

**WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD!
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!**

LABOR ACTION

APRIL 4, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Opposition of Radical Writers Seen Most Effective

Stalinist "Peace" Conference Flops

By R. FAHAN

Seldom has the American press devoted so much space to a "cultural event" as the Stalinist-sponsored "Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace." If there was very little about "culture" in the press reports, there was hardly any more in the conference itself. For the truth is that both the conference and the press reaction were political events, part of the chilly war between the U. S. and Russia. Only in terms of that simple fact can the conference be understood.

After having sat through two days of turgid Stalinist, semi-Stalinist and neo-Stalinist oratory (I shall later distinguish among these various kinds), I think it reasonable to conclude that, from the Stalinist point of view, the conference was a failure. The conference lacked the "quality folk" names from the literary and scientific worlds which previous CP-staged conferences had had in America; it did not run smoothly; it met with serious opposition from among its delegates; and it had to witness the humiliating and shameful spectacle of seeing a Russian Stalinist bureaucrat attacked from the floor

and not be able to send his critics to corrective labor in Siberia! This last was the most stunning blow of all.

**Opening Beset
By Difficulties**

The conference opened with a dinner at \$10 a plate at which some of its more important intellectuals from the U. S. and abroad spoke. Here it ran into its first snag. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, had previously been invited to speak at this dinner and had refused. I have it on good authority that emissaries, probably unofficial, of the State Department urged Cousins to attend the dinner and attack the conference. He did. But Cousins, be it remembered, is both a muddle-head politically and a middle-brow intellectually. Consequently, his attack was ineffectual; he confined himself to noting that the American CP was disliked by most Americans (hear! hear!) but said nothing about the role or nature of Russian Stalinism.

For his remarks he was roundly and semi-hysterically rebuked by Lillian Hellman, the cat-sharp party-liner, who told him that it was not polite to insult one's hosts. (By that line of reasoning, it was impolite of the Russian delegates to attack the U. S. government, which had allowed them to enter this country.)

At the dinner a great to-do was made about the refusal of the State

Department to permit the delegates from England and France to attend the conference. This proved to be one of the sustaining feelings of those who participated and showed how stupid and reactionary was the State Department's refusal of visas. Its argument had been that the Stalinists from Eastern Europe represented state regimes while those from Western Europe represented no one but themselves—as if the fact that a Stalinist has state power makes him more attractive than when he has

not! By refusing visas to the English and French delegates, the State Department not only violated democratic standards but played into the hands of the Stalinist sponsors of the conference.

When the conference itself opened on Saturday morning, March 26, at Carnegie Hall, hundreds of Catholic War Veterans and various nationalist Ukrainian organizations picketed in the streets. They carried some signs that were rather clever: "Shostakovich (Continued on page 3)

Congress Agrees On Legislation to Crack Rent Control

By SUSAN GREEN

On March 29 a Senate-House committee ironed out the differences between the Senate and House so-called rent control bills, and brought up as foul and flagrant an example of favoritism for a section of the propertied class as is possible to imagine.

On the same day, as if to give a living testimonial to the rank unfairness of the compromise bill, 30,500 people applied for 1,357 apartments in Woodside Houses, a New York City project in Queens. Applicants came at the rate of 6,000 an hour, or 100 a minute, to the thirty City Housing Authority offices. Ninety per cent of the eager applicants were war veterans, still without homes—and, shall it be added, still without the permanent peace that the last imperialist war they fought was supposed to bring.

This was only the first day that applicants were accepted. How many more thousands will apply for these 1,357 apartments? How many more will there be like one of the applicants, a veteran of the Philippine campaign, living with his two small children and a sick wife in a cold-water flat, five flights to walk up? "I should get in," he said. "After all, I have two children. We have to climb five flights upstairs and the doctor said my wife shouldn't climb stairs because she is sickly and underweight."

"HOME RULE" DECONTROL

Here is the picture of the housing situation still existing today. Here is the living argument for an adequate housing program and for honest rent control by the government. Here is the background against which must be considered the iniquitous bill that the Democratic Congress is about to pass and the Democratic President is about to sign.

The two aspects of the bill most important to the many millions of anxious tenants are first that it is really a decontrol bill, although it purports to extend control for fifteen months, and second that while it does not say it is removing all rent ceilings, actually it does by the privileges it extends to the landlords.

On the first count, the fifteen-month official extension is vitiated by the so-called "home rule" provision also contained in the bill. States, cities, towns and villages will have the right, under the bill, to decontrol rent, if the Governors approve. This "home rule" provision was placed in the bill in spite of the testimony before Congress of the Conference of Mayors that "States and municipal (Continued on page 2)

Reveals the Real Identity of Leon Trotsky's Assassin!

By JULIAN GORKIN

This book, the product of a scrupulous investigation, and based on the only official and complete documentation that exists, would nevertheless be inconclusive were the true identity of Leon Trotsky's assassin to remain in doubt. Obviously, I refer to the material assassin, the simple instrument of execution, since no one can throw a shadow of a doubt on the identity of the other. This identity has been clearly and definitely established.

As is noted elsewhere in this book, various Catalan refugees who held positions of trust in the Communist organization during the Spanish Civil War, and who later found themselves on its fringes—some in opposition to it—recognized the assassin without a shadow of a doubt. As proof of their assertions, they assured me that the former had a scar on the right forearm caused by a wound received at the front. A fact which I had verified without arousing any suspicions on the part of the assassin. Scrupulous in the extreme, I nevertheless wished to await for other complementary proofs.

At last they have arrived. Some, the main proofs, from Moscow itself. The iron curtain created by Stalinist totalitarianism to isolate the martyred Russian people from the rest of the universe has its flaws and leaks. In any case, I find myself in the position of making a series of affirmations and of answering fully for them. Let me also say, that if it is necessary I can at any moment cite my proofs in support of what I am about to say.

Mother Worked in GPU Service

The mother of the assassin is living and is named Caridad Mercader. She is a Catalan, energetic and fanatical. She is a woman who has irremediably played the game of Stalinism. She lived in France and Belgium for many years. She educated her children, four boys and one girl, in these countries, and this explains the correct French which they all speak. And this is why Trotsky's assassin, the third child, could pass himself off as a Belgian.

I believed that Caridad Mercader had entered the service of the GPU in Spain, and had begun during the Civil War. This is not so. Her relations with this sinister police and espionage organization go back much further. In 1928 she was already in its service in Paris. She formed part of a "special cell" controlled by the secret service which acted—and still acts—under the cover of diplomatic immunity. She, as well as other GPU agents, entered the political organizations that were independent of the Communists. This is an old tactic of the GPU, which it used and abused in my poor Spain before applying it in the countries today under the Stalinist yoke. With her daughter, Montserrat, Caridad Mercader belonged for a few years in Paris to Section 15 of the Socialist Party. The old militants of this section know them and remember them perfectly.

During the Spanish Civil War, Caridad Mercader participated actively in the Catalo-

What is the real identity of "Jacques Mornard" or "Jackson," the agent of the Stalinist GPU who murdered Leon Trotsky and who is now serving a prison sentence for the crime in Mexico?

Up to now, investigation has failed to establish the truth behind this sinister assassin. The article we print herewith gives the story of his true identity. It is written by Julian Gorkin, the well-known Spanish socialist, who lived in Mexico throughout the war and afterward and is now in Paris. The article is the sensational climax of a book written recently in Mexico by Gorkin in collaboration with the chief of police of Mexico City. The book is the result of an extensive independent investigation, based largely upon the files of the police authorities.

While the propriety of a literary collaboration with a police chief by a socialist has been brought into question, and some of the conclusions reached in the book have also been questioned by comrades and friends of Leon Trotsky who are intimately familiar with all phases of the crime, the present article is of such a highly important nature and filled with details of such world-wide interest, that we reprint it in full. It was transmitted to LABOR ACTION for publication by the widow of Leon Trotsky, Natalia Sedov Trotsky.—Ed.

nian party of Socialist Unification (PSUC), which adhered to the Communist International. She gave proof of a blind fanaticism, and of an absolute lack of scruples in the army of terror. She gained merit in the eyes of the important agents of the GPU, and principally with the most important of all, "Peter," ex-agent in Paris, in Brussels, and in Barcelona, and one of those who organized the political and police coup which has placed Hungary under Stalinist totalitarianism. Caridad Mercader became one of the trusted GPU agents in Catalonia, and drew her children toward that terrible organization.

The surname of the children is del Rio Mercader. One of them died in Spain. The oldest resides in Paris. The second in age is the daughter, inseparable from Caridad. The third is the sadly celebrated Jason-Mornard, the material assassin of Leon Trotsky*. The youngest of the children, Luis, lives in Moscow and is finishing his course in engineering.

Petty Adventurer to Assassin

The so-called Mornard belonged to the Communist militias of Catalonia. It was at the front, then, that he received the wound in the right forearm to which I referred above. His existence had been aimless. He had been accustomed to living without working, to frequenting houses of prostitution to satisfy all his vices. He was a petty adventurer without a future. Following the example of his mother, he became one of the docile instruments of the GPU. Once in their hands, he was designated

to assassinate Trotsky, should the attempt of the painter Siqueiros fail, in accordance with the plot outlined in this book.

Caridad Mercader lived in Moscow from 1940 until August 1944. She was treated there as an important personage. She maintained direct relations with Beria, all powerful chief of the NKVD. She was strictly forbidden to speak to anyone about her third child. Notwithstanding this, she revealed most of the story, above all to trusted militant Communists, who were refugees in Moscow. There is one thing which the NKVD has not succeeded and will never succeed in altogether suppressing: individual conscience, trust between comrades and intimate friends, family ties, and the maternal sentiment. . . . Besides direct contact with the Russian reality must be a tremendous blow to the critical judgment of some of the foreign militants. So tremendous and dramatic must it be, that it drove Jose Diaz, ex-secretary-general of the Spanish Communist Party to jump from the third floor of the Hotel Intourist in Moscow. Caridad felt herself the prisoner of remorse. She began to hate in the depths of her heart the Russian tyranny and the chiefs of the organization of which she and hers were slave perhaps forever.

After long and persistent pressure, Caridad Mercader succeeded in leaving the USSR at the time indicated above. Her youngest son remained there as a hostage to guarantee the silence of his mother and his brothers. The NKVD did not dare to suppress Caridad for fear that the son, the assassin of Trotsky, would speak out one day. And it did not care to suppress the latter, for fear of his mother. Such is the infernal circle.

Caridad Mercader stayed in Mexico under a false identity from the October of 1944 until November of 1945. She maintained a permanent connection with her son. She saw to it that he lacked nothing, and moved the strings through a skillful lawyer and judge in order to allow the argument of "legitimate defense" and obtain an important reduction in the sentence of 20 years and one day.

She has been in Paris with her oldest son and daughter, Montserrat, for almost three years now. But she maintains contact with a commission of direct NKVD agents in the Mexican capital. These agents are paid high salaries. Their only mission consists of attending to—and watching over—Trotsky's assassin. I must add that the organization of the assassination of the ex-chief of the Red Army, the aid given his assassin, and the maintenance of the apparatus of the NKVD in Mexico cost Moscow the handsome sum of \$600,000.00 to date. Stalin must surely value these hirelings. For him, for his totalitarian tyranny, the death of Leon Trotsky was worth this and much more.

