

ECA Plan for Union Of Europe Bogs Down

By MARY BELL

The Marshall Plan "integration" of Western Europe urged by Paul G. Hoffman, administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, on the European Council last week has tossed new terms, new problems and new contradictions into the arena of world politics.

Hoffman cited the 150 million American consumers who, in forming one mass market, have been indispensable for the building of the American economy. Remove the barriers in Europe, he reasoned, and you have a freely trading area of 270 million consumers who can furnish the large-scale market which will be the impetus to low-cost mass-production methods. This should help to close the "dollar gap" and raise the standard of living of the Europeans.

The reactions of the Europeans begin to indicate some of the difficulties in this plan. Reaction was immediate, but timid and tentative where it was not hostile.

The Steering Committee of the European Council decided to recommend that the quantitative restrictions on one half of the imports in private trade of the Marshall Plan countries be removed by December 15. Then it immediately withdrew this recommendation for reworking because of differences. The recommendation would also require that those countries that do not remove their restrictions need merely explain their reasons to the council.

The British representative, Sir Stafford Cripps, said that Britain was all for the integration of the continental countries, to be sure—partially, tri- laterally, "Fritalux," "nuclearly" or total unionization—but that Britain could not integrate "in any manner that would prejudice the full discharge" of her responsibilities as leader of the British Commonwealth and sterling area.

Even while Britain agreed to the removal of quotas on imports, the French complained that she was hypocritical, inasmuch as the British government controls one-third of Britain's imports and Britain has already excluded Switzerland, Belgium and Western Germany from the benefits of the removal of quotas because of the competitive nature of the products from the latter countries.

SUBSIDY TO EXPORTERS

What is the connection between the "integration" scheme and the Marshall Plan? The Marshall Plan countries point out that no such scheme was originally attached to the receipt of Marshall Plan aid. But Hoffman said: "It was to this that Secretary Marshall pointed in the speech which sparked Europe to new hope and endeavor."

He said further: "A European program to this end—one which should show real promise of taking this great forward step successfully—would, I strongly believe, give new impetus to American support for carrying through into 1952 our joint effort toward lasting European recovery."

This latter statement showed the big stick: If you don't integrate, Congress will not pass the third Marshall Plan appropriation.

What is the "dollar gap" which Hoffman refers to as one of the two problems for solution? The "Report of the ECA-Commerce Mission" which he issued prior to his trip to Europe and message on "integration" contained the important data on the fundamental imbalance which exists in world trade.

Briefly, from July, 1914, through 1948 the United States exported goods and services to a value of \$101 billion more than was imported. Of this amount, \$68 billion was provided by the U. S. government, \$49 billion in the form of outright grants.

In the words of the ECA report: "The \$49 billion supplied to foreign countries between 1914 and the end of 1948 as grants from the U. S. Treasury came out of taxes or out of increases in our own national debt. . . . The government's grants and loans to foreign countries have in effect been unconscious subsidies to American export industries" (our emphasis). The American taxpayer may have been "unconscious" of the subsidy, but we are certain the exporters were not.

To close the dollar gap, the report

(Continued on page 4)

Pot-and-Kettle Campaign in N. Y. City Elects O'Dwyer; Davis Snowed Under

NEW YORK, Nov. 7.—As the New York City election race goes into the home stretch, the pots and kettles are busily describing each other with a sufficient amount of veracity to convince almost anyone that a real Tweedledum-dee choice is before the voters as between incumbent Mayor O'Dwyer and Republican-Liberal-Fusion candidate Newbold Morris.

At the same time, the Newbold Morris line imposed on the Liberal Party by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers and the boss of the party, has roused little enthusiasm in its ranks and not a little discomfort. Morris has a chance to win, of course, but it will take nothing short of a Morris victory to avoid a vigorous and healthy reaction among the best elements of the Liberals against the policy of hanging the party label on the Republican candidate. A Morris defeat will mean—not a sharp blow-up, perhaps, since there is probably not enough vigorous life in the organization to make that possible—but at least a slow burn.

O'Dwyer has been "standing on his streak"—which includes two or three strikebreaking operations. Morris has been promising "good government" in one of the most mealy-mouthed campaigns (even for milquetoast reformers) that a sophisticated city has seen. Marcantonio, the Stalinist candidate under the label of the Amer-

Russian General, Blood of Warsaw On His Hands, Heads Polish Army

A Russian general, Marshal K. K. Rokossovsky, has been imposed on Poland as that satellite country's minister of defense and head of the army.

At the same time Poland received orders to change its constitution to permit Rokossovsky, as commander in chief, to become a member of the Polish State Council. This amendment is necessary not because Rokossovsky is a Russian but because constitutionally the military head is not a member of the council in peacetime.

The thin veneer of Polish national independence is therefore publicly stripped off to a greater degree than heretofore. President Bierut has covered this up slightly by referring to "the fact that Marshal Rokossovsky is a Pole [that is, was born a Pole] and is very popular with the Polish nation." The cynicism of this reference is to be seen in one other fact about Rokossovsky.

This Russian general is the co-hangman (with Hitler) of the uprising of the Warsaw people against the Nazi occupation in 1944. Rokossovsky is the man who was at the head of the Russian forces which stopped their pursuit of the retreating German army on the eastern bank of the Vistula River in the Warsaw suburb of Praga.

In anticipation of the Russian advance, the Warsaw population rose in a heroic struggle against the Germans, led by the Home Army (the resistance forces). Rokossovsky deliberately encamped across the river while the Germans proceeded systematically to crush the uprising. While he waited for the Nazi slaughter to be accomplished, the Germans killed or wounded nearly a quarter million of Warsaw's people and, after surrender of the Home Army, burned and dynamited the city to almost complete extinction. Then the Russians moved in, after the Nazis had had plenty of time to do the dirty work of crushing the movement of the people.

Only speculation is possible about the reasons for this open step of domination of Poland by Moscow. Whether the motivation is the danger of Titoism, or whether it is preparation for withdrawal of Russian troops from Eastern Germany to Western Poland, the question arises why a Polish military man could not be the front man even under 100 per cent Russian control. Is there not a single Polish general who can be completely relied upon by the Moscow masters?

It's CIO vs. CP— Split Raises Basic Issues of Unionism

DeGaullists Lose Heavily, CP Holds In French Vote

By SAUL BERG

PARIS, Oct. 29.—The military budget of the new Bidault government in France provides an ironical commentary on the politics of the government parties and especially of the Socialist Party.

As previously reported, the French workers have been fighting a losing battle with the rising cost of living. This is partly due to profiteering, blackmarketing, tax evasion and the leadership of the French unions, both reformist and Stalinist. And it is partly due to concentration on rebuilding heavy industry and generally replacing the outworn plant of the country. But most of all it is due to the overwhelming drain of the military budget, especially because of what is commonly referred to now, in France, as the "dirty war" in Indo-China.

Nevertheless, the outgoing SP defense minister, Paul Ramadier (a "Socialist"), proposed an INCREASE in the military budget from 350 billion francs in 1949 to 473 billion in 1950! Ironically, the "non-political expert" who occupies the finance ministry, Pétische, insisted on cutting 50 billion from this increase before he would consent to take office.

What a commentary on the degeneration of the SP.

(Continued on page 4)



GEORGES BIDAULT

The Bell System

In Gary, Ind., an independent steel company didn't learn a thing from the Bell strike in Buffalo but the steel workers did.

The company announced that any of its employees who wanted to go back to work the next day would be guaranteed protection against their union leaders. At 7:30 the next morning 350 men lined up at the plant gate and went back to work. An hour and a half later the 350 walked out again—but this time, 90 pale and frightened-looking men who had been sleeping and eating inside the plant were walking out ahead of them.

Free Enterprise

Six giant manufacturers get 75 per cent of the gravy from America's drinkers and smokers, a Federal Trade Commission report on concentration of manufacturing facilities shows.

In the distilled liquors industry, the FTC, said, Schenley, Seagrams and National Distillers Products Corp. hold 72.4 per cent of the assets. Together with five other distillers, they control nearly 95 per cent of the liquor field.

American Tobacco, R. J. Reynolds and Liggett & Meyers are the big three in cigarettes, holding 77.6 per cent of the industry's wealth. They make Lucky Strikes, Pall Malls, Chesterfields and Camels. Together with the makers of Old Golds and Philip Morris, these tobacco kings dominate more than 95 per cent of their industry.

BULLETIN

As we go to press, O'Dwyer and Lehman have been elected mayor and U. S. senator respectively in New York, both by large Democratic pluralities. In the City, the vote for Newbold Morris on the Liberal Party line was 372,281 while the vote for Lehman in the city on the same line was a little less than 400,000. Marcantonio, ALP Stalinist candidate for mayor, got 356,423. The contest into which the Communist Party had poured most effort—Benjamin Davis' run for city council against Republican-Democratic-Liberal coalition candidate Earl Brown—resulted in a 3-to-1 defeat for the CP leader.

ican Labor Party, has been promising everything else.

SAVING LABOR

Believe it or not, the main election slogan of the Liberal Party seems to be that under its emblem it is possible to vote for Lehman and Morris with one jerk of the voting-machine lever instead of two (Lehman is running under the Democratic star and Morris under the Republican eagle in addition to their listing in the Liberal column). It sounds as if they are offering a labor-saving device rather than a political line, which is

true. It is also their only proposal on saving labor in any sense.

Republican Morris has ducked out of openly endorsing Republican John Foster Dulles, who is running for U. S. senator in New York State against Lehman, but the Republican high command obviously decided that it was not good politics to keep the T-H label off the campaign. On Saturday, Governor Tom Dewey made his first speech for Morris, describing him as a "good Republican." Dewey, who once lumped the Liberal Party with the ALP as a "Communist-dominated" splinter group (the Liberal Party is actually dominated by venerable social-democrats), also came out for Harry Uviller, the Liberal Party's representative on the fusion ticket for the three high city offices; but he still referred to the Liberal Party along with the ALP as a "splinter party."

