people who burned the Reichstag."

The South is not fascist. To call the South fascist is to say that the distinguishing feature of fascism is terror, intimidation, "lawlessness," and lynching. If this were true we would have to say that fascism did not begin with Mussolini and Hitler and that it is still with us after they have been destroyed. Even if fascism were merely an extreme form of terroristic régime, the South could not be called fascist. Fascism is an economic and political movement of monopoly capitalism which atomizes the working class and other exploited poor. It destroys the organization of the people first of all. How can one say that we have fascism in the South? This has to be kept in mind, lest when fascism does come it will not be recognized; clothed as it might well be in the garments of the Founding Fathers.

We have tried to set forth in this series of articles certain relevant ideas in connection with the South; certain considerations which must be faced by the CIO, AFL, Negro and white workers and revolutionary socialists. We say again that the beginning of a solution for the South is the organization of the Southern toilers into mass unions. From the side of the Negroes there will be no great difficulty. But there will be some difficulty with white workers who have been indoctrinated for decades with race superiority notions.

This will be fully exploited by the white ruling class and the organizers of the AFL. These same AFL organizers will advise the Negroes against the CIO because it is "controlled by communists." It must be the function of the CIO to dispel the fears of the white and black workers by a skillful process of welding them together in the same organization and locals; by showing them that it is possible and necessary for the white and black workers to work together, live together and struggle together. Through such experiences they will learn to vote together, eat together; attend school together, live together and organize as a class for economic and political action across the lines of race and color.

They Talk About Disarmament - -

(Continued from page 3)

the League as a "Thieves Kitchen" and warned the workers of the world. This age in which we live, said he, is an age of imperialist war or proletarian revolution. Organize, struggle, overthrow the imperialist governments, establish international socialism or a bigger, bloodier war will be the fate of humanity.

The imperialists knew this as well as Lenin. It was more than ever necessary to bluff the people. Therefore in 1928, with great fanfare of trumpets and a terrible outpouring of lies, they solemnly outlawed war by the Briand-Kellogg Pact. With all sorts of amendments and qualifications which hid the truth from the people, they pretended that a great step had been made forward toward peace and disarmament. Lies, all of it, as we today have every reason to know.

Every imperialist scoundrel plays this game. Hitler did. In 1933 he shouted to the world that he was ready to disarm. Yes, Adolf Hitler did. And ever afterwards he referred to it as a sign that he was forced to disarm.

TROTSKY WARNED THE WORLD

But Trotsky saw through the maneuver and as early as 1933 in his pamphlet "What Hitler Wants" he wrote

"If Hitler has so eagerly accepted the English plan for armament re-

duction, it is only because he counted in advance and with full certainty upon its failure... For the same reason Hitler is not niggardly with his 'warm thanks' to the American President for his declaration in favor of armament reduction. The more broadly and extensively the program of disarmament is presented before the whole world, and the more inevitably it ends in collapse the more incontestable will be Germany's right to rearmament."

That is the game they play. That is what Molotov and the U. S. delegates and Bevin are doing today. Trotsky and the Fourth International have never ceased to point out the pitiful (and dangerous) illusions of any talk about disarmament by imperialist powers. In 1934 the Fourth International stated the elementary truth that "new and very rapid disarmament is inherent in modern industrial technique." Look at what the U. S. did between 1939 and 1945. If even it were possible to disarm all the imperialist powers, the most powerful industrial organizations would still be ahead in the inevitable armaments race for war.

Molotov knows that very well. He aims at the atomic stock-piles of the U. S., but above all he aims at bluffing the people and presenting Russia as the lamb of peace beset by the wolves of imperialism. We have seen how skillfully Hitler used this very maneuver.

No. Russia joins the chorus of de-

ception, in fact now is the chief disarmament soloist, for the same reasons that have motivated the imperialists for the last fifty years. Not for one moment should one ounce of faith be placed in this pitiful, miserable, illusion.

In 1938, in the Transitional Program of the Fourth International, Trotsky made yet another of his unceasing attempts to carry on the tradition of Lenin and to warn the workers of the coming war and the only way to stop it.

"The entire question [of disarmament] wrote Trotsky, 'revolves around who will disarm whom. The only disarmament which can avert or end war is the disarmament of the bourgeoisie by the workers. But to disarm the bourgeoisie the workers must arm themselves.'"

We failed to achieve it. The world has been flooded with the blood of workers. But today they are at it

again, the same lust for power and profit, the same readiness to run the risk of annihilation and the death of civilization. They must either do this or abandon their power and privileges and abandon those they will not.

For fifty years we have endured their bluff, their lies, their bloody conflicts. It is time that we learnt the lesson. Let the workers disarm the imperialists. Let the workers in every country struggle without flinching until real freedom comes through the rule of the workers and oppressed people. There is no other way. With their talk of disarmament they bluffed us into World War I. With their talk of disarmament they bluffed us into World War II. Now they are at it again. Nothing can save us from World War III but the merciless destruction of imperialism and its replacement by socialism.

The Cain Plan for Writers - -

(Continued from page 3)

sions to show why this plan is the best possible one for defending the economic and artistic interests of the writer. He cited a list of economic grievances. One of these concerns the contracts which motion picture scenarists are required to sign. These contracts give to the studio the rights to all writings produced by a writer while he is under such a contract. Is the creation of a five-man board of "mugs" the most effective way of changing the terms of such contracts? Would it not be better for the Screen Writers Guild to take up the question directly?... Instead of going about their problems in this manner, however, the Screen Writers have concocted a plan which causes many writers to feel the most justifiable alarm.

Why? Because the Screen Writers Guild is Stalinist-dominated and influenced. It would be a mistake to approach the Cain plan from purely economic considerations. This is an important

question but can be left for another time. Of primary importance today is the political problem involved. The fact that the plan is opposed by a Marxist like Farrell, a Democrat like Dorothy Thompson, who accurately described the Cain proposition as taken from one of Goebbels' pages, and the extreme right among authors such as Rupert Hughes and Clarence B. Kelland, only illustrates the overall inacceptability of the plan.