* The complete name of Trotsky's assassin is: Ramon del Rio Mercader. He never used the father's surname, but that of the mother: Mercader. His older brother, who lives in Paris with his mother and sister, Montserrat, is named George. And as has been said, he who lives in Moscow, the youngest of the Mercaders, is named Luis.

Illinois Broyles Bills Threaten Civil Rights

By SAUL BERG

CHICAGO—The latest step in the drive against civil liberties is the unanimous recommendation by the Illinois Senate Judiciary Committee of the infamous Broyles bills. These bills would outlaw the Communist Party.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are well aware of our reasons for opposing any suppression by the government of the advocacy and organized propagation of ANY ideas, even those as abhorrent to us as those of the Stalinists. But the concrete provisions of these bills are startling. They make last year's Mundt-Nixon bills in Wash-

ington look tame by comparison. Every organization of 20 or more members would have to turn in membership lists and minutes of all meetings. Teachers could be dismissed by Boards of Education whenever it was in the "public interest". Furthermore, not only the Communist Party but also "Communist front organizations" are outlawed, and their members subjected to heavy penalties. And how is "Communist front organization" defined? Why, as "any organization that seeks to replace free enterprise with a communistic economy!"

Just as in Washington the "Fair Deal" Democratic victory of November is being shown up as of no practical value to labor, so in Illinois the same disillusioning pattern is taking shape. For the first time in years the Democrats have a majority in the Illinois House and a very large minority in the Senate. Yet not only did every Democratic "friend of labor" on the Judiciary Committee vote for the bill, but also all the Democrats took part eagerly in moves to investigate "subversive" activities at the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College.

The Judiciary Committee had advanced hearings on the bill by a week on very short notice, and as a result there were very few representatives of adult organizations on hand to testify against the bill. Student organizations at the U of C and Roosevelt had been more alert and 150 of them were rallied in two days for a bus trip to Springfield.

STUDENTS VILIFIED

These students have since been vilified by the legislators and the press in an outrageous manner. For example, the press gave the impression that they were all Wallacites and Stalinists. Actually the student witnesses before the committee hearing included representatives of the ADA, the Student Republican Club and of the student bodies of the theological schools.

Every paper in Chicago reported the day after the hearings that the students had hissed, hooted and generally behaved in a rowdy fashion at the hearings. But the American Civil Liberties Union representative testifies that they behaved in an absolutely orderly fashion. A few days later, one paper, the Sun-Times, printed a brief correction of its report but has done nothing since to prevent its columnists from echoing the same charges.

The papers reported that the students created such disorder in a Springfield drug store that they were refused service. The truth on this point is that a Rexall store refused to serve them because they were an interracial group. They then went to another store, bought sandwiches and coffee and went back and occupied the Rexall to eat their snack. Not one paper in Illinois has ever stated the actual reason why they were refused service. Most of the eating (Continued on page 2)

Smith Act Key To Prosecution In Trial of 11

By WYATT LEE

The outlines of the U. S. Government's charge of conspiracy against eleven Communist Party national committee members took form last week as U. S. Attorney John F. X. McGohey made the prosecution's opening presentation and Louis F. Budenz, former Daily Worker editor turned Catholic university professor, took the stand as the first government witness.

Keystone of the government case is the 1945 turn in American Stalinism, when Earl Browder was deposed as national chairman and the war-time Communist Political Association was re-constituted as the Communist Party. From that date, McGohey charges, the CP and, specifically, the eleven officials on trial "conspired to advocate and teach the violent overthrow of the government."

Such a conspiracy, which does not presume any overt act on the part of the defendants, is illegal only under terms of the Smith Act, passed by Congress in 1940 and used once before, in 1941, to convict 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party. Though upheld in lower courts, the Smith Act has not been upheld by the Supreme Court. In the SWP case, the Supreme Court refused to grant a review and thus avoided a specific test at the highest level.

In general terms, the defense, consisting of six attorneys and Eugene Dennis, CP general secretary who is defending himself in the trial, argued in its presentations that the defendants are not guilty of "conspiring" as the prosecution charges, but that they represent an open political viewpoint; and secondly, that their right to present this viewpoint is protected by the constitution.

Without evidence of an "overt act" the conspiracy charges cannot hold up, the defense says, and the (Continued on page 4)

China CP Set to Take Cities; Peace Unlikely

By JACK BRAD

After a stalemate lasting almost four months, the Chinese Communist Party last week finally appointed a five-man commission to open "peace" negotiations with a similar committee of the Nanking government. This is the first break in the unacknowledged and tenuous truce.

The Nanking Kuomintang (KMT) had made overtures to the Stalinists as early as the middle of January. Its committee has been in existence for several months. It has even visited the northern headquarters of the CP in an effort to force the opening of discussion. The CP, on its part, stated on January 22: "We are willing to negotiate the question of a peaceful settlement with the reactionary Nanking government." Yet, with all this surface willingness, the CP has held the Nanking group at arm's length and only now has set April 1 as the specific date it would meet the na-

tionist representatives in its own new capital city of Peiping.

Basis for negotiation has also long been established by the victorious Stalinists as the now famous eight-point program of Mao Tze-tung. While Nanking has not indicated the slightest tendency to accept these points it has acknowledged them as the axes for discussion. Thus there appears on the surface to be some reason to expect a resolution of at least some aspects of the conflict. However, an examination of the CP "peace" proposals dashes all such expectations to smithereens.

In reality the eight points are not negotiable matters, but constitute a set of demands on Nanking. Heading the list is the demand for "punishment of war criminals." The list of "war criminals" issued by the CP to date—and this is a flexible list constantly being enlarged—includes almost all the important members of

what is left of the government and army from Chiang Kai-shek down. It also includes the present head of state, Li Tsung-jen, who is to organize, ratify and execute any decisions agreed to. It also includes General Ho, the new prime minister.

The other demands constitute a program for liquidation of the entire KMT regime. The "bogus constitution" is to be abrogated, the "legitimacy of traditional institutions is to be abolished," "all reactionary armies [are to be remodeled] in accordance with democratic principles," and "all treaties of national betrayal" are to be abrogated, that is, all treaties with the U. S.

As a capstone to this program, it proposes to "convoke a political consultative conference without the participation of reactionary elements, establish a democratic coalition government, take over all power from the Nanking KMT reactionary govern-

ment and all its levels of government." The "reactionary elements" referred to are constituted by the present regime and all its cliques, by the CP's own definition. These groups are not to be allowed participation in the political conference which is to set up the new state. They cannot, therefore, call such a conference themselves. Only the CP can do this under the above stipulations. This is not so much a demand on Nanking, then, as a declaration of intent by the CP to outlaw Nanking from its future regime. Such a proposal obviously cannot be negotiated.

NO CHOICE FOR NANKING

In addition to these political demands, Mao also calls for "reform of the agrarian system and confiscation of bureaucratic capital." That is, he insists that the landlord class be driven from power in the countryside and that the "Four Families"

who rule the KMT and the economy have their wealth confiscated. For the KMT to do this, it must wage civil war against itself.

The eight points are really a declaration of policy by the CP, a statement of national reorganization of the state and social order in city and country of a character which specifically excludes the present Nanking regime and all the other old cliques of the former Chiang Kai-shek party and state. They are not meant to be proposals for peace; that is, there is no basis for compromise implicit in them. It is, therefore, unlikely that the coming Peiping conference will result in "peace" or even in a cease-fire.

Nanking is fully aware of this reality. However, it has no choice whatsoever. Its only thin ray of hope is for a breathing spell during which some positive force could emerge to (Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

FE Convention Defies CIO Order

A wire from Chicago, as we go to press, informs us that with various NLRB votes scheduled (at Allis-Chalmers in Springfield, Ill., on April 15, etc.), the FE has suspended all its officers.

By KEN HILLIER

MARCH 27—The United Farm Equipment & Metal Workers, CIO, adjourned their convention today in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, with a 100 per cent victory for the Stalinist leadership.

The convention met in the face of a CIO order to liquidate the organization and merge with the United Auto Workers. The answer of the convention was "No."

The FE leaders adopted another 100 per cent turn in negotiation strategy. This year their demands include all of the demands of the UAW for pensions and full medical protection paid for by the companies, wage increases (they set their figure at 30 cents an hour), plus the issue of the seven-hour day with eight hours' pay.

CHANGE IN STRATEGY

This left turn, this militant set of demands which is roughly equal to 70 cents an hour wage increase, is in direct contrast to the 1948 negotiations when the FE top leadership, scared to death because of the defeat of the Packinghouse Workers strike, settled in a hurry for the 11 cent wage increase and made no contract changes, even giving up holiday pay for Saturdays.

UAW plants in Harvester struck later, won, and the company then "gave" the same to the plants represented by FE. Last year, the leadership told the FE rank and file that we were living in a real reactionary, union-busting period and that the Taft-Hartley Act was going to bust the unions. What "we" had to do was conduct a "holding" operation.

What has changed so markedly? The election results, the UAW drive, are, we think, prime factors. However, in this program mere campaign rhetoric, one that will remain on paper? If we look on the UE as the example, we can say in advance that a struggle for these demands will prove to be a strategy to be used in

case of NLRB elections with UAW.

Other resolutions adopted at the conference were: a plank calling for a national congress of labor of all trade unions to organize the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act, a call for a labor holiday, and support of the "one package repeal" bill. The convention called upon the Democratic Party to carry through its campaign promises on adequate housing, mine safety, etc.

STALINIST OBJECTIVES

The convention also came out against the North Atlantic Pact. The line of the resolution was the complete Stalinist position. The resolution called on President Truman to make "a genuine effort to restore peaceful relationships with the Soviet Union through direct negotiations, reverting to the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt." Throughout the resolution there is no real sign of an anti-war, international labor solidarity policy.

The vote on the above resolution revealed how completely the Stalinists controlled the convention. It carried 20 to 1. There was also a unanimous vote against the CIO Executive Board order for merger. The delegates were elected very carefully. Where there was the possibility of opposition delegates (as in McCormick in Chicago) the leadership expelled these people by decree through the local president, without a trial or charges.

There is no doubt that, except for a few locals, FE has the rank and file solidly behind the leadership. Their "left" turn helps them. Besides this turn, there is the important fact that the FE is in a good position vis the UAW merger question because the local leaderships are in the good moral position of being, in many cases, non-Stalinist and militant (East Moline, West Pullman, Harvester), commanding the respect of the rank and file.

Except for McCormick Works in Chicago, the UAW has not much strength. The unity of the unions for the best interests of the International Harvester Workers is absolutely necessary. The Stalinists, who used to be the biggest "unity" shouters, are today holding on to a union only because it is a good sounding board for

their foreign policy. Why are they afraid of unity with UAW? Isn't it a democratic organization? True, they received an ultimatum. But why not negotiate for an honest settlement? Why two CIO unions in Harvester, one with 30,000, the other with 24,000—each played off against the other in negotiations?