The pot-and-kettle act has starred O'Dwyer and Morris. The Liberal Party, in full-page newspaper ads, has leaned heavily on the book recently published by Robert S. Allen, "Our Sovereign State." One such ad quotes from the Allen book:

"In almost every department, usually after newspaper exposes or in fear of them, O'Dwyer has been forced to remove many of those whom he named and whose taking

(Continued on page 4)

Need of German Unification Will Bring Bitter Controversy at Paris Parley—

Big 3 to Meet Again Over Germany

By HENRY JUDD

The foreign ministers of the Big Three—America, England and France—will meet in Paris this coming week to discuss—once again—the problem of Western Germany. There will be, of course, other items on the agenda, but this remains the key and dominant question in the efforts of America to build up a bulwark against Russia.

It is possible that the question of recognition or non-recognition of the new Chinese Stalinist government will come up, with the well-known difference between the United States and England likely to come out in the open. In addition, there is the problem of the failure of Western Europe to proceed to fulfillment of the various dictates given to it, by America with respect to economic policy under the Marshall Plan.

But Western Germany will hold the center of attention, and rightfully so. Less than two months after installation of a new German regime under the Bonn Constitution, that document is proving—as we predicted—worthless and unsatisfactory to all concerned. The new German government, despite its conservative and often openly reactionary character, is pushed into a position where it must demand (and receive) an ever greater measure of independence from the occupational authorities.

Its demands center around the fol-

lowing points, and the creation of a puppet "independent" East German state by the Russians has increased the demand of Western Germans for a solution to this problem.

First, the German government demands increased representation in the various international bodies—World Bank, Monetary Fund—that have been set up. This is one aspect of its insistence upon recognition as an independent government, with embassies throughout the world and with the right of German people to travel about freely. It also reflects the sensational extent to which German production and commerce has revived and plays its part once more in European economy.

Secondly, there is the matter of trade relations with Eastern Germany. The Western German regime, realizing that its sole and most important attraction to the East lies in a thriving and prosperous economic life, wants to take measures helping such a trade revival. One of its important demands, therefore, is an immediate end to the dismantling of Western German industries.

This will undoubtedly be the subject for most bitter controversy at the Paris gathering. In France, where economic recovery has now definitely leveled off and even begun to show signs of decline and stagnation, a violent resistance to increased German productivity has developed. The whole tendency of French policy in

the future will be to hold back and stymie all developments in Germany leading toward further independence. Paris will always insist upon "real and long-range control of German industry," in the words of the New York Times.

GERMAN UNITY—WHAT KIND?

This leads us to the third important issue—the question of administration of the Ruhr. At present, the Big Three control this administration, and the German industrialists sit in as a kind of "lost cousin." Clearly, the German capitalists are not satisfied with this state of affairs, and are pressing for a return of the Ruhr to their complete and unhampered control. The regime of Chancellor Adenauer, it goes without saying, does not propose any nationalization of the Ruhr under state control. It desires a return of this key industrial area to GERMAN capitalist control, the better to strengthen their newly founded semi-state.

Behind all this, of course, stands the much greater issue of German unity and unification of the two separate states. Despite any temporary measures or proposals, this will always remain the real issue until its ultimate solution. One might say that there are THREE kinds of a unified Germany now possible, each represented by various forces.

On the one hand, we have the German Stalinist movement, organized in

its puppet state, and entirely subservient to the will of Russian imperialism. They struggle for a unified Germany under a Stalinist "People's Democracy" regime, with Russia holding all the cards.

On the other hand, we have the regime of the German bourgeoisie, now organized at Bonn, and in an alliance with the occupational forces. It is, however, more independent and more demanding in its relations with the Western allies than are the German Stalinists. Its objective is the revival of a unified, capitalist and imperialist Germany, acting as the economic heart of Europe.

Finally, there is the mass, inchoate and popular movement for a unified Germany—largely represented in a political form through the German Social-Democratic Party—whose desire is to end all and any form of occupation, subjection to any foreign authority and the need to furnish reparations which have been paid tenfold already. These are the working-class, peasant and middle-class forces which desire, in their own way, the revival of a truly democratic and free Germany.

They are not represented at the Paris conference, any more than they were represented at the Stalinist conference which created the puppet state. Both the Bonn state and the East German state are not their creations.

The 1949 convention of the CIO is over; and there is no doubt that crucial steps have been taken in Cleveland—steps to which labor will look back later in hindsight as their effects unroll in the next few years.

On the heels of the expulsion of the Stalinist-dominated United Electrical Workers (UE) and Farm Equipment Workers (FE), the action of the convention in barring (or more accurately, taking the first steps to dump) all of the other ten Stalinist unions from the executive board makes it clear that the heralded split is really here. Whether it is brought to a climax through new expulsions by the Murray majority or through a gradual or speedy withdrawal of the Communist Party bloc to found a new trade-union center around the UE, this will only determine the secondary features of the split but not the fact of the split itself.

The pernicious influence of the CP in the CIO is on the way out, if not yet quite smashed. If this were all that need be noted about the action of the convention, only cheers would be in order—and an evaluation of the convention would be much simpler. But it is not. Some of this evaluation we have made in the last few weeks; a summing up is necessary.

First things first:

After all that needs to be said has been said about what has already taken place, the fact is that what is now beginning is an all-out fight. It is a fight between the CIO and the Communist Party—in local union elections, NLRB votes, court battles, jurisdictional struggles.

In this fight we emphasize that the first duty of every union militant is to rally the workers to remain in the CIO, and where the Stalinists succeed in taking them out, to support the CIO against them, to fight to bring their loaves back in.

The course of the CIO leadership has not made that fight any easier, but has made it many times harder than it should be. That may not be true for the main body of the CIO rank and file, but especially in the most hotly contested centers of Stalinist influence it is true of many—especially many among the best militants, not the worst, repelled by the political-purge tactics of the Murraysites.

Murrayism Versus Stalinism

But regardless of what deep-going differences any union militant may have with the present leadership of the CIO, regardless of how he may condemn its methods, he will be making a fatal mistake unless he realizes that the CIO-CP struggle is no ordinary conflict on the level of trade-union differences, even the most important. It is not at bottom, a matter of a divergence of policy inside the working class but a death struggle between two tendencies:

(1) The CIO and its leadership, representing basically the American labor movement as it is today, with the backward program that it still has today, and—

(2) The Stalinist Communist Party, a reactionary anti-working-class tendency which operates inside the labor movement but is not really of the labor movement.

Stalinism is the most reactionary force inside the labor movement. This is not so because this or that specific policy it advocates at this or that moment is more reactionary than Murray's—on the contrary, it is capable of any degree of demagogic leftism which typically in such cases tends to slide off into adventurism. Its slogans, its policies, its tactics change with dizzying rapidity, but its guiding goal and objective remains fixed and unalterable: it aims to make the labor movement (or whatever section of it that it can lay its hands on) a tool of the foreign policies of the monstrous Stalin totalitarianism in Russia.

The Stalinists are at bottom the reactionary agents of a barbarous anti-working-class power. The Communist Party does fight the American capitalist class, but not in the least in order to advance the interests of the American working class—exclusively to promote the aims of the Kremlin rulers, rivals of the American capitalist class. Never and nowhere do they oppose their real masters in Moscow; they are ready to go to any extreme to cut the union movement to pieces if they need be (as need was in Eastern Europe), to lead it either into suicidal adventures or into capitulatory compromises in accordance with the demand of Russian diplomacy.

Thus today, the Stalinist-dominated unions preferred to orient toward a split from the CIO rather than abandon their propagation of Russian foreign policy. This was amply indicated by the UE convention's arrogant ultimatum to the CIO, its virtual walkout (announcement of stoppage of per-capita tax) even before CIO action, its merger with FE in defiance of the CIO. The Stalinists are not in the least interested in the trade-union democracy for which they now yell, but which is never seen by oppositions in the unions they control.

The leadership of the CIO is a conservative officialdom. It supports the basic features of American imperialist foreign policy. It continues to rely upon capitalist politicians, to collaborate with capitalist parties. It supports the capitalist system. For all these reasons, its policies, in the opinion of Socialists, weaken the effectiveness of the labor movement and make it difficult to advance the class struggle of the labor movement and prevent the powerful union movement from utilizing its full power for the advantage of the working class.

Nevertheless, the CIO officialdom represents a legitimate working-class tendency. Although they support capitalist policies, they must and do fight against the capitalist class in their own way. In their own inadequate way, they fight for the elementary interests of the working class; they must fight to defend the existence of the labor movement; they remain subject to the pressure of the working class and in one degree or another respond to its needs. None of these considerations apply to the Stalinists.

The basic cause of the split is the deep-going antagonism between the

(Continued on page 2)

U. S. Steel Gets Its Signals Mixed

Irving S. Olds, chairman of U. S. Steel, got his signals mixed, according to two different items in the October 26 New York Times. One item is on an Olds statement to reporters on the steel strike and the other (back in the financial pages) is on a report to stockholders.

In the first, Olds "indicated that the company might be willing to make its contribution to a pension and social-insurance fund MORE THAN THE 10 CENTS AN HOUR RECOMMENDED by President Truman's steel fact-finding board if the union would withdraw its objection to a supplementary contribution by the 177,000 United States Steel employees." (Our emphasis.)

According to this, U. S. Steel has no objection to paying the 10 cents an hour—it's the principle of the thing.

The same issue of the Times also carries Olds' remarks at a press conference on his release of the corporation's quarterly financial statement, more or less addressed to his coupon-clippers. Here—

"He said that United States Steel has not changed its position—that it 'cannot afford to pay alone' the entire cost of a worth-while pension plan."

The yawning discrepancy—between not being able to "afford" even the 10 cents, on the one hand, and on the other hand offering to pay even more than 10 cents—illustrates the cynical demagoguery of U. S. Steel's propaganda on the question.

A SOCIALIST ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUES IN THE SPLIT—

It's CIO versus the CP - -

(Continued from page 1)

CIO officialdom and the Stalinists which had been temporarily suppressed during the war but which is now brought out into the open once again with the rise and intensification of the cold war between Russian and American imperialism.

How the Fight Developed

The fight against the no-strike pledge and the wildcat strike wave during the war reached the highest intensity in the mass CIO unions, and that was the beginning of the end for the CP.