There must be an end to the inequitable economic position of the writers, but certainly a far better plan than the one proposed by Cain can be developed. For example, in the case of the Hollywood writers, there is the Screen Writers Guild. It is difficult to understand what purpose there is in the Guild if it does not or cannot fight for improving the contractual and job conditions of the Hollywood writers. The same holds true for the Radio Writers Guild. It should be made clear that we are not so much concerned with the high paid writers, in which category most of the sponsors of the plan

belong, but with the many underpaid writers in the movie and radio industries.

We are even more concerned with the creative writers who do not work for the industries. It is they who suffer most from economic inequities. Whatever plan is developed for defending their economic interests and of all writers, it must be one which in no way interferes with the free and unencumbered creative work of which they are capable. Any plan which contains within it bureaucratic totalitarian measures is a threat to the writer. The fact that it is sponsored by James M. Cain and not Joseph Goebbels, makes no difference. It would be just as bad under Stalinist domination as any other reactionary force. In this present circumstance, Cain serves as a perfect front man. The fact that he is "sore" because he feels gyped, and that he is not a Stalinist, makes him a perfect front man for the advocacy of a plan which could only redound to the benefit of Stalinism and against the best interests of the writer.

Program of the Workers Party

I. For Price Control by Labor and the Consumers

Wipe out profiteering and high prices by action. Only the workers can control prices. Labor must have the decisive voice in determining the prices of consumer commodities. For wage increases without price increases. For popular price control committees.

II. For a Living Wage

1. For an immediate wage increase to meet the rising cost of living.
2. For an escalator clause in every union contract to provide for automatic wage increases to cover any additional price rises.
3. For job and wage security through a guaranteed annual wage, providing for a \$5000 annual minimum per family.

III. Clear the Slums! Build Homes!

1. For a 250 billion dollar five-year program to provide decent housing at low rental for all and an extensive public works plan to provide schools, hospitals and other needed community facilities.
2. For a national plan to begin work immediately on the erection of 25 million permanent low-cost housing units.

IV. Tax the Profiteers

For a 100 per cent on all wartime profits above five per cent on invested capital. For a \$25,000 ceiling on all annual incomes.

V. Nationalize Big Business

For the nationalization of the big monopolies: the industrial establishments, transportation and communication systems and the banks. To be owned by the nation and operated under workers' control.

VI. End Discrimination Against the Negro People

For full social, political and economic equality for Negroes.

VII. Open the Doors to the Jews

For full and unrestricted immigration into the United States by the persecuted and homeless Jews of Europe.

2. For the right of the Jewish people to unrestricted immigration to Palestine or any country of their choice.

VIII. For Full Economic and Educational Opportunities for Veterans

1. Readjustment allowance, on-the-job training subsidy provided by the GI Bill of Rights, to be based on a wage of \$40 a week for single veterans and \$55 for married veterans, plus \$5 a week for each additional dependent.
2. For immediate granting of a federal bonus of \$1,000 for each year of service.

IX. For Peace and Freedom

1. For the right of all peoples and nations to decide their own future. For self-determination for all nations. For freedom of the colonies.
2. For the withdrawal of all armies of occupation. Bring the American troops home. For an end to conscription.

X. For an Independent Labor Party and a Workers Government

For an independent Labor Party of the workers and working farmers based on the trade unions. Break with the Republican and Democratic Parties. For a government of and by labor.

FOR A SOCIALIST AMERICA AND PLENTY FOR ALL!

NOTE:

The New Address of

THE WORKERS PARTY

LABOR ACTION

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

is

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, New York

CHICAGO MEETING

on
"The 29th Anniversary
of the
Russian Revolution"

Speaker:
ALBERT GOLDMAN
Attorney for Leon Trotsky

Showing of the Film
"WE ARE FROM KRONSTADT"

WORKERS PARTY
1501 W. Madison Street

Contribution: 75 Cents

Protest Ban On Minority N. Y. Parties

BUFFALO, Oct. 31 — A protest meeting was held here at the YWCA on October 31 against the elimination of the minority parties from the ballot in New York State and Congressional districts in New York City.

Representatives of four of the five minority parties involved presented the cases of discrimination against their respective parties. It was obvious from these reports that the Workers Party, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Liberal Party, had all been deprived of basic democratic rights on the most flimsy of pretexts.

UNIONS SEND SPEAKERS

In addition to speakers from the various parties, representatives from the American Veterans Committee, Civil Liberties Union, UAW, and Bell Local 501 all stressed the dangerous consequences involved if such undemocratic procedures are not vigorously attacked by the labor movement and progressive groups. All agreed that the defense of the rights of these parties is nothing less than the defense of the rights of the American people.

The Workers Party representative pointed out rather humorously the means by which the boss politicians, together with the courts, connived to keep Ernest Rice McKinney, congressional candidate of the Workers Party in Harlem, off the ballot. He pointed out the desperate plight and bankruptcy of the Democratic Party as proved by their inability to allow a minority party candidate as opposition.

A resolution was unanimously adopted condemning the boss parties and demanding that all minority parties be given the right to the ballot.

The Workers Party distributed LABOR ACTION together with a leaflet urging support of this protest meeting and a united front by all working class parties for the defense of democratic rights.

McKinney Scores at Harlem Symposium

A highly interesting election symposium was held last week at the Harlem Public Library in which local congressional candidates or their representatives spoke. Ernest Rice McKinney represented the Workers Party as its congressional candidate in the 22nd District. Grant Reynolds spoke for the Republican Party and Rep. Adam Powell, Democratic candidate, was represented by a clergyman.