Footnotes on FE Convention

The much-heralded clash between Grant Oakes and John T. Watkins failed to materialize. Watkins, who for many years has appeared as the non-Stalinist independent, withdrew his candidacy for president and Oakes was elected without opposition. Watkins gave the show away on Saturday, when he told the press: "I have no comment to make at this time. I expect to know by midnight tonight." Reduced to simple language, his group (Stalinists) had to decide whether a change of presidents would aid their cause. All district presidents were also re-elected.

A minor unimportant skirmish between Watkins and Oakes developed on the question of enlarging the board. Watkins was defeated 412 to 203. This minor battle was deliberately planned to show that FE had its differences.

An important position taken by the Stalinists on CIO affiliation was recorded Saturday and Sunday. For months, the FE paper has carried on an attack on the CIO and intimated that it might go independent. However, the convention showed a change in line. The CIO constitution states that a member union can only be expelled at a national convention and then by a two-thirds vote. FE is to ask for autonomous rights in the CIO. Oakes continually repeated he was loyal to Murray and CIO.

A \$2.00 per member assessment for the years 1949 and 1950 was voted as a fund to battle UAW.

The convention just concluded shows the Stalinist FE leadership holding the upper hand. The UAW has been checked for the time being. The formal NLRB hearing on March 27 at the Springfield, Ill., Allis-Chalmers plant brings the jurisdictional dispute to a head. The first vote will be decisive.

OHIO LABOR NOTES:

20 Arrested in UE Strike; UAW Wins at Chevrolet

By JOE CLARK

CLEVELAND—Occupying the center of the stage the past week in Cleveland labor circles was the strike at the Fawcett Airflex Co. in suburban Brooklyn. The company makes industrial clutches for General Motors. The struggle has been marked by flurries of violence in the past few days, with 20 arrests, including four charged with stench-bombing of the store of a non-striker, the others charged with throwing rocks and railroad spikes through auto windows when scabs pierced the picket line.

On March 26, defense attorneys moved for a change of venue because of the hostile atmosphere created by local newspapers, but the judge refused the motion.

The strike was called by Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers, CIO, on March 7. A raise of 30 cents per hour had been asked. The company not only refused the raise but refused to deal with the union at all, giving the reason as the failure of the union to comply with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

About a week ago the United Auto Workers, AFL, filed a petition with the NLRB for an election at the plant. It is not hard to discern the hand of the company in this move. The election was held March 22. Since the UE was not permitted on the ballot because of non-compliance, the issue was AFL union or no union. The result was defeat for the AFL union.

Despite this election outcome, the AFL (with plenty of police present) broke through the UE picket line. During and after the fight the arrests were made. The outcome of the court struggle is in doubt, but meantime the company is doing all possible to get the plant running again. It looks as if it may succeed soon. This would be bad for the UE, which has lost bargaining rights at four large plants here during the past year. These plants are the National Carbon Co., the Harris-Seybold Co., the Elwell-Parker Co. and the Marbott-Weld Co.

The strike has been marked by a fine spirit of militancy and struggle on the part of the rank and file, with the usual bluster and bluff by the Stalinist leadership, and the usual utter failure of the rank and file to comprehend the motivation of the Stalinist leadership. Of course we cannot for a moment overlook the despicable role of the AFL in this bitter struggle. We can only condemn

them in the strongest possible terms. Their union label only makes their scabbing all the more disgusting.

CLEVELAND—On March 18, the UAW won a decided victory over the AFL union affiliate at the new General Motors Chevrolet parts plant in Parma (a Cleveland suburb). The vote was 836 for the UAW and 184 for the AFL union. The victory in this plant is important not only for its present significance but also for the future, as the company expects to increase its working force from the present 1,200 to approximately 10,000 in the near future (so they say).

More than a thousand railroad workers have been laid off in the Cleveland area during the past week, chiefly as a result of the coal miners' "holiday." Other layoffs have occurred at National Carbon Co., Westinghouse Electric and Midland Steel Products. Last October, National Carbon Co. had 2,200 workers; it now has 1,500 and expects to cut this to 1,100 very soon. The company managers told the UE representatives that they will reduce the working force to the pre-war level. Westinghouse has laid off 256 and Midland Steel Products 140. The Ohio State Employment Service reports that in the Cleveland area 59 of every 1,000 workers are jobless compared with 51 a year ago and 48 in 1947. Unemployed in Greater Cleveland now number more than 40,000 and are increasing rapidly.

Who Says You Can't? Sanitation Men in Yonkers Said You Could

By WILLIAM BARTON

Events this month in the city of Yonkers, N. Y., again have proved that the strange legend, "You can't strike against the government," is either a serious threat to a free labor movement or impossible to enforce, even if given legal definition.

Five hundred and fifty Sanitation Department workers struck for eight days in protest against the dismissal of eighteen workers, most of whom had refused to work on Sunday at straight time. The Condon-Wadlin Law, which was passed by the state legislature last year to prohibit strikes in state and municipal agencies, was immediately brought into play and a court injunction issued against the strikers.

The law provides that any employee who does not report to work because of a grievance shall be immediately dismissed, and, if later reemployed, shall lose civil service protection for five years and receive no pay increases for three.

The strike had been terminated with city officials agreeing that the injunction be withdrawn and that the strikers not be penalized. The cases of the original eighteen were to be decided later. In other words, the public officials had agreed that the act was unenforceable unless the unions (in this case the AFL Teamsters and CIO Government Workers) were to be crushed.

During the past week, the mayor has reneged on the agreement and has announced he will invoke the act's provisions. The unions are prepared to fight on this issue, even to the extent of testing the constitutionality of the law. As significant as the switch from the agreement by this,

leading official is the original, unavoidable decision to avoid penalizing the government workers who struck.

ALL OVER THE STATE

This is not the first time this law has had to be ignored by public officials. In New York City, 900 employees of the City Housing Authority stayed away from work six days last month to attend daily protest meetings at union headquarters; with no penalties, invoked.

In Buffalo last April, 550 workers used the technique of being 'simultaneously sick for three days. State Attorney General Goldstein attempted to have the Condon-Wadlin legislation applied, but local officials told him it was impossible since some of the workers may have actually been sick.

Short "strikes" of one form or another have occurred in New York City's Departments of Welfare, Hospitals and Sanitation since the bill was passed, but no officials have made any serious attempts at applying punitive action. Similar laws exist in Pennsylvania; Michigan; and Ohio, with rarely a move to punish strikers because of them.

Government workers cannot be expected to sit by and accept abuses while their brothers in private industry fight back. In 1940, a book was published entitled "One Thousand Strikes Against the Government." The idea that government employees are unable to act like other workers was thus shown to be merely a widespread and sometimes accepted fairy tale. Government officials have been shown to be reluctant to prevent them unless prepared to fight the entire labor movement.

RIGHT TO STRIKE FOR ALL

The Yonkers strikes were undoubtedly preventing a near "essential" service—garbage collecting. In the present situation of the labor movement and the political-economic climate, such workers can have no outlet to settle many grievances other than protesting by walkout—just like workers in essential private industries like the railroads. And they have and will continue to avail themselves of such opportunities, regardless of legislation to the contrary.

Laws like the Condon-Wadlin Act must be repealed. Though hardly ever enforced, they supply another possible legal excuse (of which there are already far too many) for strike-breaking. The doctrine of "no strikes against the government" has been frequently used in many different situations; for example, the government has officially taken over struck industries and forced the workers to return. A free labor movement demands the right to strike for all workers.

Stalinist Control of Calif. AVC Broken by Split at Convention

SAN FRANCISCO, Mar. 20—An organized walkout of over fifty delegates, led by the Independent Progressive Caucus, split the state American Veterans Committee convention wide open yesterday and heralded the end of Stalinist control in their last remaining stronghold in the AVC.

For twenty hours the 125 delegates to the annual state convention in San Francisco wrangled and fought over delegate representation until the Stalinist (Progressive) Caucus eked through a majority vote, limiting the Los Angeles Wendell Willkie (Independent Progressive) Chapter to only nine votes out of a claimed four hundred and fifty. By simultaneously accepting the claimed and admittedly inflated representation for all other chapters, the Stalinists assured themselves of a clear majority at the convention. As a result, the Independent Progressive Caucus, supported by a few delegates from a middle (Build AVC) group, broke demonstratively and appealed to the AVC national office for the appointment of a state administrator who would declare the state convention illegal and would make provisions for another convention democratically run with appropriate representation.

Since the formation of the AVC in California three years ago, the Stalinists have ruthlessly dominated the state organization despite a constantly growing opposition in the ranks of the chapters. As far back as the 1947 state convention a liberal group attempted to head off this bureaucratic leadership. Eventually this group became known as the Independent Progressive Caucus with a strong following in the San Francisco Bay area. These chapters, however, had only a small membership and were easily overwhelmed by the Stalinist strength in Hollywood and Beverly Hills chapters, with a combined membership in the past of about 1,500.

As the California AVC approached the 1949 state convention, the organization under the control of the Stalinists had precipitously fallen to less than 2,300 claimed members. Numerous chapters had given up the ghost; factional squabbles wracked the Southern California group; activities had declined with the drop in membership; even the Stalinists in Hollywood and Beverly Hills chapters claimed less than 700 members. In all this demoralizing atmosphere the only positive achievement lay in the Negro Wendell Willkie Chapter, which grew from a handful to 450 members in a few months. But because this chapter had lined up with the Independent Progressive Caucus it became necessary for the Stalin-

ists to discredit its work. The close balance of forces at the convention drove the Stalinists toward preventing the seating of the Wendell Willkie delegates with full voting strength.

The lineup of factions was revealed in the sessions of the Credentials Committee when it was shown that the Progressive (Stalinist) Caucus claimed a voting strength of about 1,000 members; the Independent Progressives, 800; and the Build AVC group, about 500. Encouraged by the Independent Progressive Caucus control of the national AVC, the state Independent forces decided upon a head-on collision with the Stalinist state machine.

In spite of the Credentials Committee's three-to-two rejection of the Wendell Willkie representation, the Independents carried their struggle to the floor of the convention, where they were finally clubbed down as much by the parliamentary obstruction of the Stalinists as by the small majority vote.

ISSUES UNDEFINED

Interestingly enough, at no point in the heated discussion was the conflict defined in terms of a Stalinist-anti-Stalinist struggle for state control. "Democracy," "Representation," "Recognition of Negro Membership" were the vessels in which liberals carried their wares. A sharp definition of issues was so markedly absent that after the convention split Ben Leeds, the Stalinist floor whip, brazenly stated to the press: "The issue is strictly one of veteran service. It has nothing to do with communism."

The delegates "taking a walk" included the Oakland, Berkeley, Stockton and several San Francisco chapters from the North; and Wendell Willkie, Don Brown, Los Angeles No. 1 and Los Angeles Labor chapters from the South.

Whether this will save the California AVC from a lingering death depends on the Independent Progressives' ability to draw into the organization young worker veterans. Although this caucus has its connections with the UAW forces in Southern California, it has been unable in the past to attract the veterans from this union.

Moreover, some few of the members of the Independent Progressives stand out as right wingers in their struggle against the Stalinists. In line with the last national convention decision, they seek to deny membership in AVC to any CPer. If this right wing element grows within the Independent Caucus and reaches into further reactionary fields, then the future of the liberal pro-labor AVC is obviously doomed.