But the present struggle against Stalinism is of a far more wide-sweeping character. The same conservative labor leaders who tolerated Stalinism during the war, and protected it against militants and anti-Stalinists, are now themselves taking the lead in a drive to oust it from control.

In the UAW, Reuther defeated R. J. Thomas, the Stalinist-supported candidate in 1946; but Murray opposed Reuther. In the UE, Murray played little or no role in wakening the fight in the ranks against Stalinism even after James Carey reappeared as one of the UE opposition leaders.

Despite Murray's diffidence, anti-Stalinist oppositions increased in strength (UE); were successful (UAW); and former Stalinist fellow travelers like Curran and Quill flopped under pressure from their own rank and file and prevailing public opinion.

Murray avoided awakening a rank-and-file fight against the Stalinists, even though he wanted the CP removed from control, because such methods of relying on the ranks are foreign to his own bureaucratic conceptions and are dangerous to the machine control of the Murray leadership itself.

Unlike the mass rank-and-file movements which are essentially democratic in their methods, Murray's techniques are typically bureaucratic. With the cooperation of Walter Reuther, who tested the "new line" at the last UAW convention, Murray devised a new principle: that all affiliated international unions and all city and state industrial union councils must "carry out official CIO policy" especially on political questions.

S. F. BAY AREA NOTES

Dave Beck Sets Up Scab Agency For Union-Busting Safeway Chain

By ARLENE WILLIAMS

OAKLAND, Nov. 5—In an open, shameless alliance with Safeway Stores management, Dave Beck is making his last-ditch stand to crack the solid line of defense established by the East Bay labor movement against his Teamsters Union drive to break the Clerks Union.

Safeway has managed to keep several of its stores open by manning them with scabs who are immediately signed up as members in good standing by the Teamsters, thereby permitting management to post signs in their windows to the effect that their

employees are "100 per cent AFL members." This tactic is designed to confuse the consumers but the bold publicity issued by the Central Labor Council has made all thinking people well aware of what the actual situation is.

The East Bay Labor Journal, organ of the AFL, predicts that "William Green, being a true-hearted union man, will be genuinely and deeply shocked by the steadily accumulating mass of evidence as to the nature of the Beck-Safeway assault on the principles of sound business and sound unionism."

The "true-hearted" Green has been well aware of this fight from its inception and despite the pleadings of the whole AFL in the area, has refused to intervene in this conflict and order the Teamsters out. Now the whole issue will be dragged through the courts, with injunctions and counter-injunctions.

President Harry Lundberg of the AFL Sailors Union announced yesterday that he has instructed locals of his union to prepare for a strike vote as a result of stalled negotiations between the union and West Coast shipowners.

CALIFORNIA GROWING—SO IS UNEMPLOYMENT

With 10,000 new births each month more than deaths and 15,000 more people coming into the state, California's unemployment problem is mounting daily. Governor Warren has called for a state-wide conference on employment, to be held in Sacramento on December 5-6 to discuss ways and means of expanding the economy to create new jobs for this ever-increasing labor force.

Another example of the United Employers, Inc., efforts to break down conditions and force employees onto the picket lines was given this week when that organization proposed a 10 per cent wage cut and a return to the six-day week for hotel-employed building service workers.

a degree which is not even true of the two big political parties in the U. S., let alone the trade unions.

This bureaucratic concept of super-centralization was invoked to put a pistol to the heads of the Stalinist leaders who were anxious to support the Russian propaganda line. But it has an edge directed against anti-Stalinist militants who are not satisfied with the political policies of the CIO.

Stalinism must be defeated in the labor movement. But how? By expulsions, political purges, constitutional decrees and the like? Or by full and free discussion without overhanging threats of "discipline"? Stalinism is an acute, immediate threat to the CIO.

BUT A CHRONIC LONG-TERM PROBLEM FOR THE LABOR MOVEMENT, AS FOR THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE, IS THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. In all unions, the most progressive as well as the most conservative we see the solidification of a machine of paid officials. Even in the UAW—even in the best section of the union movement—this process is evident; the subtle encroachments of the machine can be seen. In the National Maritime Union, a crude expulsion campaign is in full swing, aimed at stifling all criticism especially organized criticism in the form of caucuses.

Against the Expulsion Method!

Their methods of fighting Stalinism deepen the tendencies within the labor movement toward bureaucratism and undermine the leading role of its progressive wing. The new super-centralist dictum ties the hands of such genuine left-wing unions as the UAW, preventing it from initiating new political methods. Stalinism can be defeated by the free democratic action of the rank and file. That is why we oppose the expulsion of International unions which deviate from "official" policy, including unions controlled by the CP; reject the expulsion of the unionists who remain members of the CP; and stand out against "settling" the problem of Stalinism by constitutional provisions barring members of the CP from holding office.

Murray's method gives the CP totalitarians a golden opportunity to parade as defenders of "democracy" and "autonomy." This is not the least reason why militants condemn it.

The split situation was not created by Murray's bureaucratic methods although they brought it to a head in an immediate sense in a manner advantageous to the CP. Long before the current split developed, the Stalinists forced small splits in the unions they themselves controlled. They expelled oppositionists and shops and whole locals out of their unions, even out of the CIO, in a series of authoritarian acts. So long as Murray permitted them their "autonomy" in expelling critics, they were content to remain in the CIO.

Even if the Murrayites had utilized democratic methods, aroused the rank and file of the Stalinist unions, encouraged them to form caucuses and groups, defended their rights against the inevitable assaults of the Stalinist apparatus, the CP would have found it more necessary to split in order to hold their remaining base in the unions. But they would have had to do so under more onerous and embarrassing conditions; they would have found it more difficult to take along large sections of the rank and file of their unions.

They accepted this opportunity of splitting because it gives them the incontestable advantage of rallying their followers around the banner of "democracy" and "autonomy." Murray's methods simplify the task of the CP.

The course of the fight in the UE illustrates the factors leading to split. The rise of a powerful anti-Stalinist opposition drove the CP toward dictatorial measures. It prepared for the expulsion of its opponents at the last UE convention. Without the intervention of the top leadership of the CIO, the situation in the UE might have festered for many months while the split was in preparation, marked by the expulsion of leading anti-Stalinists and locals as in the past. As the opposition increased in strength so would the CP have intensified its dictatorial methods.

But once Murray began to move against the CP, the Stalinist UE leadership decided upon a quick move in anticipation of a general split so that the UE might serve as the rallying center of all Stalinist forces. The action of the CIO convention served to speed up, the inevitable split in the UE.

Aside from the question of Stalinism, the CIO continues as before the convention. Its political platform calls for the support of so-called "liberals" in the capitalist parties. Militants must continue to press for a policy of class independence—for the formation of an independent Labor Party based upon the unions. Despite their differences with the policies of the CIO leadership, they will of course fight as loyal members of the CIO against the attempts of the Stalinists to tear it apart. In criticizing the methods employed by the CIO leadership in the fight against Stalinism, militants do so not to defend Stalinism but to preserve democracy at its maximum within the labor movement. The union movement cannot go forward without union democracy.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

"Lord, Lord, How This World Is Given to Lying!"—Shakespeare

Our Paris correspondent Saul Berg's report on the recent Congress of the Peoples Against Imperialism appeared in the October 24 issue of LABOR ACTION. In the Socialist Workers Party's paper, The Militant, about the same time, an article on the congress by one Ali was published. The reply to Ali by Comrade Berg, printed below, was sent to The Militant, copy to LABOR ACTION. One must read Ali's fulmination in order to realize how mild and restrained Comrade Berg's reply is, under the circumstances. Among other things, as Berg barely notes, this gentleman announced the discovery that the Independent Socialist League is an "anti-working-class tendency"—no less!—whereas, as is well known, Ali's Fourth Internationalists insist that the Stalinists are a working-class tendency! The editors of The Militant, in printing this gem, did not see fit to warn their readers that their correspondent was frothing at the mouth.—Ed.

To the Editor of The Militant:

In The Militant for October 24 appeared an article by Ali on the Congress of the Peoples Against Imperialism. Since the article criticized myself and the Independent Socialist League in terms that I have hitherto encountered only in the Stalinist press, I ask for the opportunity to

But before dealing with the specific attacks on our position, I must mention the shocking sectarianism of this report by Ali. Presumably it is the only information that the readers of The Militant will get about the congress; yet it devotes two paragraphs to the sketchiest possible report of the main events of the congress and of the participating organizations, and then all the rest to a long diatribe on the subject of the delegate, of the Vietnamese workers in France not being placed on the International Committee.

A comparison with the treatment of the congress in LABOR ACTION will show clearly enough that Ali or the editors of The Militant do not

have the slightest interest in really building up a feeling of solidarity toward the congress and in conveying to their readers the spirit of anti-imperialist struggle that remained the DOMINANT note of the congress.

And now to the details of Ali's incredible series of lies and slanders.

(1) The question of Levon's exclusion from the International Committee: I will leave it to Rous to defend himself against Ali's charges directed against him. He is perfectly well able to do so. But as for what was before the congress, it was in no sense a question of voting for Stalinism versus Trotskyism. The congress had already agreed that every national affiliate from Asia and Africa would be represented on the International Committee, even if there were more than one organization from the same country. There was therefore no question of Levon OR some other Vietnamese being on the committee. The membership of one on the committee would in no sense prejudice the right of the other to membership.

It was therefore ONLY a question of deciding whether to ADD Levon to the committee by defining the delegation of Vietnamese Workers in France as a national movement. Furthermore, if that had been passed, we would have immediately been confronted with a demand for representation for the organizations of African Students in Britain, some of whom are influenced by Stalinism. Their status, that of a small community temporarily located in another country, is exactly the same as that of Levon's organization. It can be seen, therefore, that the delegates were wise in voting that Levon's organization is a local one and ineligible for the International Committee. Furthermore, it was made clear that this in no sense prevents Levon from participating with voice in all the work of the Paris center of the congress.