Reynolds' main line of attack was to point to Powell's record of 65 per cent absenteeism in Congress during important legislative decisions. Powell's representative replied with a chauvinistic eulogy of his leader. When E. R. McKinney took the floor, he brought the house down by declaring that he didn't care whether Powell spent every minute of his life in Congress or none at all; what McKinney stressed was that both Powell and Reynolds were tied up with the two old capitalist parties, the Democrats and Republicans, which were both enemies of the Negro people. Powell is in the same party as Bilbo and Reynolds in the same party as Dewey, said McKinney. The Negroes could find their way to freedom only by breaking away from the two boss parties and becoming part of a movement for an independent Labor Party.

McKinney's speech was most warmly received and after the meeting many of the Negro listeners asked him questions in further detail and took copies of Workers Party publications.

Dist. 7 Conference Hears Murray's Plan

Lashes Reactionary Congress but Offers No Lead on Independent Labor Political Action

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA — The seventh annual convention of the Steel Workers Union, CIO, District 7, at Town Hall here on October 26 and 27 considered, in reality, two "orders of business." The first was the routine handling of reports, resolutions and union elections. The second order of business was a desperate attempt by the union leadership and PAC-CIO to get out the vote on November 5.

For the delegates' political edification there were speeches by Philip Murray, president of the CIO; Walter Reuther, Clinton S. Golden, Joseph Scanlon and James C. Thimmes as well as from Chairman Mike Harris, Democratic Congressman William Green and spokesmen of the PAC-CIO and NPAC.

MURRAY ANNOUNCES POLICY

Murray lashed the reactionaries in Congress, singling out Senators Taft and Wherry for special attack and urged the delegates to vote against "these vicious interests that are trying to destroy our economy." He did not, of course, go on to say that since there is no Labor Party and no labor candidates on a national scale, it is impossible to vote against the big business interests. President Murray

Philly Forum on Hunger in Europe

The Philadelphia Local's Committee for International Relief presented the third in the series of Fall Forums, devoted to a study, Hunger in Europe. Committee Chairman Joe Arnold acquainted the audience with the work the committee is doing in sending packages of food and clothing to the revolutionary socialists of Europe, who are in desperate need of material assistance.

James M. Fenwick, organizer of the Workers Party, analyzed the famine conditions in Europe today, stressing their political significance. Victor and vanquished nations alike find themselves unable to feed their people at any level above that of subsistence. In our day of modern agricultural methods, no natural disaster could make hunger the horrible reality that it is today.

The showing of a motion picture portraying the destruction of Europe concluded the evening's program.

accused the monopolized meat industry of a "sit-down strike" against the American people.

Regarding the wage and price levels, Murray pointed out that the recent 25 per cent increases in prices have not been accompanied by a corresponding wage increase. These wage increases will be demanded by the 900,000 steel workers when they reopen contract negotiations on January 1.

Elaborating on the wage and price relationship, Murray stated, "American industry is making plenty of money, and can well afford to give healthy wage increases now without increasing the price of commodities." This is in essence the program of the GM division of the UAW-CIO which Murray repudiated last spring when he agreed to a wage increase for the steel workers but at the same time agreed to a price increase for the steel industry. President Murray has been driven by economic necessity to support a wage and price policy which LABOR ACTION has consistently put forward for many months—Wage Increases Without Price Increases.

ON ESCALATOR CLAUSE

Most of the resolutions adopted by the convention were of a routine nature and were accepted as proposed by the Resolutions Committee. These were on CIO Unity, Job Evaluation, Industry-wide Contract Demands, Stewards' Education, Housing and Educational Facilities for Veterans, Liberalized Workmen's Compensation, Unemployment Compensation, Full Employment, Civil Liberties Guarantee and Permanent Security Fund. There was also a resolution for support of the Taylor Bill (S-2508) providing for income tax credit to workers whose income falls below a minimum decent standard of living.

A resolution on political action was passed which called for continued participation within the PAC and for a recommendation that "the national CIO-PAC explore the possibilities of establishing an American Labor Party." There was, however, an amendment submitted from the floor calling for a Labor Party now based on the unions and embracing the PAC. This amendment, although receiving some support from several delegates, was ruled out of order by the chairman on a technicality.

The wage policy resolution, call-

ing for substantial wage increases, was modified by removing the "cost of living clause" and replacing it with "wage increases commensurate with the increased cost of living." Some delegates voted against the inclusion of the "escalator clause" because they felt that it prohibited the unions from making any wage gains on an absolute scale and tied wage increases irrevocably to the tail of the price increase kite.

REUTHER'S FAILURE

The speech by Walter Reuther, president of the UAW-CIO, on the closing day of the convention followed in general the pattern of the Murray address but was enlivened by Reuther's somewhat greater political

SYL DISCUSSES "WALLACE ISSUE"

The Socialist Youth League held its regular forum on Sunday, October 27, on the topic of "The Wallace Issue." Jackie Robbins of the Executive Committee led a lively discussion on the foreign policy of the United States and Russia, pointing out that both countries are equally imperialist and reactionary and can offer no leadership to progressive youth.

A few AYD members from the floor offered objection to her characterization of Russia as "imperialist and reactionary." A hot discussion then ensued on Russian foreign policy, particularly the utilization of slave labor, the dismantling of factories and the suppression of freedom in Russian-occupied territories. The discussion was continued after the adjournment of the meeting over coffee. The AYD members said they would be interested in hearing more about our point of view and promised to come to the next meeting. The forum closed with the singing of the "Internationale."

The New York unit of the Socialist Youth League holds forums every Sunday night at 8:30 at 276 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, third floor. ("All trains to Boro Hall.") A forum will be held on Sunday, November 10, on "OPA and the Program of the Workers Party."

The unit is also conducting several informal study groups. The topics include: "Negro History in the United States," "Fundamentals of Socialism," "The American Labor Movement" and "The History of Bolshevism." All interested friends can come to unit meetings and register for the study groups.