Broyles Bills - -

(Continued from page 1) places in the state capital are Jim Crow, but not one legislator has ever protested this situation.

The legislators responded to the student lobby by adopting a joint resolution to investigate the U of C and Roosevelt, appropriating \$2,500 for this purpose. The vote on this resolution was unanimous in the House, with one opposed in the Senate! The Democratic Party has thus far not lifted a finger to oppose the Broyles bills or to oppose an investigation resulting from the desire of college students to express democratically their opposition to the bills.

Meanwhile the U of C students have organized the Council to Defeat the Broyles Bills and have stepped up their campaign. The Council represents the broadest united action ever achieved even on this comparatively alert campus. Outgrowth of a rally of over a thousand students, the Council was organized on the basis of representatives from organizations, as well as representatives from living units—dormitories, co-ops, fraternity houses, and delegates elected by petition of thirty off-campus residents. There are now well over 120 accredited delegates, representing; after deduction for overlapping, over 3,000 students.

The policy resolutions adopted by the Council deserve reprinting in full. They read as follows:

- (1) We call for the defeat of the Broyles bills SB 152-157.
- (2) We stand opposed to the spirit and purpose of the proposed investigation of the University of Chicago and of Roosevelt College. We believe that experience has demonstrated that legislative inquiries into political opinions lead to defamation of individuals and to the suppression of academic freedom. If such an invasion of fundamental freedoms cannot be checked at institutions with the power and prestige of the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College, it cannot be prevented elsewhere. We believe the investigation is part and parcel of the attempt to pass the Broyles bills.
- (3) We affirm the right of any individual to hold whatever political opinion and affiliation he chooses. We hold that it is against the American traditions to demand under coercion that an individual make public his political opinions and affiliations or his opinions as to the political opinions and affiliations of others. The decision to answer or not to answer such demands is the responsibility of the individual. To answer such a question sets a precedent which aids in compelling others to do so. To refuse to answer such a question may involve legal penalties.
- (4) We will provide full legal counsel for any individual requested or commanded to appear before any Broyles Commission sub-committee. We urge every student so involved to consult us.

DECIDE ON TACTICS

The following statement of tactics was adopted:

- (1) The committee shall consult with the university administration.
 - (2) The committee shall oppose any exhibitions of injudicious or non-representative hostility which will only unnecessarily antagonize the committee and play into the hands of the investigators.
 - (3) The committee shall press for open hearings.
 - (4) The committee shall set up a public relations sub-committee.
 - (5) The committee shall hold a general protest meeting at the time of the investigation.
- A steering committee of nine has been elected to lead the campaign. Attempts by the Wallaceites to capture the committee were decisively repulsed, but attempts to handpick a conservative leadership and thereby threaten the unity of the council have also been defeated. The result is a very heterogeneous committee that faithfully reflects the total complexity of the council and that will be best fitted for the difficult job of enlisting the energies of hundreds of students during the month of April when the investigation will take place and when the Legislature will complete action on the Broyles bills.

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

13-14

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW

Crack Controls - -

(Continued from page 1)

governments are ill-equipped to administer rent controls in a form which would give adequate protection to the people of our cities."

This "home rule" provision was inserted in the bill in spite of the fact that—as practically every man, woman and child knows—THE local interests are more often than not REAL ESTATE interests, who actually control political machines and, sad to say, also local governments. These interests want decontrol.

Therefore, it is a deception to call what Congress is doing to pass a rent control bill. It is in reality a DECONTROL bill. This should be noted along with the fact that the fifteen-month period of control make-believe is nine months less than what the Democratic Party promised—and the promise was for real control, not make-believe.

"REASONABLE" ROBBERY

On the point of rent ceilings, the senators on the joint committee agreed to drop the provision of the Senate bill for a boost for everybody of ten per cent in two installments. Presumably this didn't give the real estate interests enough elbow room. The bone of contention then became whether to adopt the provision of the House bill allowing the landlords "a reasonable return on reasonable value" or to adopt the substitution offered by the senators to permit the landlords "a fair net operating income." All that the tenants of the country can make out of these two phrases is that they both mean rent increases—and substantial ones.

Senator Paul Douglas, one of the most liberal of the liberal Democrats and on the joint Senate-House committee, voted for the "fair net operating income" provision as the "lesser of two evils." It should not be forgotten that Paul Douglas and the whole Democratic Party were supported by the majority of the people not because the latter wanted an evil, either a lesser or a greater one. The people asked for some positive good in their behalf on the problems of housing, rent control and many others. The people have, as usual, been sold out. The joint committee, after much bickering, finally adopted the provision for "a fair net operating income" as the measure for rent increases.

Although the provision specifies what will be considered in determining "a fair net operating income" when the landlord comes before the local housing expeditor for rent increases, it is pointless here to enumerate these specifications. It is not what a law specifies that makes the law, but rather the number of loopholes left in it. This provision has plenty. The real estate interests with their lobbies and lawyers and skill where self-aggrandizement is involved, will lose no fair or foul opportunity to put the squeeze on their

tenants. Above all, every local housing expeditor and every clerk in every area rent office will understand that this is a law to RAISE rents, a law for the landlords.

ACTION INDICATED

Perhaps the only other time in recent history when the profit-grabbing capitalist system showed itself so openly and so shamelessly as now in this rent decontrol bill, was during the war when the soldiers were giving their lives on the battlefields and the workers were expending their strength in the factories at frozen wages, while the profits of the capitalists exceeded anything in history.

Today, when the lack of adequate housing—an elementary human need that capitalism has not provided—puts the many-million tenants of the country at the mercy of the landlords, except as checked by adequate rent control, Congress refuses to enact this needed control.

Though at this writing the Senate and House have not yet passed the compromise bill, and though some disagreement is expected in the Senate from the Republicans who think the bill still does not give the landlords enough freedom to squeeze the tenants, probabilities are that the bill discussed here will become the law, with the President's signature and all. Then, certainly, the tenants will have to gird their loins to fight in their own interests—or else.

Tenant organizations will have to be strengthened where they exist and formed where they do not exist. Only by determined united action on the part of tenants will landlords be curbed in their demands. Here the unions will undoubtedly do their part, especially if the rank and file members call upon their unions to help them as tenants.

Other action also is called for. If this rent decontrol law is to be repealed, the unions, tenant groups and other people's organizations will have to engage in an effective agitational campaign. The Democratic Party promised, before election, rent ceilings at the 1947 levels, a two-year extension of real control, criminal penalties for landlord violations, strong anti- eviction provisions. The Democratic Party is the majority in Congress. Let it give the people the rent control law it promised.

Lastly, as LABOR ACTION keeps pointing out, such demonstrations of the profit motive not merely guiding but dominating the politicians of both capitalist parties, must make clearer the need for the formation of a working class party motivated by people's needs.

Four New York Lecture-Discussion Meetings For the Benefit of 'Politics' "Packages Abroad"

Friday, April 15
BERTRAM D. WOLFE
Author of "Three Who Made a Revolution"

JOSEF STALIN, THE MAN AND HIS PLACE IN HISTORY

Friday, April 29
KARL AUGUST WITTFOGEL
Director Chinese History Project, Columbia University

THE HISTORICAL MEANING OF CHINESE COMMUNISM

Thursday, May 12
ARTHUR M. SCHIESINGER, JR.
Author of "The Age of Jackson"

TRUMAN—HEIR OR EPIGONE OF THE NEW DEAL?

Thursday, May 19
DWIGHT MACDONALD
Editor of "Politics"

GOODBYE TO UTOPIA

Rand School Auditorium
7 East 15th Street
At 8:30,
Admission 75c

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

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

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME.....
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....
ADDRESS.....APT.....
 Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

The Betrayal of Warsaw—A Lesson for Our Times

The Warsaw Ghetto: 63 Heroic Days

By JACQUES

There will be no memorial meetings held in Warsaw this April to commemorate the desperate uprisings of the Jewish Ghetto that took place on April 19, 1943. The 50,000 Jewish workers still living at that time represented just ten per cent of those who had been crushed together by the Nazis into the walled-in ghetto section of Warsaw in October, 1940. The rest had been hunted down in batches in the continual manhunt of the SS (Hitler's stormtroops), to be exterminated in the gas chambers of Treblinka.

The hopeless armed struggle of this remnant of Jewry was not merely an act of desperation to sell their lives dearly rather than be exterminated quietly and without resistance. It was that too. But above all it was intended as an appeal for help to the Polish workers outside. Then, too, it was meant to reach the outside world as a final cry from the depths of a barbaric hell such as the world had never imagined, a cry for aid in extremity. It was meant to arouse the conscience of a warring world against permitting the final atrocious strangulation of an utterly helpless people.

This appeal went totally unheeded. "Civilization" watched with incredible indifference while the Germans used long-range artillery, tanks, flame-throwers, poison gas to wipe out the ghetto fighters. The ruins were set afire until the entire enclosure was reduced to one great mass of rubble reaching three stories high. The majority of the Jewish fighters were buried in these ruins.

The leaders of the Bund made a direct appeal to the underground organization of the Polish workers for help, if not with arms in hand then at least by means of a protest strike. The Poles refused. They were divided by anti-Semitism. Many sympathized with the Jews, but others said outright: "Thank heavens the Germans are doing this for us." Nor was this attitude confined to the upper class. The backwardness of layers of the Polish workers, as of many others, could be measured by the degree of anti-Semitism.

Representatives of the Jewish Bund had been smuggled out of the ghetto to seek help abroad. Artur Ziegelboim was in London during the uprising appealing to the Polish government-in-exile and to the Churchill government. He rendered the balance of his mission, its total and unfeeling failure, by committing suicide and indicting the "civilized" world for its lack of any humanity in his heart-broken letter. That letter speaks far more eloquently than all the mouthings against genocide at the UN

meetings by the diplomats on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Stalin Completes Hitler's Job

The Poles themselves were to experience the bitterness, not merely of indifference but of outright betrayal only little more than a year later. All of Warsaw, including the last Jewish remnants, rose up as one man on August 1, 1944, against the Nazi oppressor. The Polish National Council had no doubt that this uprising, called for incessantly by the Russian radio, would be aided by the advance of the Red Army, whose artillery could be heard not far off.

The uprising lasted for 63 frightful days during which the Red Army remained completely inactive on this front. The Russians would not even permit the English planes sent with a little help to land on Russian airfields! Warsaw was reduced to rubble just as had been the ghetto. The Nazis were permitted to wipe out the Armia Kryova (army of the Polish underground) and its leaders so as to save this labor for the Russians. The NKVD finished what little was left when the Red Army finally marched into the ruins in January, 1945.

No, the Poles will not commemorate the Warsaw ghetto uprising, nor will the Russians press them to do so. The handful of Jews left in all Poland will not care to do so either, particularly with any fake Stalinist coloration given an "official" celebration. But those everywhere who take to heart the resistance of the oppressed to the oppressors will once again marvel at the incredible feat of arms of the Jewish workers of the ghetto.

A Miracle Of Achievement

All the vaunted efficiency of the Gestapo, all the barbarities of the terror unleashed by them in an abandonment of sadistic cruelty, could not prevent the leaders of the Jewish working class from organizing underground, from making contact with the organized Polish workers, from smuggling in and caching arms in the ghetto bunkers. It is to the eternal credit of the Jewish Bund that its leaders accomplished this seemingly impossible task.