Of course, what is really idiotic is to explain that Levon was kept off the committee by Rous plus the ISL plus Common Wealth! How the devil does that add up to 60 votes? Actually

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 6—This city is one of the big storm centers in the jurisdictional battle between the Stalinist-led United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America (expelled by the CIO convention) and the newly formed CIO affiliate, the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America. Yesterday the two locals at the Philco Corporation plants here voted almost unanimously to disaffiliate with the UE and to join the new IUE-CIO.

This vote, affecting the 7,000 workers at Philco Locals 101 and 102, swelled the total of electrical and radio workers in the area who have voted to return to the CIO to almost 10,000. About 40,00 such workers are in the area. Despite these victories for the CIO, the UE-CP spokesman, International Representative Philip Van Gelder, has reported repeatedly to the press that virtually no UE members will swing over to the IUE-CIO.

Besides the Philco locals, four others in the area are committed by overwhelming vote to the CIO—Locals 105, 136 and 111—and 800 employees in Local 116. The action of these six locals was to be expected since all had been consistently for the Carey-Block group in the old UE. Local 101 at Philco is the home local of James B. Carey and Harry Block, the guiding figures in the founding of the UE in 1936.

No decision has yet been reached in other large locals. It is almost certain that the Exide local will soon swing to the CIO and that the bulk of Local 155, where Dave Davis, an avowed Communist Party leader, is business agent, will remain in the UE-CP. There is a movement in some

Jim Crow in Africa

The October 20 issue of the People du Monde (Paris) publishes on its front page a photo of a sign over an elevator in the Union of South Africa. It reads:

"This Lift Is for Europeans Only. Service Lift Is Provided for Tradesmen, Non-Europeans, Prams and Dogs."

People du Monde is scandalized, as any civilized people would be. Here in America we have our own Southern snake pit of Jim Crow. The British Commonwealth of Nations has its South Africa.

Depression Note

Tommy Manville, the marryin' millionaire, recently told Quick magazine: "I'm working very hard these days (you didn't know that, did you?) ... Hell, man, I'm down to my last 39 million dollars."

155 shops to join the CIO, a few of them seeming to prefer the United Auto Workers to the Carey-led IUE.

BATTLE OVER RCA LOCAL

Except for President John Leta and a handful of other officers at RCA the local is pro-CIO. Union members at RCA are resentful not only of the Communist Party dictatorship in the UE but also of the recent UE-RCA settlement so widely heralded by the UE News. Most of the gains in the recent contract were long overdue, as RCA was well known as a sweatshop. Moreover, the contract made no provisions for a pension and the welfare benefits covered only the worker and not his family.

The fiercest fights shape up in the big General Electric and Westinghouse locals. At GE Local 119 the remaining Stalinists in the leadership were recently ousted in a local election but the great majority of the stewards remain loyal to the UE-CP and the Stalinist policy. On November 3 the UE distributed a leaflet at the plant which called upon the workers to reject their local leadership and gave their version of the UE-CIO split with the usual slander.

Since the UE is still negotiating with both Westinghouse and General Electric, the Stalinists are posing the certainty of a fabulously favorable settlement with Westinghouse and GE if only the workers will remain loyal to the UE. What seems much more probable is that the companies will make no offers until the jurisdictional disputes have been settled.

The pattern of the struggle at Local 119 has thus been set by the UE and will see both sides hitting the local from the outside with the

Hypocrisy or Schizophrenia?

International Latex is the Delaware corporation which has made quite a name for itself in liberal circles as the sponsor of big paid ads in New York newspapers, for many years, supporting the New Deal, Roosevelt, anti-racism, and various and sundry liberal causes. Top man is A. N. Spanel.

Recently the International Ladies Garment Workers Union set out to organize it. It turns out, says the ILG, that the "liberal" Mr. Spanel is fighting unionization with all the viciousness of a 19th-century robber baron. He works his 2,000 employees—farmers, tenant farmers, their wives and daughters too—on a three-shift, seven-day schedule, does out an average pay of \$28 a week with take-home pay nearer \$21, fires those who join a union and harangues the employees regularly on the "blight" of unionism.

for all colonial peoples and for total opposition to both imperialist blocs—be entered into the minutes, so that slanders like Ali could not misconstrue it, and I proposed that a resolution by the Congress on the obligations of the European workers be drawn up which could be subject to amendment, and which finally could be really voted on for and against, by the congress.

It is interesting to note that Jef Last of De Vlam, [Dutch left-wing Socialist organ—Ed.] whose name is certainly known in Europe a thousand times better than mine, voted AGAINST acceptance of the declaration, being so dissatisfied with this very murky form of procedure. But Ali does not mention any votes against. Can it be that he is afraid to launch his slanders against a well-known European anti-imperialist? He will not be allowed to conduct his outrageous campaign by long distance. He will answer for his dishonest efforts and he will be asked to answer here, in Europe, in the functioning center of the congress.

I think that now the record is clear.

Paris, October 29

On Nehru

Today another in the series of meetings held for Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, took place in the Greek Theatre of the University of California, with over 10,000 students attending. It was a real show. Six Cadillacs, high army brass, the faculty and local gentry and Governor Earl Warren were the escort with a pack of newspaper men following in their wake. Everyone got into the act, all the way from the escort to a score of the Indian students attending the university, to the football band and the head yell leader, who led in the solemn singing of the Alma Mater.

Nehru, the diplomat, responded by making his first comment: "Of all the meetings I have attended, this one stands out in my memory." He then read an empty prepared speech, so done, he admitted, that he would not step on anyone's toes.

relying mostly on the stewards and the CIO finding support in the top leadership and in the rank and file.

In contrast the fight in Westinghouse Local 107 has been shaping up within the local union structure. In this largest local in the area there has been a tradition of independent unionism and the UE leadership has in general kept hands off. While in the past the radical and semi-radical leadership, with the exception of the socialist elements, has in the main served the interests of the UE top leaders, there has been a "third camp" attitude against both the Stalinist UE and the CIO.

In the current issues, however, the local leadership and the stewards' body are overwhelmingly pro-UE. The sentiment in the shop is just as overwhelmingly pro-CIO: For example, on November 4, within eight hours, 1200 members signed petitions calling for a special membership meeting to hear BOTH sides of the story of the CIO-UE split and to take appropriate action. However, this current wave of CIO enthusiasm is likely to be dissipated unless the leaders of the pro-CIO caucus can head up this sentiment in the very near future.

The UE leadership, instead of distributing leaflets or calling membership meetings, decided to concentrate on the leaders and the stewards to cement their advantage there. On November 4 Organizational Director Jim Matles and International Representative Ed Matthews worked around the clock holding a series of stewards' meetings, shift by shift. The national officers presented a one-sided and distorted picture of the split and then proceeded to the real business at hand of flattering and threatening any wayward stewards into line.

It was said that certain immediate expulsion from the local awaited any member or officer who advocated return to the CIO, who advocated a meeting to talk about return to the CIO, who advocated that the local decide its own affiliation, who ran on a pro-CIO slate, and so on.

The immediate effect of these threats of expulsion was to silence a few of the critics. However, the threats were quite unpopular with the members when they heard of them.

On the top level also Philadelphia is an important center of struggle. The new IUE-CIO has scheduled a founding convention here for November 28 while the Stalinist UE will hold a convention a week earlier on November 21. While the UE fired the opening shots in the Philadelphia area, the CIO is moving in its big guns and has now set up headquarters in the Philco 101 local. Harry Block is a temporary organizer of the new union.

When he had finished and was leaving to lunch at the university president's mansion, the escort fought over who should sit next to him in the longest of the Cadillacs. Governor Warren, who is still feeling the strain of the last election, tried hard but was left behind, body blocked but still smiling in the backfield. The escort and Nehru seemed to be the only ones who enjoyed the meeting.

All of Nehru's meetings, it seems, have followed more or less this pattern with the exception of one, which rated only a few lines on one of the inside pages of the New York Times, telling that Nehru was to meet that day with the president of the Chase National Bank, one of the biggest in the country. Thus, while the lackeys and stooges of American capitalism are breaking their collective backs to put on a good show for the Indian leader, the capitalists quietly themselves sit Nehru down and discuss with him the prospects for further expansion of American imperialism into India.

If Nehru were a leader who represented the best interests of the millions of oppressed people of India, people oppressed for hundreds of years by just such people with whom he is now winning and dining and having business conferences, he would never get this type of reception—if he got one at all. If he were a true leader and servant of his people and interested in getting the mass of American people to support the struggle of the Indian masses, he would go to those places where he could speak to the workers, poor farmers and middle classes of America.

He would go to the trade unions, cooperatives and the halls that they could make available for him to speak in. The more intimate meetings that he would hold would be those where he would meet with the representatives of the labor and socialist movements here, to discuss with them the necessity, ways and means for popularizing the fight against American imperialism at home and abroad—among the American masses.

Scott BYER Berkeley, Calif., Oct. 31

CRISIS TECHNIQUE

ARMY SEEKS TO REACTIVATE MACHINERY OF CONSCRIPTION

(From Conscription News)
 WASHINGTON, Oct. 21 — "Army chiefs are considering reactivating Selective Service early next year," according to a Washington Post writer, Robert S. Allen, in the October 5 Post. "Two reasons are behind this contemplated move:
 "1. Fear that unless the system is operating, Congress may refuse to renew it when it expires next June 24.
 "2. Growing indications of a slackening in enlistments.
 "The military is also itching to make another try to put over universal training."
 The article continued: "Enlistments for all the armed services averaged about 40,000 a month during the past summer. That is sufficient for their needs. But earlier the inflow was below this minimum level and recently there have been indications of a resumption of this downward trend."
 Another news story revealed that some senators who are most partial to military proposals had a secret session with General Lawton Collins and Army Secretary Gray to tell them that the peacetime draft act would probably die next June unless the army anticipated an emergency (August 4, AP dispatch from Washington). Such advance warning of the need of an emergency may result in still another use of the crisis technique for achieving legislation.
 A columnist, Douglas Larson, said: "The generals believe . . . [the draft] has been so completely inoffensive to the American public," because few were drafted and inductions were then suspended. He added: "For this reason, they think, Congress will be willing to renew the law next year and probably for a long time. . . . They hope a peacetime draft law on the books will become generally accepted as necessary." (Elizabeth, N. J., Daily Journal, Sept. 16.)