Bankruptcy of PAC Policy in Chicago

CHICAGO, Oct. 25 — Concrete evidence of the complete bankruptcy of the policy of CIO-PAC in supporting candidates of the capitalist parties for public office was given last night at a meeting of the Chicago Industrial Union Council, CIO.

Michael Mann, Council secretary, reported on the candidates to be endorsed for public office in Cook County. "The job of the committee was very difficult," he said. "There was very little to choose from." He emphasized the fact that there was practically no choice between the candidates at least three times and then proceeded to list the "endorsed" candidates. What a farce!

A delegate representing Local 719, UAW-CIO, in speaking for his local, stated that it had gone on record for the organization of an Independent Labor Party and opposed the policy of endorsing candidates of the capitalist parties, and would not participate in the wrangling on which Republican or Democrat to endorse.

and social consciousness. When Reuther analyzed the evils of our capitalist society with its scarcities, unemployment, high prices and low wages he held the undivided attention of the audience; but when he failed to draw conclusions from his observations, the audience grew restless.

Although Reuther announced that the auto workers would begin the new series of wage negotiations with Chrysler the following week and would ask for wage increases, he gave no indication that the new demands would be based on the GM Program.

At the time of the convention there were rumors that Murray would resign the presidency of the CIO at the coming Atlantic City convention on November 18 and that Reuther was interested in the position. These rumors were denied by Reuther, who expressed confidence in Murray's leadership. The important choice, however, is not one between a Murray and a Reuther but between a militant program centering on independent political action and effective control of wages, prices and production and a program of continued collaboration politically with those whom labor has long recognized to be its economic enemy in the shop.

Now Available at Reduced Cost! Bound Volumes of The New International for 1945 Indispensable for a Revolutionary History of the Year 1945 NINE ISSUES Cross-indexed by Author and Subject PRICE NOW: \$3.00 Order from: THE NEW INTERNATIONAL 4 Court Sq., Long Isl. City 1, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION BOUND VOLUME 1945 Now Only \$2.00! A permanent record of Marxist analysis of the year's outstanding events. Order from: LABOR ACTION 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

You Can Subscribe To Labor Action For Six Months For 50 Cents!

With the Workers Party

AKRON: Write to Box 221 for further information. BUFFALO: HEADQUARTERS: 639 Main Street. Open meetings on Sunday evenings. THURSDAY EVENINGS at 8 p.m. a course in the Program of the Workers Party. Fee: 25c. LABOR ACTION can be bought at newsstand at Chippewa and Delaware Avenues. CHICAGO: LABOR ACTION, 1501 W. Madison, 2nd floor, Chicago 7. Telephone—CHESAPEAKE 3798. Office hours: 3-5:30 p.m. daily, except Sunday, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. Series of 6 classes in "Problems of Socialism" every Friday night. CLEVELAND: The Cleveland branch of the Workers Party meets every Thursday at 8:00 p.m. in Carnegie Hall, 1220 Huron Road. The Cleveland branch of the Socialist Youth League meets every Thursday—definite headquarters not yet established. Youth socials are held every Friday or Saturday night. Buy LABOR ACTION and the New International in Cleveland at Wheatman's store, 719 Prospect Ave., downtown. For further information write Bernard Douglas, P. O. Box 1190, Sta. B., Cleveland, Ohio. DETROIT: Headquarters, 3773 Gratiot (at Mt. Elliott). Office hours: 11 a.m.-3 p.m., Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. Class in "Fight for Socialism" every Thursday at 11:30 a.m. LOS ANGELES: Headquarters at 316 1/2 W. Pico near Olive. Telephone Richmond 7-3230. Office hours: 12 to 3 p.m. daily, except Sunday; also 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. on Monday and Friday. LOUISVILLE: New International on sale at Eilers Bookshop, between Liberty and Jefferson on 3rd. For other information regarding LABOR ACTION, New International and Workers Party—Write Robert Durant, Box 1181, Louisville, Ky. NEWARK: HEADQUARTERS: 248 Market St. OFFICE HOURS: Tuesday—3 to 6 p.m.; Wednesday—12 to 3 p.m.; Saturday—3 to 4 p.m. Newark newsstands: 91 Barclay St., 163 Belmont Ave., Stand, Market and Mulberry, northeast corner. LECTURE ON RUSSIA will be delivered by EMANUEL GARRETT, editor of LABOR ACTION, at 8:30 p.m. on Saturday, November 16, at Labor Action Hall, 248 Market St. Admission 50 cents. Refreshments. NEW YORK CITY: CITY OFFICE—114 West 14th St.—Open all day until 7:00 p.m. Tele-