Foremost in the ranks of this leadership stands a figure who became legendary: that of Bernard Goldstein, organizer of the Bund militia. His book, "The Stars Bear Witness," is about to appear in English. It should be read by all who would understand how miracles of organization can be achieved against overwhelming odds. Here one can find the inner meaning of leadership, a leadership of understanding, of complete selflessness and self-sacrifice, of ability to go on liv-

ing and to organize resistance even in the midst of an existence that no nightmare could conjure up.

"Comrade Bernard" had behind him the experience of a generation of fighting first against czarism, then against Polish landlordism. He helped organize the most oppressed of the workers in militant trade unions. He organized the first Polish workers' militia to defend the trade unions from attack, and also to fight the pogromists. It is no accident that he was one of the leaders to organize the protest strike against the infamous ritual murder trial of Mendel Beylis in 1913.

No, it is no accident that a socialist trade union organizer, close to the people, completely steeped in their folkways, should lead the desperate armed struggle of the Jews against the Nazis and hold an entire army at bay. This man alone could secure the willing aid of the Polish workers; only he had their confidence. His exploits, known not directly from his book (he is too modest to recount them all) but from eyewitness accounts, make him the Chapeyev of the ghetto.

An epic quality marks the story of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. Humanity somehow survived, not merely in the sense of existence but in all its cultural meaning, in all its humanness. How can one think of humor under the sadistic German hunters in this ghetto-jungle? Yet there is the story of the Jewish pickpocket who, to amuse the inhabitants of his hide-away bunker, all trembling for their lives, demonstrates his skill for their eyes. And Warsaw, one may add, was famous for this skill! Hanna Krishtal survives with her child and is now here in New York solely because of the care of Bernard in the very midst of the fighting, during which she gave birth. Somehow he found time even for this. It was only later that he confided to Hanna how he was torn inwardly by his resolution to do away with the child in order to permit Hanna herself to escape from the ghetto alive!

Bernard Goldstein is still living but he has no life. The life he knew in Poland and in Warsaw is gone forever. It remains only as part of the archives in Perez, in Sholom Aleichem, in the story of the ghetto uprising.

Profound Symbol Of Our Times

The last touch of irony is added by Bernard's arrest by the NKVD, dread arm of the Russian "liberators." They released him but kept him under observation in the hope that he would betray his organization. The Stalinists fear nothing so much as honest and experienced revolutionists, particular-

ly those with such vast experience of organizing in the underground as was possessed by Comrade Bernard. He had to flee from these new oppressors, not so much to save his own life as to avoid betraying those who might want to make contact with him.

Warsaw stands as a profound symbol of our times. Crushed on the one side by the forces of capitalist reaction in the shape of Nazism and on the other by the Russian counter-revolution under Stalinism, this betrayed city mirrors modern civilization in decay. It is in this sense a vantage point from which to view the chances for survival of civilized humanity. The indifference of the world to the fate of the Jews during the war and after bodes ill for society. The utter breakdown of all human decency in the ghetto is no mere passing phenomenon. It is rather a token of the awful speed at which decay can spread and barbarism can replace modern civilization. Warsaw at the same time is an added and striking proof that Stalinism, far from arresting social decay, is itself the epitome of that decay.

It is impossible to study the terrible fate of Warsaw's ghetto and again of the rest of Warsaw, without a

clenching of the fists and a surge of anger and hatred against the forces that introduce such hideous villainy into life. Warsaw stands as a stark lesson of the inhumanity that flowers evilly from anti-Semitism and racial doctrines. This lesson must sink deeply into the consciousness of every working class fighter against exploitation and oppression. Society is doomed to go under if it is not thoroughly cleansed of the disease that made and continues to make such brutal sadism possible.

That disease can be traced to its roots in class exploitation. Every ruling class is willing to sacrifice millions of its own people for the sake of maintaining its powers and privileges. Why not, then, people of other "races" against whom it is so much easier to kindle the fires of prejudice.

Warsaw stands as a stain on civilization. It must never be forgotten. It can and must be avenged! The recurrence of such brutality can be prevented only by a deep-going change in society, the change from capitalism which engenders hatreds, to socialism, which engenders brotherhood and humanity, the Russian experience of counter-revolution notwithstanding.

Stalinist "Peace" Conference Flops - -

(Continued from page 1)

Thackrey, publisher of the New York Post, who is hardly a man of intellectual preeminence; and O. John Rogge, a lawyer.

The political line which they, and the conference chairman, the distinguished astronomer Harlow Shapley, adopted was also important. They indulged in no mere unqualified encomiums of Russia. Whether through guile or cynicism, the speakers at the opening session all used the following approach: they would begin by noting that they were in favor of peace, were not Communists and saw faults in both sides. Then would come a quickly muttered paragraph attacking Russia, a totalitarian country, as many of them said. After which (the audience meanwhile nervously quiet), they would launch into a detailed attack on U. S. policy from a Stalinist slant. Then the audience would respond with great enthusiasm.

I have said before that in addition to Stalinists there were semi- and neo-Stalinists at the conference. In point of fact, these latter probably predominated among the "prominent sponsors." Their fear of war had led them to favor the crudest appeasement of Stalinism. Unable to think of social forces other than the Russian or the U. S. governments, they identified themselves with BOTH simultaneously. For while criticizing Russia, they spoke of "we," that is, the American social system. And while criticizing the U. S., they slid into the Stalinist line. This curious and all too characteristic shuttling between identification with both Stalinism and capitalism was the major political characteristic of the conference.

Thackrey, publisher of the New York Post, who is hardly a man of intellectual preeminence; and O. John Rogge, a lawyer.

The political line which they, and the conference chairman, the distinguished astronomer Harlow Shapley, adopted was also important. They indulged in no mere unqualified encomiums of Russia. Whether through guile or cynicism, the speakers at the opening session all used the following approach: they would begin by noting that they were in favor of peace, were not Communists and saw faults in both sides. Then would come a quickly muttered paragraph attacking Russia, a totalitarian country, as many of them said. After which (the audience meanwhile nervously quiet), they would launch into a detailed attack on U. S. policy from a Stalinist slant. Then the audience would respond with great enthusiasm.

I have said before that in addition to Stalinists there were semi- and neo-Stalinists at the conference. In point of fact, these latter probably predominated among the "prominent sponsors." Their fear of war had led them to favor the crudest appeasement of Stalinism. Unable to think of social forces other than the Russian or the U. S. governments, they identified themselves with BOTH simultaneously. For while criticizing Russia, they spoke of "we," that is, the American social system. And while criticizing the U. S., they slid into the Stalinist line. This curious and all too characteristic shuttling between identification with both Stalinism and capitalism was the major political characteristic of the conference.

Sponsors Confounded At Writers' Panel

After the first plenary session came panel sessions. The only one worth reporting in detail is the writers' panel. Here again it was possible to see how much the Stalinists have lost in the intellectual world. The only distinguished figure from "highbrow" literary circles present was F. O. Matthiessen, the Harvard professor and critic. Otherwise, there were such CP-line hacks as Albert Kahn, Howard Fast, Richard Boyer and Agnes Smedley.

At this panel session a number of anti-Stalinists, most of them not connected with the Hook opposition committee, took the floor to attack the Stalinist sponsors. A highly tense and dramatic situation developed. The first speaker was Matthiessen, who made a platitudinous talk about "the American tradition" and the "democratic heritage" of Thoreau, Melville and Whitman. Then came Boyer, who spoke openly as a Stalinist and gave a strictly party-line talk. When questions and remarks were permitted from the floor (for two minutes each), Dwight Macdonald, editor of Politics, addressed several extremely pointed questions to Alexander Fadyayev, head of the Russian delegation: (1) Where are such Russian writers as Pasternak, Babel, Zostchenko, Akhmetova, Katayev and Pilyayak? "Are they alive or dead? Are they in concentration camps or free?" (2) Is it true that, because of criticism in Pravda, Fadyayev had agreed to rewrite his novel, "Young Guard," after it had been a public success?

When Macdonald finished, there was a hurried consultation among the Russians on the podium. Surprisingly, Fadyayev agreed to reply. Of the six writers mentioned by Macdonald he referred only to two. Zostchenko, he said, had published a novel in 1947—which was hardly to the point, since the attack on Zostchenko came after 1947. And Pasternak, he said, was translating Shakespeare—which was again irrelevant, since reports from

Polish Regime Murders Bund

The following is excerpted from the March issue of the Jewish Labor Bund Bulletin:

"The Bund in Poland no longer exists. A party convention held on January 16, 1949, decided to bow to the will of the Communist regime sponsored by the Kremlin bosses, and dissolved the Bund movement in Poland. As we have already stated in our resolution on this tragic matter published in a former issue of our Bulletin, 'the very forces which seven years ago, in December, 1941, murdered in the Soviet Union the leaders of the Polish Bund, Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter, committed this political and moral act of murder of a movement.'

"More than half a century of glorious activities of the Jewish labor movement under the banner of the Bund came to an end in Communist Poland. A movement which withstood successfully severe persecution on the part of the Russian czars, a movement which the reactionary government of pre-war Poland was unable to extinguish, which, during the bleak years of the Second World War, the Nazi hangmen could not eliminate, which went underground to wage war against the Nazi subjugators of Poland and gained immortal glory as a leading exponent of armed uprisings in the ghetto of Warsaw and other cities, was liquidated by the evil power of the Communist usurpers who, unable to confront an independent socialist movement, exterminate it wherever their power of coercion and terror is established.

"... it must be noted, first, that it was the prior liquidation of the Polish Socialist Party which made the Polish Bund's position wholly untenable; and, second, that the liquidation of the Polish Bund by the Communist regime of Poland came at a time when the Jewish community in that country numbered but a small fraction of its former strength. Out of a quarter of a million Jews who survived the wholesale annihilation of Polish Jewry accomplished by the Germans under Hitler's direct orders, only 50 to 60 thousand Jews now remain in Poland. 200,000 remnants of the pre-war Jewish community of 3½ million escaped from Poland driven, on the one hand, by anti-Semitic sentiments lingering in Poland even after the end of the war, and on the other hand by their abhorrence of the Communist regime forced upon their country."

Russia had it that Pasternak was translating Shakespeare because he felt unable to write freely himself. As for himself, said Fadyayev, it was true he had agreed to add some chapters to his novel but he had not yet had time to do so. In the meantime, his novel was still being circulated in Russia. When, at one point, Macdonald interrupted Fadyayev from the floor, the Russian turned toward him with a look of the most brutal hatred—and one could not but wonder if he was thinking about what he would do to Macdonald if he could only get hold of him in Russia.

From then on the polemic became still fiercer. Mary McCarthy asked Matthiessen if he approved of Fadyayev's answer to Macdonald, and the Harvard professor debased himself sufficiently to say that he did. McCarthy further asked him if he thought his hero, Thoreau, would have a chance to preach civil disobedience in Russia today as he had in America during the 19th century. Matthiessen lamely answered that Thoreau would be no more tolerated in Russia than would Lenin in America.