CRISIS TECHNIQUE

The powerful veterans' organizations are asking for continuation of Selective Service. The Amvets, for example, took such action as recently as September (New York Times, Sept. 16). The Senate on July 29 gave an indication of its thinking when it doubled the \$4½ million Selective

Service appropriation agreed to by the House. The final compromise resulted in \$8 million for the draft program.
 President Truman's announcement on September 23 that there had been an atomic explosion inside the Soviet Union jolted the United States and most other nations. But in terms of politics the timing of the president's announcement illustrated another use of the "crisis" technique for getting administration-sponsored legislation passed. The House had previously cut the military aid to Europe bill to an appropriation of \$889,505,000. But after the president's announcement the House on September 28 readily agreed to the full \$1,314,000,000 already voted by the Senate. The House-Senate conferees also struck out a provision put in the Senate bill by Senator H. Alexander Smith which would have required the president periodically to report to Congress in detail all that the United States had been doing to bring about disarmament (New York Times, Sept. 28).
 Most U. S. government officials, however, took the line that instead of efforts at disarmament there should be more rearmament. David Lilienthal, who has sometimes been thought of as more liberal and more civilian than his military colleagues, said that the United States must do everything necessary to "establish unquestioned and unmistakable leadership" in an atomic armaments race (New York Times, Sept. 25).
 Senator Brian McMahon, chairman of the joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, suggested that the U. S. may have to expand its atomic energy program. He said: "There is just no other thing for us to do but increase our stockpile qualitatively and quantitatively" (New York Times, Sept. 28).
 Still another viewpoint was presented by a Cornell University professor, Clinton Rossiter. He said some form of executive military dictatorship would be needed in the U. S. to insure our survival. Interestingly, he urged the unsuccessful formula of ancient Rome. We ought, he said, "to make the dictatorship effective and responsible while the crisis lasts and to guarantee a return to normal government when the crisis has passed" (New York Times, Oct. 2).

THE BIG STICK

U. S. BLACKJACKING CUBA AND MEXICO FOR BANKERS

There was a time when the U. S. used to call out the marines to collect its bankers' debts from small nations below the border. That was a trifle expensive, publicized "dollar imperialism" too openly, and caused liberals and others some heart-burning. With Roosevelt's "good-neighbor policy," the emphasis shifted to the economic big stick.
 Two current questions indicate how the latter operates.
 In the first case, even the "peaceful" method of economic squeezing has brought some difficulties, and the Senate Finance Committee recently approved a bill to repeal part of the Sugar Act passed last year. At that time, at the request of the State Department, a provision was put into the act threatening to cut the "sugar quotas" of any country which, in the opinion of the State Department, "denies fair treatment of U. S. nationals."
 That provision was aimed at Cuba, whose economy depends on exporting sugar to the United States. If its "quota" were cut, Cuba would be in a bad way.
 Why was the provision included? In the Senate debate last year, it was pointed out that Wall Street interests have long been trying to collect a multi-million-dollar claim on a deal which they made in the 1930s with the then-Dictator Machado. American shipping interests also have claims against Cuba.
 If there is now more sentiment in Congress against this blackmail policy of the administration, it is not due to any repentance but to the considerations of the world-wide cold war as noted by one senator: "All over Latin America, Communists shouted: 'See, we told you so. Uncle Sam is still a big bad wolf. He

still practices dollar diplomacy. Look what he is trying to do to Cuba."
POINT FOUR'S BITE
 It is reported that even the State Department has therefore changed its mind about the Sugar Act holdup. It is no doubt planning to swing the big stick in some less public fashion than through a congressional law.
 But so far as is known, there is no State Department change in tactics on the Mexican oil deal recently criticized by Chairman Cresser of the House Interstate Commerce Committee. He charged that a big Wall Street international law firm, Sullivan & Cromwell, is trying to use the State Department as a "collection agency" to make the Mexican government pay \$300 million to one American oil company and to "adjust" other claims.
 More important than either of these two cases, but better concealed, is the way in which the "Point Four" program of Truman ("bold new program" for extending American capital around the globe) is to be wrapped up with a program for collecting with the big stick.
 State Department officials have been testifying before Congress committees asking for sweeping guarantees (backed up by the U. S.) that American businessmen and financiers will not lose a cent in profits or principal in their "humanitarian efforts to develop backward countries." The House Banking Committee has already approved legislation toward this end. The NAM and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce urge the government to require an iron-clad treaty guaranteeing the sacredness of U. S. investments and profits. The idea is to put the State Department in the bill-collecting business in a BIG way.

Fear of Titoism Holds Back Russian Tyranny in Polish Satellite—Up to Now

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Foreign observers have been struck by the silence and absence of highly dramatic events in Poland, while in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia a planned Stalinist offensive is unfolding against Titoism, Catholicism and the remnants of whatever opposition exists.
 Whoever is familiar with the modern history of Central and Eastern Europe and revolutionary socialism knows that for more than a century the struggle of the Polish people against czarist oppression was the inspiration of all the Slav and non-Slav peoples in their struggle for democratic emancipation. How explain, then, the present "armistice" in Poland, that traditional focal point of anti-Russian rebellion?
 Are events following a course like that which occurred after the last national revolution of 1863-64? At that time the bourgeoisie raised the slogan of "organic work," repudiating the revolution and the struggle for national independence. The period of "positivism" began, the period of feverish economic construction after a crushing political defeat. The bourgeoisie and Polish capitalism accommodated themselves to the absolutist rule of the czar, their hope of reconquering a democratic national state lost.

EMERGING FROM UNDER

It might seem that events are taking a similar course now in Poland. The war left the country exhausted, half of the pre-war national territory lost; production in some industries fell to 30 per cent; the country's capital was completely destroyed. The defeat of the Warsaw insurrection and of the entire underground movement, handed over to the Russians by the Anglo-Americans, was so crushing that no one could think of resuming a new underground struggle against Russia with the expectation of any success.

Betrayed in its aspirations by the three imperialisms, the Polish people first and foremost accused the Anglo-Americans for its defeat, knowing that it has no probability of continuing the clandestine resistance to Stalin. The only hope that remained after so many years of struggle against the Nazi occupation is the economic reconstruction of the country, the salvation of the national patrimony for the future generation.
 The defeat in 1944 as in 1864 has created a "neo-positivism," a fury of economic reconstruction. All foreign observers declare that no country has been reconstructed so rapidly as Poland. Today it can be said that the period of reconstruction has ended. Almost all of the industries have again reached the pre-war level of production; agriculture, in spite of the loss of the best land in Eastern Poland, is approaching the 1939 level. The Poles are proud of having reconstructed their national patrimony in spite of, and at times against, the policy of exploitation and oppression pursued by Russia.

The social struggle has shifted from the political and national terrain to the economic terrain, to the plane of reconstruction. Undeniably, the nationalization of the means of production and state planning have facilitated this reconstruction, whose success, however, is primarily due to the enthusiasm and vitality of the proletariat and the population generally. The Poles pay colonial tribute to Russia in the form of coal (something like 30 million tons yearly at 10 cents a ton), in manufactured products, in forced labor deported to Siberia, etc.; but gritting their

teeth they reconstruct and build in preparation for the coming struggles. Hence the "neo-positivism," the new period of "organic work" in Poland. The technical and political bureaucracy, like the bourgeoisie 80 years ago, accommodate themselves to the artificial political structure, striving to draw all possible benefits at the expense of the proletariat and peasantry. The Polish regime is the totalitarian rule of the bureaucracy, of the "intelligentsia," adapted to Stalinist czarism.

RUSSIANS TAKING IT EASY

But this is not the only cause of political silence. There is also a certain policy of condensation and even "tolerance" on the part of the "autocrat of all the Russias" in the modern edition. Stalin knows very well that to provoke a resistance, an armed uprising, in Poland in the present circumstances would mean to provoke a conflagration in all of Europe that is controlled by the GPU.

Stalin knows full well that Poland was a country of national revolutions against the czarist autocracy. Faced with Tito's rebellion, Stalin strives at all costs to "appease" the resistance in Poland, or to delay its outburst until the circumstances are more favorable for the Kremlin. Tito's rebellion is the wall behind which the Polish people enjoy a period of respite during which they can dedicate themselves to economic reconstruction.

Tito knows this very well, and according to the Polish press, foments Polish resistance, praising Gomułka for his expressions of sympathy for Yugoslavia. A Yugoslavian diplomat, Petrovich, has been arrested in Katowice under the accusation of having created a network of Yugoslav spies and of distributing leaflets containing "hostile intentions" toward the Polish regime and the friendship between Poland and Russia.

The sensation caused by these clandestine leaflets was such in Poland that Gomułka, praised by the Yugoslav leaflets, had to publish declarations in the official organs of the regime protesting against the abuse of his name and recalling his capitulation of a year ago when he condemned the "traitorous Tito clique."
 In spite of such declarations, there exists in the ranks of the United Polish Workers Party, the PZPR (the Stalinist party), an expectant attitude regarding Gomułka, who continues to be a symbol of resistance against the impositions and abuses of the Russian GPU. Consequently, the ruling circles are disturbed and uneasy over the possible revival of the crisis that was stifled by police measures last year.

BEHIND THE WALL OF TITOISM

It is our opinion that while the Tito government continues to exist in Yugoslavia together with the latent pro-Titoist opposition in Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Eastern Germany as well, the period of respite for Poland will be prolonged. The Stalinist autocracy cannot afford to provoke the Poles and thereby broaden the anti-Stalinist front in Russia's Europe.

On the other hand, the Poles, the opposition as well as the Stalinist leaders themselves, are trying to prolong the period of calm, the former in order to rebuild and strengthen the country, the latter to strengthen their privileged positions, taking advantage of Russia's difficulties elsewhere. Naturally, should Stalin succeed in overthrowing the Tito regime, not only in Yugoslavia and the other countries but in Poland as well there will be a period of purges much

bloodier than that of 1934-38 in Russia. There will come a period not only of forced collectivization, with the expropriation of the peasantry and their deportation en masse to Siberia, but a general slaughter among the leading circles themselves of all those suspected of opposition or coolness toward the Kremlin's imperialist policy in Poland.