phone: CHelsea 2-9681. MANHATTAN — Meets every Wednesday at 8:00 p.m. Third floor, 114 W. 14th St. HARLEM — Meets every Wednesday at 8:00 p.m. Workers Party Headquarters, 2143 Seventh Ave., Room 106 (near 127th St.). BROOKLYN DOWNTOWN — Meets every Wednesday at 8:00 p.m. Workers Party Headquarters, 276 Fulton St., 2nd Floor. Also, please send us your name and address so that you can be kept informed of all Workers Party activities. READING: LABOR ACTION and The New International are sold at newsstand at Fifth and Penn Streets, southwest corner. For information regarding the activities and affairs of the Reading Branch of the Workers Party address: P. O. Box 1671. Regular class on the "Role of the Party in the Fight for Socialism" every Monday evening at 8:30. PHILADELPHIA: HEADQUARTERS: 1139 West Girard Avenue (3rd floor). WP Branch meets each Monday, at 8:00 p.m. Socialist Youth League meets Friday at 8:00 p.m. LABOR ACTION on sale at following newsstands: N. E. cor. 11th and Walnut Sts. N. W. cor. 13th and Market Sts. N. E. cor. Broad and Arch Sts. N. E. cor. 15th and Market Sts. S. E. cor. 19th and Market Sts. N. E. cor. 16th and Seybert Sts. S. W. cor. Kensington and Allegheny Aves. N. E. cor. Broad St. and Girard Ave. NEW INTERNATIONAL on sale at following newsstands: N. E. cor. 11th and Walnut Sts. N. W. cor. 13th and Market Sts. N. E. cor. Broad and Arch Sts. N. E. cor. 15th and Market Sts. N. E. cor. Broad and Arch Sts. N. E. cor. 15th and Market Sts. SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA: For information on the activities of the Workers Party in the San Francisco Bay Area, write "Labor Action, P. O. Box 435, Berkeley, Calif." LABOR ACTION and New International may be purchased at 2059 Fillmore St., San Francisco; Golden Gate News Agency, 81 3rd St.; McDonald's Bookstore, 867 Mission St. In Berkeley: Whelens, Bancroft and Telegraph. SEATTLE: For information regarding the activities of the Seattle Branch, and for further information regarding LABOR ACTION and the WORKERS PARTY, write to E. Donaldson, c/o Eckhart News, 102 Washington St., Seattle, Washington. SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE: The Socialist Youth League, youth section of the Workers Party, has youth units in the following cities: New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Morgantown, W. Va., Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, Seattle, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

PRESS MANAGERS' PRESS ACTION BY HENRY JUDD

RENEWAL SUBSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN: Results on the Renewal Subscription Campaign have now been completed, and the results indicate that up till now 500 subscribers who began to read LABOR ACTION six months ago have decided to become constant, regular readers of the paper. We still expect many more renewals to come in steadily, and many agents are still at work obtaining renewals. These results have been gratifying and full credit goes to those branches of the Workers Party (San Francisco, Philadelphia, Newark, Chicago, etc.) where real efforts were made. MONTHLY BILLING: Regular monthly bills are now in the mails to our LABOR ACTION agents. We hope that action, in the form of substantial payments and clearing up of accounts, will follow immediately. Some agents are already falling behind and we again give notice that we will have to "crack down" on them in the very near future unless they catch up. NEW INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN: As announced previously, LABOR ACTION is solidly behind the campaign of The New International, its sister publication. We urge all our agents to give their fullest support to this campaign. Many LABOR ACTION representatives are running this campaign for the magazine, after completing their work on the Renewal Subscription Campaign for LABOR ACTION. It is very important for us that the work for the magazine be highly successful. A solid 50 new subscriptions and renewals came in to LABOR ACTION during this past week. New York City, for the first time in many weeks, leads the list although still not doing as much for LABOR ACTION as is possible. The Newark Branch of the Workers Party is in excellent standing with LABOR ACTION. Here's the list for the week:

Table with columns for City and Number of Subscriptions. Includes New York City (14), Newark (10), Buffalo (6), San Pedro (4), San Francisco (4), Detroit (3), Reading (3), Philadelphia (1), Seattle (1), Miscellaneous (4), TOTAL (50).

I Want to Subscribe to THE NEW EIGHT-PAGE LABOR ACTION 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Name Address City Zone State 50 Cents for Six Months \$1.00 for a Year

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Civil Liberties In Baltimore

Dear Editor: A worse than usual outrageous obstruction to free speech has just occurred in Baltimore. An evangelical group and the Socialist Labor Party had been holding open-air meetings on a downtown corner. The Bible Society already had a permit, so the Socialist Labor Party proceeded to get one also. And that is where the trouble rested. The Evening Sun of Baltimore reports that in the debate over the permit, the city solicitor asked the question whether such a busy intersection should be used at all for public gatherings. This objection was ruled out because there had been no complaint to this effect.

Then the president of the Board of Estimate said that he was in favor of letting religious groups hold such meetings but not political groups. (The city administration decides on what kind of free speech should be allowed—which isn't free speech at all.) But now we came to the climax.

A New Dream Movie House

Dear Editor: The New York papers have recently seen some splurgy advertising about a new dream movie theater on Park Avenue that is to cater strictly to the carriage trade.

Except for a matinee performance, J., New York.

Offers an Idea On Cartoons

Dear Editor: The cartoons in LABOR ACTION are usually good, sometimes quite eloquent, but they are too limited in scope.

The enclosed cartoon, "New Price Control," clipped from the Chicago Daily News of October 18, showing a housewife, who obviously wept to the butcher shop to buy some meat, walking away from a very tempting looking steak shown her by the meat cutter, and turning away she says, "Sorry, it's too high."

The subject of this cartoon will indicate what I mean by saying that, your cartoons are too limited in scope. The housewives, we know, buy most of the foods and goods in general; therefore, they should be made aware, pictorially when possible, of their power as buyers of foods, household goods, etc. SALLY SUMMERS, Chicago.

New Headquarters In Philadelphia

Readers of LABOR ACTION in the Philadelphia area now have available for their activities a large, pleasant meeting hall and club rooms at 1139 Girard Avenue (northeast corner of 12th and Girard). On November 1 the Philadelphia Local of the Workers Party moved into this new Labor Action Hall, which is centrally located near the Girard Avenue Station of the Broad Street Subway.

The new hall will be officially opened with a gala housewarming and Halloween Party on Saturday, November 9, at 9 p.m. There will be refreshments and dancing, with valuable door prizes for costumes as an added attraction. All readers and friends of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend the opening affair and also to use the facilities of the hall at their convenience. The Workers Party School will be continued in the new headquarters as well as the remaining sessions of the interesting Fall Forums.

Revolutionary Policy in Venezia-Giulia

An Eye-Witness Report on the Trieste Issue

By GEORGE HARRIS

I have just returned from the most troubled and strife-torn city in the world—Trieste, where agents and dupes of the two main imperialist powers in the world are conducting a struggle to the death against each other.