Jean Malaquais, the French novelist, took the floor to remark that the kind of reasoning Matthiessen used was quite irrelevant, since Russia claimed to be a socialist and democratic country while most of those present at the conference condemned America as a capitalist country. He further pointed to the treatment Andre Gide had received from the French Stalinists after criticizing Russia as evidence of the totalitarian outlook of the people running the conference.

Robert Lowell, a brilliant young American poet, took the floor and declared that he was both a Catholic and a conscientious objector who had been in a CO camp during the war. He asked one Russian, Pavlenko, what were the laws about conscientious objection in Russia. Pavlenko replied that he did not know but that HE was willing to fight for his country!

Lowell also asked Shostakovich a question: How has the criticism of the Russian government helped his music? Shostakovich had been sitting nervously and, one would guess, unhappily on the podium and when asked to reply, uttered a one-sentence answer: Russian criticism "helps my music go forward." He did not say "forward" to what. Then he sat down. One felt deeply sorry for this poor man, who is apparently uninterested in politics and would wish nothing better than to be left alone to compose his music.

Mailer Break Shocks Stalinists

Then came perhaps the most surprising and exciting event of the panel. Norman Mailer, author of The Naked and the Dead, arose to speak. The Stalinists cheered madly, but Mailer's first sentence turned them cold. He had come, he said, as "a Trojan horse." He did not approve of such conferences. "I am afraid," he continued, "that both the United States and the Soviet Union are moving toward state capitalism. There is no future in that. The two systems approach each other more clearly. All a writer can do is tell the truth as he sees it."

The Stalinists were shocked. They arose from the floor to make "more in sorrow than anger" remarks about

Mailer, urging him not to be a "pessimist." Mailer then took the floor again to say that he believed the only solution to the world's problems was through socialist revolution and that he did not note any revolutionary spirit at the conference. From then on the references in the Stalinist speeches to Mailer were harsh. Mailer's speech was an honest, if halting, effort to grapple with the truth. Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that he had been playing ball with the Stalinists, his remarks were particularly courageous.

It was interesting to observe that the Stalinists had few competent people at hand to answer the opposition. Their speakers from the floor included such distinguished intellectuals as a representative from the Wallace publicity committee and a delegate from the office workers union. All they could do was to reiterate endlessly "peace"—as if the mere incantation of the word would bring peace closer.

The second day of the conference proved less important than the first. Apparently dissatisfied with Shostakovich's cryptic reply to Lowell's question, the Russian delegation was assumed to have pressured him into speaking up at greater length. He came to the panel on "fine arts" with a long speech full of the usual idiocies about how the Russian criticism of his music had helped him divest himself of his "formalism." It was strictly Pravda style and one may doubt very much if Shostakovich himself wrote it.

Middle Class, And Middle Brow

Several conclusions can be drawn from the conference:

1) The Stalinists are no longer in a position to run such affairs blatantly. For a time at least, they must permit such neo-Stalinists as Rogge and Frederick Schuman (who spoke on the second day) to take the forefront. Such people are ready to make the most hair-raising admissions about Russian society, but favor a top-level rapprochement with it on a completely reactionary basis.

2) Mailer's remark about the absence of revolutionary spirit was, to put it mildly, accurate. None of the American speakers even presumed to be speaking from the standpoint of socialism. Their constant line of attack was to point out how advantageous it would be to American capitalism to make a deal with the Russians.

3) The Stalinist movement in the U. S. is by now a predominantly middle-class affair. It has suffered serious defeats among the workers and the serious intellectuals. Its present major base of strength is among the middle brow professionals—thus, one of its stronger representations to the conference was from Broadway. These people, largely ignorant of the elementary facts of politics, cannot be appealed to from the reactionary standpoint of the Catholic pickets. But one cannot doubt that the radical approaches of Malaquais, Macdonald and Mailer, whatever inadequacies one may note in them, did succeed in making a dent in at least some minds. Had there been a more strongly organized radical anti-Stalinist opposition at the conference, the Stalinists might have been completely routed.

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

April 3—GUNTHER REIMANN

Russian Policies in Germany

April 17—ALFRED KAZIN and IRVING HOWE

Two Novelists: Melville and Hawthorne

SUNDAY, 8 p.m., at 114 West 14th St., N. Y. C. 50 Cents (SYL: 25 Cents)

Editorials

What Happens To the UN?

Among the many ramifications of the North Atlantic Pact is its effect on the United Nations. The treaty itself, and all of the White Papers and public statements, carefully explain that this new military alliance comes within the framework of the UN charter, under the clause permitting regional organizations to establish "defense against aggression" in that infinitely prolonged period before the UN can cope with such breaches of the peace.

This very fancy diplomatic legalism can scarcely hide the larger reality that the UN is ineffectual in so many parts of the world that its place in the calculations of foreign policy of even small countries must be very small indeed. Holland is no giant world empire but for four months it has made war on Indonesia in defiance of the carefully worded resolutions of the Security Council.

The North Atlantic Pact reduces the UN and its chief political bodies to about the same stature as the League of Nations, after 1933. It is indeed the beginning of the end of that futile organization.

For quite some time now, the councils have served on the one hand as rostrums for Russian propaganda and on the other for repeated numerical majorities marshaled by the U. S. against the Russians—majorities which prove time and again that the UN is its instrument. The Russians have begun to withdraw from various technical and lower organizations of the UN. It has been a long time since they have sent their top-flight foreign ministers to its sessions. The Russians have used the UN for their own purposes but now show signs of losing interest as it becomes increasingly apparent that it is under U. S. control.

With the new military alliance, the U. S. and England have also struck the UN a blow from which it will not recover. In effect these countries have said that military alliances, coordinated arming, organization of a huge power bloc for the establishment of a new imperialist balance in Europe are far more realistic measures for their purposes than the UN world talking shop.

Besides the North Atlantic military alliance there now exist also the Brussels powers' military pact, the European ERP Council and the Truman Doctrine, not to mention the Pan-American Congress—on the one side—and the Cominform, the Eastern Europe Economic Council and the other coordinating instruments of the Russian Empire on the other. In all these real steps of world power, the UN has no role. International politics does not

take place in the UN arena but among the real powers outside of it. It is not an important factor.

The UN was originally conceived by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at Yalta. It was expected to be the means of keeping together the victors in the war by creating an organization through which their peace could be enforced. That is, the UN was to give legal sanction to the division of the world decided upon by the Big Three, and by preserving some balance between them to keep them from each other's throats. By bringing in the small and satellite nations, the entire world was to be made to accept the victors' peace.

Shortly after the San Francisco founding sessions, even before the end of the war with Japan, conflicts among the victors-to-be already had developed. The very treaties which the UN was supposed to support, the very division of the world that came out of the war, and the treaties which were to embody this new balance of power have not been signed because the differences between the powers are greater today than on V-J Day.

But what of all the small nations, the new Asiatic nations, the tribal groups of Africa who send their petitions to the UN, the South Sea Islanders who sent a delegation to the General Assembly to present a petition—what, in short, of the hopes of the peoples of the whole world? While as socialists we never had illusions that the UN was anything but an inter-imperialist arena, much of the speech-making for the UN about one world and international organization struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many.

The Atlantic military treaty strikes a final blow against these hopes. Cynically it informs the small nations that they must line up definitively with one or the other of the war camps. "Regionalism" has replaced "world unity." The pact announces a new stage of the cold war—armaments race, subordination of economic reconstruction to military needs, and shameless maneuver for strategic advantage. The UN can hardly be expected to survive this except as an empty shell.

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 W. 14th St., New York City 11, N. Y.
General Office: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: BRONX 65-5117
Vol. 13, No. 14 April 4, 1949

Emanuel Garrett Gelman,
Editor

Editorial Board: Jack Brad, Hal Draper, Henry Judd, Business Manager: Joseph Bean

Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a Year; 60¢ for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

May Day Greetings

to LABOR ACTION. We do not wish to announce our plans now—but we promise a sensational MAY DAY ISSUE—the best yet.

Send us your greeting—\$1.00 per columnar inch (for example: \$4.00 for a 2 inch, 2 column greeting). Include your own text. Copy must be in by April 20.

Mail to LABOR ACTION, 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y.

By Max Shachtman

Under the Banner Of Marxism

A Reply to Ernest Erber

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

Order your copy from

THE WORKERS PARTY
4 Court St., Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Public Meetings, Radio Talks Aid Kutcher Defense in Detroit

DETROIT, Mar. 20—Close to 100 people attended a meeting of the Kutcher Defense Committee here tonight. Speakers included George Novak, secretary of the Kutcher Defense Committee, George Schermer of the Mayor's Interracial Committee, Dr. Harold Sheppard of Wayne University, Rev. Charles A. Hill and Tom Clampitt of Local 212, representing Emil Mazey of the UAW. The meeting was chaired by Frank Marquart, educational director of Briggs Local 212.

Speaking over the UAW radio station, WDET-FM, last night in an interview with Guy Nunn of the UAW staff, Novak traced the history of the legless veteran. The UAW has shown great interest in this case and has recorded itself as favoring Kutcher's defense. The position of the Executive Board of the UAW was made clear by Clampitt in his short talk.

REFLECT ALARM

Clampitt told the audience that the UAW was interested in this case and was trying to eliminate such cases in the future by its activity on the political field.

A reflection of the alarm which the Kutcher case has aroused among liberals could be seen in the remarks of George Schermer, who, while favoring some method of protection of "this country's security," could not

see any rhyme or reason in the firing of a man who had absolutely nothing to do with any security material.

Dr. Sheppard, of the Wayne University sociological department, drew a connection between the Kutcher case and the question of academic freedom.

Rev. Hill in a militant speech stated that the Kutcher fight was part of the fight for "freedom from fear." He told the audience that, too often, fighters for elementary democracy were labeled "reds" and worse. He called the audience to join in a united struggle for Kutcher, for only through such a struggle could our democratic freedoms be protected.

HIT SUBVERSIVE LIST

George Novak stressed the undemocratic manner in which organizations were being put on the "subversive list" and how all types of organizations are having mud flung at them.

He related the story of a leading student on an Akron campus who could not see any importance to the Kutcher case until a certain veterans' organization labeled the United World Federalists (to which the student belonged) as subversive. Novak stressed the fact that the subversive list, limited to several hundred organizations now, could be extended to include just about any group—depending on the whim of the attorney general.

China Strategy—

(Continued from page 1)

re-establish the basis of resistance. Also, an irresistible tide of popular desire for peace is the ruling passion of all sections of the population in South China. The Stalinists do not have such a ferment in their conquered territories. Without substantial gestures toward negotiation, Vice-President Li would go the way of Chiang. Already the city councils of Shanghai, Nanking and a score of other cities in KMT hands have demanded peace in no uncertain terms. These councils, representatives of merchants, compradors and small and foreign bourgeoisies, have no overwhelming stake in the Nanking regime. Their first desire is for stability, which the CP offers. To prevent the complete defection of these cities, Li is forced to make serious approaches and offer concessions to the Stalinists.