But meanwhile the exhausted, hungry and work-burdened Poles, uncertain of the future, enjoy Stalin's "grace." The struggle against Catholicism, the Stalinist "Kulturkampf," is limited to relative skirmishes in comparison with the open offensive in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Although there are many political trials with death sentences against the AK (underground army) and other organizations, there is no general offensive as in Czechoslovakia or Hungary.

Because of his difficulties with the satellite countries, Stalin prefers to leave Poland for another and more opportune occasion. And the Poles, who have learned from their defeats, hardly want to be cannon fodder for the Americans as in 1939 and 1944.

NO EYES TO THE WEST

Undeniably, the inter-imperialist struggle between Russia and the United States has not reached the stage where Poland may be forced to make a new sacrifice. The United States has offered nothing to the Polish bourgeoisie opposition, which has therefore not undertaken any de-

cidated activity or armed resistance against Russia.

The popular feeling in Poland, despite the hatred for the invader, is one of distrust for the Anglo-Americans; nor is a new "alliance" with them desired, since it is well understood that this would mean a catastrophe for the country as in the 1939-44 period.

Certain writers of the Polish emigration speak of the "Czechization" of Poland, referring to the Czechoslovakian attitude toward the German invasion and occupation in 1939-44. But in Czechoslovakia today we observe a "Polonization" of the Czechs, who are engaged in an open struggle of industrial sabotage and political and cultural resistance against Russia.

I believe that the "Czechization" of Poland, like the "Polonization" of Czechoslovakia, are healthy phenomena in the struggle of the European peoples against the Stalinist autocracy. In Poland there was an excessive cult of heroism that degenerated at times into adventurism, while in Bohemia there reigned the excessive political "realism" of Benes and Masaryk, which at times degenerated into petty-bourgeois opportunism and capitulation. But peoples, like individuals, learn from experience.

The relative "calm" in Poland will not last long; neither the contradiction between the interests of the Polish people and the Stalinist autocracy nor the international situation, which grows more tense each day, will permit it.

Calm Before the Storm in Poland?
 That the period of "calm" is coming to an end in Poland is indicated by a news dispatch appearing in the New York Times of October 30, 1949. According to the New York Times reporter stationed in Warsaw, Edward A. Morrow, "A purge of minor officials that may have major repercussions in the political life of Poland is now occurring, reliable sources stated today."
 Morrow indicates that a Polish Trial "à la Rajk" is being prepared to discredit the Western powers and eliminate those who were not wholeheartedly in favor of the merger of the Stalinist and Stalinist-controlled "Socialist Party." Morrow confirms Rudzienski's analysis by pointing out that no major political figures have been arrested, and "that the Polish government as yet never has found it necessary to play its tunes as stridently as other 'people's democracies' have." In a word, Stalin has been afraid to provoke a major Polish explosion.
 That he is also afraid that the period of calm is ending may be indicated by his unprecedented step in appointing a Russian general to openly head Poland's armed forces (see page 1).

NAM Organizes Propaganda Drive To Infiltrate Educational Systems
 The following article is from the October 22 issue of one of the most important trade-union papers in the country, the weekly "Labor" published by the railway brotherhoods.—Ed.
 Charges have been repeatedly made that the National Association of Manufacturers is endeavoring to take over the schools and indoctrinate the pupils with the reactionary views of big business.
 "Labor" has often published evidence along that line, but unusually shocking revelations on how far that organization plans to go in poisoning the minds of students appeared this week in its own official organ, the "NAM News."
 In fact, the NAM boasted of its far-flung program to infiltrate into the schools—a program that evidently will be backed up with a whale of a lot of money.
 Camouflaged as "teaching aids," all sorts of pamphlets, movies, posters and other propaganda materials are being poured into the schools by the NAM. Its old publications have been "completely revised" and even "picture stories" along comic-book patterns are being distributed, the article in the "NAM News" discloses.
 Beginning October 20, the NAM said, these "teaching aids" are being mailed to "principals and heads of social studies departments of 25,000 public high schools, as well as private and parochial schools. Next target will be the elementary schools." In each instance, the NAM supplies large quantities for distribution to teachers.
 Last year, the NAM said, teachers orders a half million copies of its publications for circulation among students, and the organization aims at going way above that this year.
 Also, the article disclosed that member manufacturers are being urged to order large quantities of the material for dissemination in the schools of their communities.
 Most of the pamphlets, as the NAM's own articles revealed, are calculated to glorify its own brand of "free enterprise," raise scares about "government interference," and smear labor unions.
 Since business interests control the school boards in most cities, it is no difficult feat for them to intimidate teachers into using the NAM propaganda. Teachers who don't go along know they are likely to be penalized.
 What the NAM is doing follows in the footsteps of Hitler and other totalitarian dictators who made it their No. 1 job to "indoctrinate the youth" in the schools.
 And of course a major objective is to turn the youngsters and their teachers against organized labor.
 Besides working on the schools, the NAM also has special propaganda material beamed to clergymen, theological students, clubwomen, veterans and others. In fact, there's hardly any organized group in which the NAM doesn't try to plant its propaganda.
 For that purpose, it has a \$5 million annual budget nationally, besides the large sums spent by its local units.

Next—A Labor Party!
 by Jack Ranger
 A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party
 25 Cents for Single Copies Independent Socialist League
 20 Cents ea., bundles of 10-50 4 Court Square
 18 Cents ea., bundles over 50 Long Island City 1, N. Y.

SPARKS in the NEWS

\$64, Please!
 According to Republican Chairman Guy Gabrielson, speaking before a meeting of GOP leaders in Chicago, General Eisenhower told him: "I hope the Republican Party will develop a set of principles so that even a person as dumb as I am will be able to tell the difference between a Republican and a Democrat."
 Look, Ike, it was hard enough to develop the atom bomb. . . .

Horrors!
 Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin is president of George Washington University and this is what he says:
 "When we legislate for a planned economy or to care for the physical wants of our citizens, we are favoring the apron-strings concepts of the socialized society, in which the state supplants the overzealous mother, and weakened men turn more and more to government for protection and sustenance."
 "This leads to lack of faith, to non-social action, despondency, suicide, increase of crime, sex outrages, mental diseases, nervous disorders and dishonoring of the home."
 But why does he leave out airplane crashes, rape, floods, nervous tics, halitosis and stupid prexies?

Non-Contributory, Too
 In Aliquippa, Pa., steel union pickets carried signs reading:
 "This Plant Temporarily Closed While Officials Figure Up Their \$75,000-a-Year Pensions."

Smart Choice
 Ernest R. Breech, executive vice-president of Ford, made a speech to the Industrial Institute in which he praised "private enterprise or capitalism, in which the security of the individual is principally determined by what he adds to the national production."
 It is understood that he said "principally" because his own boss, Henry Ford II, determined his individual security by cleverly choosing the right grandfather.

WHAT'S ON AT THE LABOR ACTION SCHOOL
 Following are Sessions 2 and 3 taking place in the next two weeks—
TUESDAYS
 Dynamics of the American Labor Movement by Ben Hall 8:00 - 9:10 p. m.
 Nov. 15—Rise and decline of Stalinism.
 Nov. 22—Unions and the state.
 Significant Events and Documents in U.S. History by E. R. McKinney 8:00 - 9:10 p. m.
 Nov. 15—Jeffersonian democracy.
 Nov. 22—Jacksonian democracy.
 The Modern State by Max Shachtman 9:20 - 10:30 p. m.
 Nov. 15—State capitalism, and the capitalist state.
 Nov. 22—Decay of the bourgeoisie state: fascism in power.
FRIDAYS
 Problems of the New Asia by Jack Bard 8:00 - 9:10 p. m.
 Nov. 18—The revolt of Asia.
 Nov. 25—India: the traditional way.
 Contemporary Problems of Marxism by Hal Draper 9:20 - 10:30 p. m.
 Nov. 18—Marxist organization today: the problem of the revolutionary party.
 Nov. 25—Can capitalism end Jim Crow?
ALL CLASSES held at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, New York City
FEES: Each class session 25 cents (Students 15 cents)

LABOR ACTION
 A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
 Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.
 114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.
 GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
 Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117
 Vol. 13, No. 46 November 14, 1949
 Editor: Hal Draper
 Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett
 Business Manager: Joseph Roan
 Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)
 Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.

New French Cabinet Shifts to Right

Daniel Mayer of SP Bounced After Timid Proposal for Wage Rise; Gaullist in Government

By PHILIPPE RICHARD

PARIS, Nov. 1—France now has a new government, and some add "just like the one before." Actually, on two counts, the new cabinet represents a further gain in influence by big business.

This is true first of all because of what has happened to the two cabinet members involved in the noisy fight which broke up the old government. The Socialist Party's tiny, cantankerous but rarely bold minister of labor, Daniel Mayer, and the jowly extreme-conservative finance minister, Maurice Petsche, were scrapping over the extent to which the burden of franc devaluation was to be put onto the backs of the working people.

Mayer, and some of his friends in the SP leadership, worried about the dwindling strength of that party as a result of its constant yielding to the conservatives, put up a strong resistance to the conservative attempt to put 100 per cent of the burden on the workers. Little Daniel did not dare propose anything that might protect the average French worker from rising prices (over 7 per cent increase since July 1) but he did propose that the tiny segment of workers earning less than 15,000 francs per month—ten dollars a week—be brought up to that amount as a minimum. Ten dollars a week in France will not buy much more in France than in the U. S.—at any rate, damned little. But any talk of raising wages made M. Petsche come out of his cage roaring with rage.

When the dust settled, three governments later, Prime Minister Bidault announced that the new finance minister would be—Maurice Petsche. And in view of the SP's kind assistance in voting in the new government, the new minister of labor was to be—no, not Daniel Mayer but another chap. Newspaper pictures of the new cabinet show Petsche smiling as broadly as if he had just swallowed someone.

BIG BUSINESS IN THE SADDLE

If Daniel Mayer is not longer in the government, however, his place

in the alphabetical listing is filled by that good friend of the House of Rothschild, the new minister of justice, René Mayer (no relation). This Mayer is a good friend of bankers in general, as befits a member of the conservative group that goes under the confusing name of the "Radical Party."