Trieste is the major city of the Venezia-Giulia area in northeastern Italy and has a population between 500,000 and 750,000. (The figure is so indefinite because of the number of Yugoslavs pumped into the area and the number of Italians abducted out of it by Tito's forces. Similar but lesser actions have been taken by the Italians.) Approximately 60 per cent of the area is Yugoslav, but the industrial cities have an Italian majority, Trieste being nearly 75 per cent Italian. Similarly Monfalcone and Gorizia have 65 to 70 per cent majorities.

At present the province is arbitrarily divided by the Morgan Line into Zone A and Zone B. The Yugoslavs occupy Zone B; the Allies, mostly the U. S. 88th Division, Zone A. Trieste, Monfalcone and Gorizia are in Zone A.

TITO'S ABDUCTIONS

Almost weekly there is a planned licensed demonstration by both sides. Almost daily there is a semi-spontaneous disturbance of one kind or another in the large cities. The most backward nationalist hatreds are stimulated by both sides. It is not at all unusual to find the most "refined" Italian families teaching their children to refer to Slavs as *Schiave* (Italian for slave). The Tito sup-

porters, in turn, indiscriminately label all Italians as Fascists.

During the 40 days that Tito's "liberators" occupied Gorizia shortly before the end of the war in Europe, 15,000 of its population—almost one out of every three—were abducted to Yugoslavian labor camps. These were mainly Italians, but many anti-Tito forces were similarly treated. Of these 15,000, some 10,000 have been heard from; most still in the camps, many dead, a few trickling back and a handful returning as agents for Tito. The other 5,000 are still not heard from. Almost every family in Gorizia has been affected by this terrorism. Under the circumstances, there is no cause for surprise at the recrudescence of extreme Italian chauvinism.

But the Slavs, in turn, have equal reason to fear Italian rule. During the period of Mussolini's domination, the Slavs in this area suffered a severe form of national oppression. Their language was discouraged and no newspapers in Slovene were permitted. Slavs found no employment in the cities, for the policy of the Mussolini government was to encourage them to remain peasants in the countryside. True, there is today a new government in Italy, but the Slavs see this new government continuing to press the same imperialistic policy which distinguished Mussolini's rule—and they therefore shy away from the prospect of Italian domination of Venezia Giulia.

In the present situation, there seems almost no equitable solution to the problem, so inflamed have the nationalistic hatreds become. A decision in favor of either nation will

leave active dissident groups for whom life would be made miserable by the victors. To internationalize the area would be equivalent to giving Tito a protectorate. With a city like Trieste internationalized, 200,000 Italians would be strangled economically by the Yugoslavs who would completely surround them. Trieste depends upon Yugoslavia for its food and upon Italy for its electric power. It is obvious that the ultimate solution lies in a workers' government in the area, based on the cooperation of working class governments in Italy and Yugoslavia. That alone could bring about the cooperation of the two peoples and lessen chauvinistic bitterness.

WHAT CHOICE?

Yet the question presses for an immediate solution. The first demand in this situation must be one for self-determination. That is to say, the choice must rest with the people of Venezia Giulia—deciding in a fully democratic plebiscite, and through their own delegated institutions what shall be their future.

However, that by no means disposes of the problem. Self-determination is an elementary right, one that is basic to every revolutionary socialist platform. In a plebiscite, the people would have before them the choice of attaching themselves to Yugoslavia, to Italy, or remaining entirely independent. Thus we have the obligation of stating our opinion as to how they should vote. Trieste cannot be considered in the same light as, say, Poland or the Ukraine. It is impossible in this situation to call for a completely independent Trieste, for it would in reality be an oppressed satellite of Yugoslavia, Italy (or Anglo-American imperialism operating through the United Nations).

To advocate that the people of Trieste affiliate themselves with Yugoslavia is to advocate that they place around their necks a totalitarian noose. The choice that is left is to advocate among the people of the area that they vote to incorporate themselves into Italy. Whatever the limitations on democracy in Italy, and these limitations are wide and varied, in the concrete circumstances the people of the area would be choosing the right to have some kind of free press, free unions and free political organizations, not one of which would exist under Tito. Such an approach, based not on Italian nationalist considerations but on the democratic interests of the Trieste people, would in its proper presentation, itself constitute a refutation of reactionary Italian

and Yugoslav nationalism. The people would be asked to make a choice not on nationalist lines, but on democratic lines designed to promote the socialist cause.

(A similar, though not identical problem, existed some years ago with respect to the Saar. A plebiscite was to be held. The Saar, under a League of Nations mandate, belonged to France. Ethnologically and in every way it was part of Germany. Hitler counted on that, and succeeded in winning the plebiscite. Independence was realistically out of the question. The revolutionists were faced with a choice—how apply the principles of self-determination.

Leon Trotsky in that situation, despite the Saar's ethnological and industrial and national ties to Germany, proposed then that the people of the Saar vote for France. The reasons he put forward were much the same as those put forward above. Hitler Germany meant death for the union and political institutions of the working class. France, in the circumstances, meant democratic rights essential to building the socialist movement. We ask our

Gould Speaks at AVC Election Forum

NEW YORK CITY—A lively political debate took place last week at the General Maurice Rose Chapter of the American Veterans Committee Forum in the East Bronx when Nathan Gould, veterans director of the Workers Party, debated representatives of the Liberal and Communist (Stalinist) Parties. The representative of the Stalinists was Joe Clark, writer on veterans' subjects for the Daily Worker.

Several hundred people attended the forum, which was held at Herman Ridder High School in the heart of a working class East Bronx neighborhood. The alert audience listened attentively to the speakers and applauded Gould's presentation of the revolutionary socialist point of view. After the speeches, questions were asked and many contrasted Gould's frank presentation with Clark's attempt to evade the ticklish questions which listeners asked him about the Hitler-Stalin pact and Russia's refusal to open its doors to refugee European Jews.