It is interesting to note that no one in the Nanking government has offered any other program or expressed possible exceptions the KMT might take to Mao Tze-tung's eight points. There could be no more damning announcement of the KMT's bankruptcy than this silence, which stems from an inability to offer ANYTHING. Any program at all that Li and his Kwangsi clique might develop would probably be rejected by other groups in KMT. Any modification he might propose to the CP's program would be the occasion for placing the onus on him for disrupting the hope for peace.

The outstanding political fact of Nationalist China is the continued disintegration of the entire governmental edifice. During these four months of halt in actual warfare there has been further deterioration, rather than reorganization of the government. Chiang remains the crucial figure with power. From his retreat in Fenghua, on the southern coast, he continues to control large sections of the bureaucracy and the army.

The economic situation has decayed even more rapidly. The gold yuan currency unit in Nationalist areas, fell in one month from 2,400 to the dollar to 13,000, a decline of over 300 per cent. So low has this currency fallen that many government units are refusing it for taxes. Trade is coming to a standstill. A merchant cannot predict prices more than a few hours ahead. The price of rice increased 400 per cent in January alone. Workers are refusing wages in money and demand rice because exchange is unfavorable and money worthless. There are continuous strikes in all the large cities as workers demand payment in kind. Soldiers' mutinies are chronic occurrences because they too demand payment in silver, gold or rice.

NEW SPLIT

All this makes it doubtful that Li could organize any resistance, even given a continued respite. There is a paradox in these circumstances. For as Li proves increasingly ineffectual the CP has less and less reason to negotiate with him. The CP needs a coalition but it must be a coalition of substance, that can bring some power to the CP. As one Stalinist dispatch put it: "Apart from his own Kwangsi group, he cannot represent anyone else." CP propaganda constantly refers to Li as a front for Chiang, tool of America and "war criminal." Thus Li cannot fulfill any bargain; he serves no purpose, even to the CP, which is seeking a coalition.

There is still another quality that Li lacks, from the Stalinist viewpoint. The CP favors a coalition, but one of its own creation and completely dependent upon it. But Li, while

daily more powerless, is strongly tainted with American ties. It was U. S. Ambassador Stuart who championed his victory over Chiang. For the Stalinists this represents a double danger. American policy is to foster "peace" negotiations in China today, and to try to rally a pro-American group on a "liberal" basis. If Li were really permitted to make peace, this U. S. protagonist would become the rallying center of any anti-Stalinist sentiments that developed, as it is bound to, in the future coalition. Many elements which are now supporting the CP coalition because there is no alternative would have such an alternative if Li could bring peace to China.

Recognition of Li's basic inacceptability to the CP has already produced a new split in KMT circles. This split is not yet in the open but there is a rumor that a document is being secretly circulated which will demand of Li "a shift in the government's foreign policy and that the time for toying the U. S. line in international politics is now over." It is not difficult to foresee a growing ascendancy for such sentiments, which will further undermine Li's position and open more possibilities to the CP.

The biggest problem faced by the CP, with its agrarian base and lack of skilled personnel, is organization and administration of power in the cities. Their agrarian history and experience give them no guide, nor do they give them substantial support in the cities. Yet they cannot march forward another inch without taking the great metropolis on the Yangtze, Shanghai, Nanking and Hankow. There is considerable disagreement in the CP leadership on how to proceed.

For if the present situation has created great difficulties for KMT, it has also created enormous problems for the CP. Over the question of what to do next there have arisen at least two viewpoints, as near as one can discern, given the conspiratorial top-level nature of such differences in Stalinist parties. The disagreement seems to hinge on the question of local political settlements versus national military conquest. (Putting this into words gives more substance to the differences than is as yet certain.)

This appears to be the shadow of the conflict at present. The respective proponents appear to be Mao Tze-tung and the old Chinese leadership who favor the cautious "Peiping Formula" of local, political step-by-step conquest. The opposition appears to be led by General Lin Piao, generally considered a spokesman for Li Li-san, whose base is in the army and in the party among the younger, more recent recruits to the bureaucracy. Li Li-san also represents the more Russified section of the leadership. It is these political problems, although military and material considerations are also important, which have forced the protracted halt of the Stalinist armies on the northern bank of the Yangtze.

Several weeks ago the party's central committee held a plenum at which it now appears Mao's views carried. This is most clearly indicated by the composition of the CP "plan" negotiating committee of five which includes General Chu, who is Mao's man, and two Hunanese, who are old-time CP bureaucrats of the Mao apparatus, and General Lin Piao. This plenum lasted eight days. After it a statement was issued declaring a new orientation toward the "rehabilitation and development" of industrial production. That is to say, the crucial axis of the party's activities is to be shifted to the cities. This marks a major reorientation of enormous

Discusses Aims of United States Policy

Will Atlantic Pact Delay War?

By EUGENE KELLER

The North Atlantic Pact is being hailed as a great step toward lasting peace (Bevin), as a powerful insurance policy against World War III (Sen. Vandenberg), as strengthening the United Nations (Truman) and as an open covenant openly arrived at (N. Y. Times).

"Peace" is the keynote of the innumerable propaganda statements of editors, official spokesmen and high-pressure organized public opinion. If this "peace" policy has not and will not in any way impair the vast preparations for World War III now proceeding apace, this need not disturb anyone: "If we can make it sufficiently clear in advance that any armed attack affecting our national security would be met by an overwhelming force, the armed attack might never come"—thus President Truman.

The Senate has promised extensive hearings before it ratifies the pact, and the State Department has assured Congress that its prerogative to declare war is in no way affected by the terms of the pact. And if anyone should question the good intentions of the pact's framers, let him heed Dean Acheson's words: "Anyone with the most elementary knowledge of the processes of democratic government knows that democracies do not and cannot plan aggressive wars."

Such statements cannot possibly be taken seriously; they are designed to "sell" this pact to the American people, from which a modicum of support is required if it is to serve as the legal basis for the coming war. This, too, is the purpose of the scheduled hearings which will hardly be more than a democratic farce, in no way affecting the ratification of the pact.

As the conflicting interests of Russia and the U. S. become more crystallized, American foreign policy gained in clearness and purposiveness; its aims, however, have been obscured by the appearance of "defending" democracy, "our way of life," etc., etc. This is only natural, since even the possibility of being suspected of aggressive intentions is in itself a political setback in an age of total war. However, the rulers of Russia, too, are aware of this truism; they, too, have fought a "defensive" cold war. To insist on conducting the argument on this level means to lose one's independence of mind (and this is, of course, the major interest of the vast propaganda organs of both camps).

The fact is that America's "defense" against Stalin's new tyranny has consisted in buttressing all the old tyrannies; and if the threat of Stalinism remains as dire as it ever was, this is in the first instance due to a foreign policy which is primarily motivated by considerations of military, strategic and military-economic advantages, and of domestic stability at the expense of the misery of other peoples.

The Truman Doctrine, giving support to two of the most corrupt and despicable regimes in Europe, was the first rather crude step in this newly evolving foreign policy. The Marshall Plan evidenced signs of political sophistication on the part of its framers; it was dressed up as a progressive measure when isolated from U. S. foreign policy generally. But its inception was accompanied by the Brussels

significance. It opens up all of Central China to Stalinist conquest. It makes more crucial than ever the coalition formula. It also will necessitate a reorganization of the party structure which has been more suitable to villages. Recently, the CP issued a call for 10,000 university students to join special party schools to learn urban administration. Thus the new emergent bureaucratic class is to draw to itself from the sons of the former cultured urban classes rather than from the sons of the "tukhao" (Chinese kulaks) as hitherto. The countryside will be made subservient to the city's needs.

The party has had great difficulty already in its few cities. Shortages of raw materials and imports have limited industrial production in CP areas. Food supply has not been sufficient and it is rumored that inflation is making headway. There have even been strikes and certainly great confusion and discontent in Stalinist-held cities. A vast sweep forward into the countryside, as Lin Piao repeatedly proposed, would by-pass these problems apparently, but in reality intensify them. In South China, agrarian problems are infinitely more complex than in the already conquered areas. Without the cities any program in the village would meet with disaster. Mao is trying to make a change before chaos ensues. This will not be simple.

The "Peiping Formula," which is apparently Mao's strategy, is, by definition of the CP news agency, "a movement headed for local and separate peace in the various cities held by the KMT." It is a movement led by the merchant and capitalist classes, with the workers as passive elements. This is the basis for the new CP coalition on both national and local levels. Cities would be taken in disregard of national negotiations with Li and by-passing the Nanking regime. There will be many consequences from this new policy that should be followed closely. For the first time Chinese Stalinism is to meet the working class.

Five Powers Agreement, in which Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, France and England formed a "defensive" alliance.

The State Department, with its wonted tact, "scrupulously" abstained from interfering in the proceedings, of course. The passage of the so-called Vandenberg Resolution in the Senate in June 1948, however, made it legally possible for the State Department to enter into negotiations for what culminated in the North Atlantic Pact.

The Marshall Plan, therefore, could not and cannot at any time be considered apart from the military-political aims of U. S. foreign policy, and it is bound to take a position subsidiary to the North Atlantic Pact now that the latter comes into effect.

WILL SPEED WAR

The North Atlantic Pact is not merely another step toward war; it is the achievement of a major aim of American foreign policy and as such is designed to set in motion a chain of events which will speed up the approach of war. For to the planners in the National Military Establishment and the State Department—both of which departments are closely associated in the National Security Council, the real top policy-making organ in the U. S.—war is only a question of time; its "inevitability" has long been assumed.

Time, however, works on the side of the Russians, especially militarily. If this were not the case, both power blocs could equally derive continued profit from the present state of tension and insecurity called "cold war."

There is, for example, the contradiction between the political necessity of assuring the defense of Europe west of the Elbe against the Russian troops and the military concept of giving up the continent, with the exception of the Iberian peninsula, and waging primarily an air war.

That this latter concept governs military planning of the Western powers is evidenced by the disproportionately large outlays for air forces, rocket devices, etc., and the "victory" of the U. S. Army Air Force over the U. S. Navy in getting its 70-group program approved by Congress, as against the 48-group program, recommended by President Truman, which obviously would have allowed a larger budgetary allotment to the Navy. (Ever since Bikini the Navy has been in the doghouse.)

Moreover, the fact that the pact, as it now stands, does not provide for arms aid but leaves this implementation up to Congress, or better, to a Congressional committee which in its decisions, is guided by the expert opinions of militarists and diplomats (who themselves often are militarists) eloquently bespeaks the gap between political and military necessities.

From a strictly military standpoint, the pact is devoid of any meaning; as matters stand today it is obvious that the continent CANNOT be defended. The mutual assistance treaties prior to World War II, if adherence to them was often doubtful, at least were consistent with any foreseeable strategic situation. The North Atlantic Pact is clearly inconsistent with the foreseeable strategic situation. It will not be possible for the American bourgeoisie to extricate itself from this fateful contradiction. The fact that Russian occupation of all of Eu-

rope will spell both the social and physical doom of the European bourgeoisie and the decline or destruction of its economic bases, renders the contradiction between present and urgent military needs on the one hand and objective political needs on the other practically irreconcilable.

From this point of view, the scheduled Senate hearings may produce much heart searching and, possibly, opposition on the part of those who would extend Marshall Plan aid to the whole world, de-emphasizing its military aspects (such as the Foreign Policy Association).