More striking evidence of a shift toward the right—or toward big-business interests—in the government was the naming of René Pleven to the key post of minister of national defense. Pleven, who takes the place of the SP's Ramadier, is best known for one thing: ever since De Gaulle began his bid for power two years ago, Pleven has been scurrying about trying to unite the old-line conservative groups with the newer, more brutal and less "genteel" Gaullists.

With the Foreign Ministry in the hands of the extreme conservative wing of the Catholic party (MRP) in the person of knobby, ascetic old Robert Schuman (who looks as if he needs a good drink), and with the prime minister's office in the possession of Georges Bidault (who always looks as if he had just had one to help him zigzag between his Catholic party and his old master, De Gaulle), it would seem as if the bankers and big-business interests should be able to sleep calmly—if only their economic system were not popping apart at the seams.

Should things get rough on the labor front this winter, due to the constant lowering of the workers' buying power, the rich can bank on the reactionary De Gaulle admirer, Pleven, as the head of the armed forces. Of course, they have never lost any sleep over the fact that the Ministry of the Interior is in the hands of Jules Moch. (The Interior Department's job is running the police, not the national parks as in the U. S.)

Moch is listed as a member of the Socialist Party, but having gone to France's Polytechnic School—a combination of West Point and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—he is widely rumored to have exchanged his party card for a radio-

operated blackjack. He is notoriously entranced with tossing troops of police about the country in radio-run trucks and helicopters to pit his wits against striking workers, "Moscow agents" (both real and imagined) and similar disorderly elements.

Moch is, of course, cordially detested even by SP and pro-SP union leaders, not to speak of the average worker to whom Moch is a symbol of strikebreaking. He has done more than any hundred Stalinists to lose face for the SP among the workers. But the SP, which allowed the conservatives to toss Daniel Mayer out for raising his little finger one millimeter to the left, continues to allow this ruthless and humorless "night-stick" (as Moch is often caricatured in the French press) to represent it in the French government.

FRANC-TIREUR GOES RIGHT

The renewed lesson of the results of participating in a capitalist government has again, for the umpteenth time, caused some of the few remaining sections of the Socialist Party to raise the cry to get out of that cesspool. With so very few real labor elements left in the SP, that cry has

probably even less chance of success at this moment than in the past.

In addition, one of the stronger elements pulling Socialists toward an independent attitude in recent times now appears to have given up fighting against the current. The important Paris newspaper *Franc-Tireur*, which for a time spearheaded the drive for the left position of the RDR, has apparently lost hope in the immediate emergence of the "third camp."

Whether from galloping Stalinophobia, or from relentless pounding from pro-capitalist forces (not the least of these being those centered around the American embassy), or just from fear of being in the financially poorest of the three camps, the group running *Franc-Tireur* has gradually swung around to a pro-SP and even pro-government participation in favor of the pre-war two-round plurality system. The latter less democratic system makes it possible for the Socialists and conservatives to get together to elect one of their men instead of a Stalinist; it also makes it extremely tough for any new independent socialist movement to win an electoral victory.

DeGaullists Lose - -

(Continued from page 1)

cracy of the French social-democracy! The financier in the cabinet has ruled that the French bourgeoisie just cannot afford to spend as much on its colonial wars of oppression as the "Socialists" would like!

LOCAL ELECTIONS SHOW TREND

In view of this military budget, which is bleeding the country to death, we can take it for granted that the new cabinet will not in any way offer a satisfactory answer to the pressing demands of the trade unions for an increase in real wages. However, certain layers of French society ARE satisfied with the present government; and in view of considerable loose talk even in the social-democratic press abroad about the growing strength of the government coalition (the so-called Third Force), it is worthwhile to report on the latest local elections in France and the trends they show.

Elections were held in October in three communities, so distinct in type from each other as to constitute an excellent cross-section of the country. These three were Pontin, solidly proletarian suburb of Paris; Sceaux, also a Paris suburb but primarily the seat of many higher technical schools, and thus having a petty-bourgeois population with an intellectual tinge; and Rouen, big commercial center and river port in conservative, Catholic Normandy.

In Pontin, in the so-called "red belt" around Paris, the Communist Party retained first place, losing a small number of votes. The Gaullists lost 20 per cent of their votes but remained in second place in the town. The MRP (Catholic party) and SP gained slightly. This time, the Stalinists outnumbered the SP by only 4 to 1 in voting strength! But since the CP did not have an absolute majority in the new town council, all the other parties joined to elect a Gaullist mayor.

In Sceaux, the Socialists gained greatly, the Gaullists lost 60 per cent and the Stalinists and MRP remained as insignificant as they had been previously.

Finally, in conservative Rouen, the Gaullists, previously far in the lead, collapsed completely; the conservative Independent Republican Party gained tremendously; the SP stood still; the CP lost moderately. The general trend seems quite consistent. The CP, based primarily on the working-class vote, held on. It DID lose, but not much. In no sense did the election results indicate that the government parties had made significant gains among the Stalinist workers. On the other hand, the collapse of the Gaullists was overwhelming in all three cities.

WORKERS PASSIVE

It seems clear that the total paralysis of the workers' organizations during the last two years, since the Stalinists disastrously converted the 1947 strike wave into a political maneuver, has reassured the normal con-

servative vote. Totalitarianism, the mystique of De Gaulle, and the rest of it, is at best an expensive and dangerous business. The less fanatical of the voters that flocked to De Gaulle are now satisfied. The country is in reasonably stable shape for them. The workers are properly demoralized and passive, from their point of view. And the "victory" of the Third Force turns out to have bought the support of the now once more "democratic" and "parliamentary" bourgeoisie by steadfastly refusing the demands of the workers and by achieving, therefore, no links with the workers.

At the same time, the passive, negative nature of the support which the workers give the Stalinists (also previously reported) has just been forcefully demonstrated by the election of committees in the great mine basin of the North of France. Out of 125,764 miners, only 73,648 voted.

As a result ALL of the unions lost heavily by comparison with the last election. But of those voting the Stalinist-led CGT received 71.6 per cent of the votes, the reformist Force Ouvrière a miserable 18 per cent, and the Catholic CFTC 10 per cent. There is the social situation in a nutshell—in heavy industry the other unions are pygmies compared with the Stalinists. Yet so many workers have been driven into cynicism and passivity that even the largest union, the CGT, cannot claim the support of the majority.

LABOR UNITY AN ESSENTIAL

More than ever it is incumbent on the growing militant minorities in the Force Ouvrière and CFTC, and on the militant leadership of the smaller Autonomous Federation, to achieve the closest possible combination and linking up of their efforts, along the following lines:

- (1) To fight within their respective federations for action NOW on the economic demands of the workers.
- (2) To seek unity of action of all the unions—including the CGT, but only for immediate demands, without any general pact of unity with the Stalinists, and with united actions organized only around precise and limited agreements. Such agreements such as organization-to-organization, and all efforts of the Stalinists to promote mass committees of action, as a way of once more swallowing up the non-Stalinist workers for their political aims, have to be repelled.
- (3) To seek, through the strengthening of the honest, militant wing in all the non-Stalinist unions, the basis for a successful unification of all the free trade unions—an essential for French labor.

To this end, the left wing that is trying to fight inside the Force Ouvrière and the left wing outside it would do well to consider themselves as allies, not as rivals—as comrades whose experience can run along different channels for the time being, only to reinforce each other in the long run.

ECA Plan Bogs Down - -

(Continued from page 1)

maintains that a continuation of subsidies or a reduction of U. S. exports would be bad solutions. It rather recommends expansion of foreign investment, which could not close it entirely, and proposes first of all the expansion of U. S. imports. Here, of course, is the rub.

NOT FOR US, SAYS U. S.

It is impossible to detail all of the barriers raised by the U. S. to the import of foreign commodities. One can cite export quotas, import quotas (on essential raw materials), export fee and taxes, excessive documentation, the high American tariff, antiquated and inequitable customs procedure and delays, "Buy American" restrictions on federal, state and local government procurement, overvaluation of the currency of the foreign exporting country, inadequate credit facilities—to name a few. The report itemizes in six-point type seven pages of imports subject to tariff duties of 25 per cent or more in 1948.

But while Hoffman and the ECA propose the elimination of the barriers in the U. S. for the free flow of European goods, there are no signs that the U. S. is doing any

thing about that. So, as the next best thing, Hoffman proposes that the Europeans let down the barriers among themselves and restore free trade and free competition. "Don't do as I do—do as I say," orders Uncle Sam.

A positive indication that the United States means to go its own way is its opposition to and expected defeat of the proposal by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) for an "international commodity clearing house" the transference of farm surpluses to shortage areas. Says the N. Y. Times, November 3: "Bilateral trade is the policy put forward chiefly by the State Department today." Bilateral trade on the part of European countries is one of the barriers Hoffman proposes they scrap.

The magic formula which is supposed to make a European "Western Union" work is "free competition," words heavily underscored in the ECA report and Hoffman's speeches. But it seems that the U. S. is more interested in its "freely competitive" way, in the expanded European market that would be achieved than in opening its own market to its European rival.

CAPITALISM STYMIES UNION

What Hoffman would like to attain then, is not the Independent Western Union which LABOR ACTION has advocated, but the type of union, imposed from above, about which we have warned. It is possible that a reactionary form of Western Union under American hegemony can be achieved. But if it is to be a "free-enterprising," i.e., old-fashioned, monopoly-capitalist union, it will be shaken by all the conflicts of old and the more sensitive to shocks the more closely it is integrated with the U. S.

What is absent above all in the ECA proposal for "integration" and antithetical to it, and yet at the same time demanded by the economic and political situation of Europe, is PLANNING. Omitted in all the talk of closing the dollar gap, expanding the economy, putting Europe on a competitive footing with the U. S., is the conception of starting with human needs and desires—the needs and desires of the bulk of the people. Integration à la Hoffman springs from the desires of the top dogs in society, the industrialists and financiers.