For a long while after the forum, members of the audience continued informal discussions in which members of the Workers Party vigorously participated.

readers to make particular note of this point. The problem of Trieste is now being disposed of imperialistically in the United Nations and it will exist as a problem for a long time. Our view as stated above will probably occasion much discussion, and we shall return to it shortly to make fuller explanation.—Ed.)

REVOLUTIONARY POSSIBILITIES

But the truth is that there is at present no revolutionary movement in Trieste. The primitive nationalism inculcated into the masses by both Italy and Tito drugs whatever class consciousness the workers possess. Yet there are significant tendencies within the "left" parties which can be successfully exploited by revolutionary elements. The Stalinist movement is split from top to bottom into three groups who often violently fight against each other. One group is that led by Togliatti, operating on Kremlin instructions, but unable to refuse, passively begging the Allies to give Trieste to Italy. The second is a majority of the Italian Stalinists who actively demand Trieste for Italy. The third group is the Titini, that is Tito's supporters.

The Fourth International is hardly known in this area. But that there are great opportunities for it is indicated in the following incident: Two British Trotskyists, who happened to find themselves in the area, spoke before a local Stalinist section (numbering 2000 in a town of 10,000) and created a tremendous impression. They were bombarded with questions and discussion. They distributed copies of *IV Internazionale*, the newspaper of the Italian section of the Fourth International. But they were unfortunately unable to remain in the area. If the Italian Fourth Internationalists find it possible to establish contact with the more advanced elements in Venezia Giulia, we are certain that they will find them interested and receptive to the program of revolutionary socialism.

San Francisco Union Pickets Demonstrate Against Hate-Monger

By MILTON MILLER

SAN FRANCISCO, Oct. 27—Carrying signs proclaiming "Frisco Is 100 Per Cent Anti-Union," "Drive Smith the Scab-Header Out of Frisco," "Smith Scabs for Big Business," more than 3,000 pickets responded today to the call of the San Francisco CIO Industrial Union Council to demonstrate against hate-monger and fascist Gerald L. K. Smith at the Commerce High School in San Francisco.

Organizations represented on the picket line included CIO maritime unions, San Jose CIO Council, American Veterans Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Workers Party, Socialist Workers Party and Communist (Stalinist) Party.

Unfortunately, the real leadership of the demonstration was in the hands of the Stalinists who played their usual role of dampening picket-line militancy and destroyed the unity of the picket line with discriminatory actions against participating organizations. First the CP saw to it that only organizations which they were sure of would be at the organizing conference for the picket line. They followed this up with a leaflet of "instructions" designed to make the picket line as silent as a grave and discourage the picketers from shouting slogans or going into the hall to let Smith know how anti-fascists really felt about his fascist gang.

To cap their flaky role, the Stalinist "marshal" in charge refused to allow the Workers Party to carry its own banners on the grounds that such slogans were "political" and "unauthorized." He threatened to call the very same cops who were swarming all over the place "protecting" Smith and have the WP picketers removed

as "provocateurs" unless they complied with his demands. The Socialist Workers Party was also enjoined from carrying a sign on the same grounds: Rather than risk the effects of a division on the line, the "offending" signs were removed, since both organizations had sufficient other signs to identify them in the line of march.

The policy of throwing cold water on the militancy of the anti-fascists played right into Smith's hands, instead of being greeted in San Francisco with the "Minneapolis treatment," which led to his being kicked out of that city for good. The present policy allows him to meet under police protection and build up his base to the point where he will be strong enough to sally forth and attack workers' meetings. The lesson of Germany and Italy must be learned by American labor. The fascist scum must be stopped before it gets strong!

After the picket line was disbanded, it was learned that the police had beaten up and arrested a union militant who heckled Smith inside the meeting. The unionist, provoked by Smith's reactionary remarks, called out, whereupon he was grabbed by three burly plainclothesmen, pulled over a row of seats, knocked down, in the aisle and pummeled unmercifully. Then he was taken outside, beaten again and finally removed to a hospital for treatment. Later he was charged with "resisting arrest" and "disturbing the peace!"

A large group of interested workers that had been apprised of the beating made representations to the police and finally secured his release on \$50 bail. The money was raised by sympathizers who were outraged at the behavior of the police. At this writing the case has been held over to avoid unfavorable publicity before the election, since Proposition No. 4 to raise police pay is to be voted on!

ITALIAN BLACKSHIRTS RENEW ACTIVITY; PUNISHED LIGHTLY BY GOVERNMENT

PARIS, Oct. 18—Italian Blackshirt and SS sluggers have been arrested for planting the time bomb that destroyed a CP headquarters in Milan on October 10, the Italian press reports. The blast killed a five-year-old boy, wrecked offices, blasted out walls and shook the neighborhood. A CP-led demonstration protested 16 Milan police.

On the same day terrorists fired on headquarters of the Anti-Fascist Union of Italo-Slavs at Monfalcone in Venezia Giulia, which includes Trieste, and wounded two persons.

SUSTER'S HISTORY

The signature of Roberto Suster, director of the fascist news agency, Stefani, from 1941 to 1943, appeared under an editorial in *L'Indipendente* on October 9 and continues to appear. The never-completed purge of former fascist newspapermen and the general amnesty have been criticized by an Italian journalists' conference in Palermo on October 7 which opposed employing ex-fascist writers. It has had little effect.

Mussolini's personal newspaper, *Popolo D'Italia*, employed Suster, now 51, as a correspondent in the Balkans, Germany, Russia, Japan and China during the 1920's. Later, as chief of the Italian press office in Warsaw, Suster was also secretary of the Fascist Party there. Mussolini himself wrote a preface to *Germania Repubblicana*, one of two books Suster had written during the fascist reign.

Suster's re-entry into newspaper activity is only the latest in a long series of similar incidents. Two days before, Mario Missiroli, who was an important director of *Il Messaggero*, most powerful daily Roman paper, when it was a chief fascist organ, was appointed an editor.