MAY AID STALIN

The weighty argument that the pact is "defensist" cannot, of course, be answered by the Wallaceites, Stalinoids or well-meaning liberals. It is far from unlikely that the Kremlin will "attack" when the time comes. Properly prepared, Russia has important military advantages over the Anglo-Americans. It is improbable that its level of scientific research and theory lags behind that of the United States in any important technological area. Which means, they know all the "secrets" but lack, for the present, the industrial potential to apply them on a mass production basis.

But the Kremlin's power is based on terror at home and the exploitation of popular discontent abroad. As pointed out above, U. S. foreign policy has in no way brought to or even encouraged democracy in foreign lands; and thus, indirectly, it has strengthened Stalin's hand in Russia. Stalin, in an unprecedented move, had the text of the North Atlantic Pact published in every newspaper of the Soviet Union. It is only too obvious that such a regime will use the threat of foreign domination and of the atomic bomb to stabilize its terror rule.

It is likely that the North Atlantic Pact will play into Stalin's hands outside Russia, too. Twice in the past six months Stalin has taken the initiative and offered to negotiate; both times the Anglo-Americans declined. Not that such offers portend any efforts at a decent peace; we have ample experience with previous Big Three meetings and their devastating consequences. But the fear of World War III is universal and pervasive and the hope of peace will cling even to the words of a butcher like Stalin.

The pact can have this effect, or it can make for even greater political passivity and apathy than prevails at present. What it will NOT do is exactly what it professes aims to do: it will not safeguard and promote democracy, for that means the active and conscious participation of the masses in decisions affecting their lives, a principle of obvious simplicity which was ignored even while the pact itself was formulated in many secret sessions.

The Western powers may think it wise not to arouse the European masses to political activity, excepting perhaps the ritual of elections; but such inactivity, too, must play into Stalin's hands; he will need fewer police to atomize their organizations.

The true nature of the Third World War thus becomes ever more apparent in the pre-war politics of the contending forces: The distinction in the character of their politics is diminishing.

Smith Act Key to Prosecution Case in CP Trial—

(Continued from page 1)

Smith Act, which negates this traditional civil liberties safeguard, is unconstitutional. This latter point will have to await the outcome of this trial and a subsequent appeal in the case of conviction, as Judge Harold R. Medina, the presiding jurist, has turned down all attempts to throw the case out of court.

BUDENZ ON STAND

In building his case around the re-constitution of the CP in 1945, McGohey will ignore the greater part of the history of the American Stalinists, a history that revolved around events and policies invariably initiated in Moscow. To be mentioned only in passing at the trial are the Comintern's Seventh World Congress in 1935, which set the stage for Stalinist collaboration with "democratic" governments throughout the world; the Stalin-Hitler pact; and its counterpart, the Teheran conference of which led to formal dissolution of the Comintern and the establishment in the U. S. of the Communist Political Association.

Budenz touched on these points briefly in his testimony, as he filled in the background of his own career as a Stalinist, but went into greater detail when he came to the events that led to ousting of Browder and Budenz's own belated departure from the CP. We will not attempt to summarize his lengthy testimony. He has repeated it again and again during the past three years, before innumerable committees and investigations, on lecture tours and in a book.

Throughout it all runs an appalling and shameful account of the degradation of the political robots who are

called the "leaders" of American Communism. Budenz, of course, comes out worst of all. Ostensibly editor of the Daily Worker, he is treated with less courtesy than an office boy. Told what to print or suppress by the overlords from the "ninth floor," (CP national office), he is paid off with bits of gossip from the inner sanctum or with tantalizing glimpses of the working of the real leadership, the GPU.

The denizens of the "ninth floor" are no better off. After gaining their positions by years of subservience, these puppets of the Kremlin sit tense and quaking in their offices awaiting another change in line that will mean new genuflections and reversals for the agile, or disgrace and downfall for the slow and clumsy. Any position they may take, after reading the signs and portents from afar, can be brusquely reversed by the Comintern rep, identified by Budenz as Gerhart Eisler.

CHANGE OF LINE

Take the events that led to the dissolution of the Communist Political Association and to the re-establishment of the CP. This remedy, which provoked an international outburst of laughter and caused greater dissension in the ranks of the CP than even the Hitler-Stalin pact, is

being paraded by U. S. Attorney McGohey as a "revolutionary" plot against the government.

First inkling of the change of line, according to Budenz, came in the form of a letter from a Daily Worker correspondent covering the San Francisco conference of the United Nations in the spring of 1945. D. Z. Manuilsky, former head of the Comintern and Ukrainian representative to the conference, criticized the American party sharply and warned that the French comrades had been authorized to set the Americans straight.

Budenz was reading the letter, he related, when Jack Stachel, one of the defendants, entered the room, snatched it out of his hands and took it to the "ninth floor." Budenz never saw it again.

The French warning, in the form of an article by Jacques Duclos, castigated Browder for his line of collaboration with American capitalism (this was then the official Kremlin line also, bear in mind). Duclos evidently is a gifted writer, for within two months Browder was deposed, the Communist Political Association dissolved and the present CP, the one McGohey would have us believe to be a true Marxist-Leninist instrument of power, set up.

And from where did the new leadership spring to lead this new and revitalized party? Well, Budenz relates, for once the CP had an ace in the hole, a leader whose revolutionary traditions had been untarnished by Browder's class collaboration. It seems that William Z. Foster had opposed the formation of the CPA and had even put his opposition in writing. Only a very few CP top members had seen the text of the opposing resolution; even Budenz, Daily

London Letter

by GEORGE STONE, Editor, Socialist Leader

STALINISTS SUFFER SERIES OF DEFEATS

The Labor government has passed its tests with surprisingly high marks. That is the undisputed verdict of the British people! Brought before the electorate for its judgment in over thirty by-elections during the past three and a half years in constituencies won by Labor in the 1945 general election, the Labor Party has been victorious on every occasion. The course of these three and a half years has revealed the Labor Party going from strength to strength.

At the outset, all the advantage seemed to be on the side of the Tory Party, which presented with all the eloquence at its command the arguments against nationalization and state control. But it overplayed its hand, and the extremism and threats that came increasingly into its arguments swung even the "floating" voters against it. Politically, the people of Britain have been content to let the Labor government follow its current evolution without interference.

The natural result of this situation has been a marked hostility toward Stalinism. Russia's chances of winning additional fifth-column converts in the immediate future are nil, for hatred of everything connected with Stalinism is so strong among all sections of the people that even the Stalinists have to beware.

So emphatic is this reaction that the Stalinists are losing ground even in former strongholds on the industrial and political fields. In the recent St. Pancras parliamentary by-election the Stalinists, as we predicted, collected only a handful of votes despite the fact that all the resources of their London organization and membership were concentrated in the area. This district has been for many years one where the Stalinists have been markedly active and the resounding beating which their candidate received at the hands of the electorate will undoubtedly cause the party to have second thoughts about its boast of putting one hundred candidates in the field at the next general election.

On the industrial field their defeats have been even more devastating. In the election for the presidency of the 350,000-strong Distributive Workers Union, Walter Padley, a former member of the Independent Labor Party and now a member of the Labor Party, defeated his Stalinist opponent by over 192,000 votes, scoring a ten-to-one majority. In the elections for the Executive, the Stalinists secured only one seat whereas they formerly held five or six.

The same trend is evidenced in the elections for officers in the powerful Engineers Union, where the Stalinists have exercised much control and influence during the past ten years. George Crane, a Stalinist and national organizer for the union for the past six years, has been defeated together with the Stalinists' nominee for the general secretaryship. The militant Smithfield branch of the Transport and General Workers Union last week passed by an overwhelming majority a resolution declaring that Stalinists would not be permitted to hold office in the branch. Thus the most zealous attempts of the Stalinists to win favor flounder in the mud of corruption and repression in which they are conceived.

PEOPLE ALERT TO MAJOR ISSUES

In glorious spring weather, with the trees bursting into leaf almost overnight, the people are changing from their somewhat drab winter clothes to brighter and more colorful garb. Holidays are being planned and no doubt there will be a mass exodus from the towns at Easter.

Consumer goods are in much greater supply but prices are still menacingly ranged against the lower income groups. The lifting of a number of controls and the abolition of clothes rationing have not led to any marked increase in purchases—showing all too clearly that it was not lack of coupons but lack of cash which prevented many people from implementing their wardrobes. Altogether there is a general feeling that with regard to consumer goods and food Britain's difficulties are not yet over—this is exemplified by the recent cut in the meat ration to eight pennyworth per person per week.

Housing is another matter which causes concern to the authorities and the populace. In the war-damaged cities the housing shortage will remain acute for some years to come, a factor behind recent legislation against prohibitive rentals. But, despite the many difficulties and shortages, on domestic issues the people's attitude toward the government is remarkably conciliatory, even cordial.

Much less reassuring to them is the international outlook. The sufferings of the war years are still remembered all too vividly for the people to be anything but apprehensive about the heating-up of the cold war. Awareness of the role of American imperialism has spread through every layer of the people and it is significant that Ernest Bevin, the government's voice on foreign policy, is not nearly as popular as other members of the government.

The final vote in the House of Commons will, of course, endorse Britain's membership of the Atlantic Pact, as will the electorate at the polls next year. But this is because the issue will be presented to them as a choice between Russia and America—and they will choose what they consider to be the lesser of two evils. At the moment they are caught in much the same position as the old man who was asked why he preferred one gambling joint to another when he knew he would be fleeced. "I know it's crooked," he replied, "but after all I don't reckon to get murdered there as well."

These then are the influences that condition the people's acceptance of the Labor government and its policies. I believe that, combined with their recent interest in democratic freedoms and safeguards, the British people are showing an awareness of the class struggle and the necessity for ever-increasing vigilance. This awakening may yet enable Britain to become the vanguard of world social revolution if it is nurtured on correct policies and is given the right kind of leadership and support.

Worker editor, had only glimpsed it. The party never heard of it.

Foster had only mustered one supporter, Sam Darcy, who was forthwith expelled, and in the end he voted for Browder's resolution but Foster's opposition was on the record, buried deep in the secret files of the "ninth floor," to be used no doubt, as blackmail if he should ever step out of line again.

REVOLTING SCENE

Irony of ironies, it was Browder, survivor of the Trotskyist purge in 1928, the Lovestone purge a year later, agile tight-rope walker who had traversed the Third Period, the Seventh World Congress, the Hitler-Stalin pact, and greatest flag-waver of them all during the late war against fascism, who was "dumped." Foster's document became his credential to lead the new party.

And who was to share the task with Foster? Darcy, his only supporter, had been cast into limbo. By the alchemy of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, his opponents became his supporters. Led by the present defendants, the national committee just as unanimously supported Foster as they had denounced him scarcely more than a year before. Now it was Browder's turn to sit, head in hands, listening to the faithful berate him as an arch-traitor and misleader of the working class.

This revolting scene has been seen again and again in Stalinist parties throughout the world. If the American breed of Stalinist appears more craven, more disgustingly abject than others, it is a reflection of the extreme isolation of the American CP which has lost the power to attract support among American workers.

IN THE MARCH NEW INTERNATIONAL

Profile of Eisenhower
by J. M. Fenwick
DON'T MISS IT!