Footnote

The Socialist Party's paper, *The Socialist Call*, publishes in its October 21 issue a version of the statement "Stalinism Is Not Socialism" which was separately signed by the SP, the Independent Socialist League and Claessens of the Social-Democratic Federation.

The SP was apparently not entranced with everything in the statement which it signed. The Call does not print the full text. All sections referring to American imperialism are omitted from the excerpts used, which are introduced with "Stressing that all socialist groups are opposed to capitalism . . ."

All-round planning requires the push from below. It must be based on the wants of the people for food, clothing, housing, and not on dollar balances and export markets. It means, as explained in the ISL resolution on Independent Western Union (Labor Action, Dec. 20, 1948), "the renunciation by all participants of any imperialist 'rights' to dominate colonies and possessions now under their rule. It means, at the same time, the most extreme democratic reforms in the political structure of every one of the countries in question."

It is the competitive fears of political and business leaders of both the U. S. and Western Europe which make their unionization plans so partial, timid and uncertain. The French fear their displacement by revived German industry; the British fear letting anyone into their colonial preserves, etc. It is only by pooling the resources of Europe and ending the competition between branches of industry, between country and country, that real union, real planning and real production for use can take place.

The achievement of a genuinely Independent Western Union is of grave, if not decisive, importance so far as the next war is concerned. Western Europe stands between two power blocs which are drifting inevitably towards the abyss. Independent and united, with a democratically planned integration of its economy, it could attract those Eastern satellites whose Russian domination depends in part on their disgust with "free enterprise" bankrupts and those Western forces who want none of totalitarian methods.

One for the Museum

The Socialist Labor Party's "Weekly People" (Nov. 5) prints a letter of its explanation by its national secretary justifying its refusal to sign the statement "Stalinism Is Not Socialism" issued over the signatures of the Independent Socialist League, Socialist Party and national secretary of the Social-Democratic Federation. For a double-distilled dose of unadulterated SLPism, we present the following excerpt:

"By associating ourselves with this proposed move, we should be acknowledging that there are, in fact, different 'schools' of socialism. . . . And this brings us to the basic reason for our refusal to join as partners in the proposed action. However much you may insist that participation in the proposed plan would not constitute 'joint action,' the very fact of our appearance supposedly as one group of American socialists among several other putative socialist groups would inescapably convey joint or collective action, apart from the tacit acknowledgement to which we would be committed that the pseudo (anti-Marxist) socialist groups are in fact socialist. It would place us in a wholly false light, as I hope you will readily perceive."

You readily perceive what we mean.

N. Y. Election - -

(Continued from page 1)

ways he should have known about even if he didn't.

"But a number of them with underworld connections were kept in office. O'Dwyer himself was on friendly terms with Frank Costello, prime minister of the underworld. Before O'Dwyer became mayor he was often a guest in Costello's swank Central Park West apartment."

"DENOUNCED" BY OWN CANDIDATE

And: "During his administration there reappeared open gambling, prostitution, payoffs, cops carrying nightsticks on strike duty, protection of racketeers, payroll padding and other characteristics of a lazy, phony government that usually ends up with underworld rule. . . ."

"The disastrous results of O'Dwyer's administration are not merely that the patronage-hungry Tammany Tiger was fed and fed well—27,000 non-civil service jobs, approximately \$100,000,000 in patronage for the machines. The greater disaster is that through a series of deft maneuvers O'Dwyer has dissipated the energies of New York's normally alert and vigilant liberal leaders, and divided and confused them."

The last-named "disaster" is hardly discreditable to O'Dwyer, whose trade as a machine politician was well learned, but rather to the "liberal leaders." Incidentally, the ridiculous position of the Liberal Party—which, remember, advocates a vote for both Lehman and Morris with a single jerk of the lever—is highlighted by the fact that Lehman has stated that he "denounces" the "slandering" campaign against his running mate O'Dwyer. It is the Liberal Party especially that has been plugging the alleged "slander." Wonderful policy this is, that gets the Liberal Party denounced by its own senatorial candidate!

Meanwhile the "Tammany-Gangster Machine" (as the Liberal ads called it) saves itself the trouble of refuting the "slanders" by running its own full-page ads on "How to Become a Phoney" in *One Easy Lesson* (à la Newbold Morris). This is not a polite campaign. The O'Dwyer men here remind Morris of "your endorsement of Alf Landon against Roosevelt. Your support of Tom Dewey both times he ran for president. Your approval of every Republican candidate from 'top to bottom'—every last lover of Taft-Hartley."

SKELETONS RAKED OUT

The appeal is to labor supporters of Morris, guaranteed to make them squirm. Morris' skeleton closet is raked further: "You [Morris] voted to cut 10 per cent in payments to all families on relief. . . . fought against a pay raise for the city's underpaid teachers and turned thumbs down on additional funds for underprivileged children. . . . defeated efforts of organized labor to get wage increases for city workers in positions where there had been no increases in 20 years. . . . killed a raise in pensions for city policemen and firemen."

And it winds up: "But don't worry too much about it. You can always fall back on your REAL friends, the partners who are cutting coupons for you in your stock brokerage firm. And don't forget those long luncheons with the boys who reduced the assessments on your 115 Wall Street and 47 Broadway properties, while you were president of the City Council. You've always got them—and Park Avenue, too!" (A previous version of this blast advised Newbold to go back to the "horsy set" where he belongs.)

Mean and nasty, no doubt, and in part below the belt, but with more than a sufficient degree of truth to have an impact on Liberal Party ranks.

Opium Note

"Newspaper editors had spotted a trend. A little belatedly, they had found that the book trade's success with religious titles was no fluke, but the result of insecurity and searching for faith in a war-torn world."—Time, Oct. 10.

Setting an Example

Truman's fact-finding board found that the steel workers were not entitled to a few cents' wage raise, but on October 19:

Clark M. Clifford, Truman's ghost-writer and think-man, was raised from \$12,000 to \$20,000 a year, and John R. Steelman, Truman's assistant, is also now pulling in \$20,000 instead of \$15,000.

The administration warns that the line has to be held on wages in order to avoid inflation, but on the same day as above:

Truman's three secretaries were upped from \$10,330 to \$15,000 and his five administrative assistants were raised from \$10,300 to \$15,000.

Teaching Democracy To the Japanese

"Although Japanese workers have a theoretical right to strike unless they are in government service, in practice General MacArthur has suppressed this right. Since a year ago it has been understood that occupation authorities would interfere if a strike adversely affected the national interest or the objectives of the occupation. But the objectives of the occupation now includes holding the wage line so that right to strike is almost entirely fictional."—News dispatch from Tokyo to N. Y. Times, Oct. 21.

On the Ground Floor

Army Chief of Staff Collins, testifying in the Battle of the Pentagon, mentioned incidentally that the presence of U. S. troops in Europe would serve to bring the country into war at the very outbreak of World War III:

" . . . the first troops that would be hit—as was the case in the Philippines at the initiation of World War II—would probably be army troops. We have in Europe forces in three areas that would be immediately under the gun—in Germany, in Austria and in Trieste."

Presumably General Collins expects these troops will still be there when the world slaughter starts. Three prefabricated Pearl Harbors. . . .

The Military Mind

Major General LaFleche, retiring Canadian ambassador to Greece, told the Canadian press that "the Greeks are a sturdy race" and then added what was presumably one of the highest compliments he could muster: "very patient, not hard to please and ask very little from life. We have to admire a people like that."

Force and Violence

On the first page of the NAM News for October 8 is featured a photo of three heavily armed men employed by the Lingia Coal Company (Clearfield, Pa.) "to protect its business and the right to work of its non-union miners."

In various other issues the NAM blows its top about "union-incited violence."

Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. Open daily 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. 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.

13-46

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

RENEW NOW

Just arrived!
No. 3 (September-October Issue)

CONFRONTATION INTERNATIONALE

Revue Internationale de Discussion

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE Single copy: 50 cents
4 COURT SQUARE 1-year sub (6 issues):
LONG ISLAND CITY 1, N. Y. \$2.50

**INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the
Independent Socialist League**

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

I want more information about the ideas and principles of independent socialism and the Independent Socialist League.


I want to join the Independent Socialist League.

Name Tel.

Address Zone State

WITH THE

Independent Socialist League



All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, classes, lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE. For general information and literature of the ISL, and for local information not given below, write to: INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, New York. For information on the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE, youth organization of the ISL, write to the SYL at the same address. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

AKRON
Write to Box 221.

BALTIMORE
Write to P. O. Box 603, Colbert & Fayette St., Baltimore.

BUFFALO
639 Main St., 2nd floor.
SYL meets Friday evenings.

CHICAGO
333 West North Ave., Room 3.
Tel.: MICHigan 9003.
SYL: same address.

CLEVELAND
Write to Box 1190, Station B.

DETROIT
9016 12th St.

LOS ANGELES
213 S. Broadway, Room 201.

NEWARK
248 Market St.

NEW YORK CITY
City Center: 114 West 14th St., third floor. Tel.: WAtkins 4-4222, CHelsea 2-9681.
Open daily 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Manhattan Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.
Industrial Branch: Thursday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.
Brooklyn - Brownsville Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin).
Queens Branch: Write to ISL at City Center, 114 West 14th Street.

**NEW YORK CITY—
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE**
For all information, write: Socialist Youth League, 114 West 14th St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.
Manhattan Unit: Open forum every Friday, 8:30 p.m. at City Center, 114 West 14th St.
Bronx Unit: Open forum every other Sunday, 8:30 p.m., at 1330 Wilkins Ave.
Brooklyn Unit: Open forum every Thursday, 8:30 p.m., at 1758 East 5th St., Brooklyn.

PHILADELPHIA
1139 West Girard Ave., 3rd floor. Meetings Monday at 8 p.m. Open House, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.

PITTSBURGH
Write to national office of ISL.

READING
Write to P. O. Box 1671.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA
Write to Labor Action Hall, 466 Tenth St., Room 212, Oakland 7, Cal.

SEATTLE
Write to Labor Action, Box 358, 905 3rd Ave.

ST. LOUIS
Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.

WEST VIRGINIA
Write to national office of ISL.

YOUNGSTOWN
Write to J. P. Walters, Box 605.