PETRI IS "PUNISHED"

"Axis Sally" or Rita Zucca, daughter of a New York restaurant owner, well known broadcaster to Allied soldiers in Italy, is to be released from Mantellate Prison in Rome, it was reported on October 16. Miss Zucca, who, according to U. S. Army authorities, renounced her American citizenship in June, 1941, had her Italian court sentence of four years and five months cancelled under the general amnesty of August and was

being held temporarily by Allied authorities.

This week's payoff in easy treatment of fascists was the case of Aristodemio Petri, ill-famed as "the terror of Porta Pia" during the Nazi occupation of Rome. Petri, who, witnesses testified, had forced anti-fascists to wear brilliant red neckties and was an expert in forcing castor oil down anti-fascist throats, was sentenced to three years and eight months in jail and a 12,000 lire fine by the Rome Court of Assizes.—J. A.

FOOD MINISTER FAILS TO CRUSH BLACK MARKET

PARIS, Oct. 21—The three-month-old half-free-half-controlled meat rationing system which Food Minister Farge had called a "bastard" system when first adopted in July is now scrapped for fully-controlled rationing.

The double ration system had authorized purchase of 150 grams of meat (about one-third pound) at the controlled price of 135 francs; and another 150 grams of meat at "free" prices which were far higher. Farge said French workers, far from wiping out the black market, had crawled into bed with it and legalized it.

Under this system, meat prices rose 47 per cent from July to September, admits Farge. Pork, which sold at a maximum of seven francs a kilo (2.2 pounds) in 1938, now sells for 160 francs, 23 times higher!

Moved by growing protests and strikes of workers frozen out of the meat market by high prices, Farge said more meat—300 grams per week per person—will be available at 200 francs a kilo. Actually this is the same amount of meat and is a recognition by Farge that it is time to legalize the 65-franc rise in prices from 135 to 200 francs a kilo, well out of range of the workers' pockets. Meanwhile the black market will continue selling meat at 300-400 francs a kilo.

Like his earlier "bastard" system, Farge's new attempt to control prices will prove as empty as his boast of ending *le marche noir* "by Christmas."—J. A.

Book Bargains

- NO. 1
- Lenin: The Teachings of Karl Marx20
 - Lenin: The War and the Second International20
 - Nearing: The American Empire50
- 50¢ for You

- NO. 2
- Lenin: The Teachings of Karl Marx20
 - Lovovsky: Role of Labor Unions in the Russian Revolution05
 - Losovsky: Role of Labor Unions in the Russian Revolution05
 - Nearing: The American Empire50
 - Shachtman: The Fight for Socialism 1.00
- \$1.25 for You
- \$1.75

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Have you read Trotsky's THE NEW COURSE? Name _____

Paper Bound \$1.00 _____ Address _____

Cloth Bound \$2.00 _____ City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Please send me No. 1 No. 2 No. 3

LABOR ACTION SCHOOL

AND

SUNDAY EVENING FORUM

- Nov. 17—PALESTINE: A Symposium Ed Findley and Albert Gates
 - Nov. 24—GUNTHER REIMANN Author of "The Vampire Economy" On "The Fate of Germany"
 - Dec. 1—JAMES T. FARRELL Novelist and Literary Critic On "Tolstol's WAR AND PEACE" Author of "Studs Lonigan"
 - Dec. 8—CLEMENT GREENBERG Editor of "Commentary" On "The Decline of Art" Art Critic of "The Nation"
 - Dec. 15—NATHAN GOULD National Organizer, Workers Party On "Trend to Militarization in the U. S."
 - Jan. 5—PROF. C. WRIGHT MILLS Dir. Labor Research Div., Bur. of Applied Social Research, Columbia University On "The New Middle Class"
 - Jan. 12—IRVING HOWE Editorial Board, Labor Action On "Can the Intellectual Escape Politics?"
 - Jan. 19—MAX SHACHTMAN National Chairman, Workers Party On "American Labor at the Crossroads"
 - Jan. 26—ISAAC ROSENFELD Author, "Passage from Home" On "Trends in American Literature"
- ADMISSION: Single Lecture, 50c — Series of four, \$1.50

<p>TUESDAY Trade Unionism in Action 7:30-8:45 P. M. Begins Nov. 12 OSCAR WILLIAMS, Instructor</p> <p>Marx's Capital Volume II 7:30-8:45 P. M. Begins Nov. 12 F. FORREST, Instructor</p> <p>Socialist Perspectives for Post-War Europe 9:00-10:15 P. M. Begins Nov. 12 MAX SHACHTMAN, Instructor</p>	<p>FRIDAY Program of the Workers Party 7:30-8:45 P. M. Begins Nov. 15 MARY BELL, Instructor</p> <p>Contemporary Problems of Marxism 7:30-8:45 P. M. Begins Nov. 15 ERNEST ERBER, Instructor</p> <p>Development of the Socialist Movement Part I: The Struggle for Scientific Socialism 9:00-10:15 P. M. Begins Nov. 15 EMANUEL GARRETT, Instructor</p>
--	---

FIRST TERM: Eight Weeks
Nov. 12, 1946, to Jan. 17, 1947

REGISTRATION: Oct. 30 to Nov. 11
Fee: \$1.50 per Course

All Courses at
Third Floor, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
Phone: CHelsea 2-9681

NOW OUT!

The New **INTERNATIONAL** NOVEMBER

MARXISM and the JEWISH QUESTION
Three Points of View

Shirley Lawrence: **THE MYTH OF GERMAN CHARACTER**

H. Leder: **WHY THE GERMANS FAILED TO REVOLT**

EDITORIAL COMMENT:
The Jews of Europe and Palestine—Paris Conference—Wallace Dismissal—Twenty-Ninth Anniversary of Russian Revolution

ONE YEAR \$2.00
SINGLE COPY 25c