

Work for a Workers World;
Join the Workers Party!

LABOR ACTION

JUNE 30, 1947

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR

FIVE CENTS

Let Us Issue Labor's Declaration of Independence --

ORGANIZE A LABOR PARTY!

Miners Quit Pits as Fight On Anti-Labor Law Begins

Late bulletins as we go to press report that over 200,000 coal miners have quit work in ten states in protest against the Taft-Hartley law. With the wildcat movement still spreading, miners posted signs at pit entrances reading, "Let the Senators Dig Coal!" A complete tie-up is expected by June 27, when the miners begin a ten-day vacation.

With government ownership of the mines due to end in a few days, the Department of Justice is reported to be investigating the possibility of an injunction to halt the strike action. The government is also debating other courses of action to break the mine strike, according to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, which allow an injunction after the President has received a report from a board of inquiry.

If an injunction is issued, the labor movement will face the need of a nationwide work stoppage to uphold the miners.

Meanwhile, with the miners' action spreading swiftly through all mine areas, 40,000 East Coast shipyard workers are preparing to strike under union direction in what will be the first formal test of the Taft-Hartley Act.

JUNE 24—Some 50,000 soft coal miners in Pennsylvania, Alabama and West Virginia today demonstrated their resolve to resist militantly the anti-union measures voted by Congress by walking out of the pits in protest against the Taft-Hartley bill one hour after its passage.

The miners, who will be among the first to feel the impact of the bill in view of their scheduled strike, duplicated the strike action that two weeks ago shut mine fields in Pennsylvania for five days.

Elsewhere in the labor movement sentiment is high for vigorous measures that will force early repeal of the law. In a telegram to Philip Murray, the San Francisco CIO Council called upon the national CIO leadership to organize a nationwide 24-hour protest strike. A United Steel Workers, CIO, official was quoted in the press as predicting that 90 per cent of all organized workers would be involved in a protest strike before the end of the week.

CIO shipyard workers announced that they might be the first to test the new law by going ahead with plans for a strike in the East Coast Bethlehem shipyards, set to begin at 12:01 a.m. on Thursday, June 26. "If we must be the first to test it, let us do it," said John Green, union president, to a meeting of six locals in the port of New York.

The National Maritime Union stated its intention to "fight this bill with everything we've got.... A concentration camp able to hold 100,000 men would have to be built."

The Sailors Union of the Pacific weeks ago formally resolved to defy the bill should it become law (see LABOR ACTION, June 16).

Philip Murray has called a meeting of the CIO Executive Board for Friday, June 27. And Leo Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, has called all the legal representatives of the CIO to a meeting on the same day.

The Boss's Dictionary

Rebellion:



Almost every union in the country, AFL, CIO and independent, is making its plans to test the act in court and in practice. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers propose to print a list, prohibited in the new law, of how the Congressmen voted.

William Green, president of the AFL, predicted that so much labor conflict will result as to "prove... boomerang" on the makers of the law.

David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, denounced the law at the union's Cleveland convention and then whittled his remarks down to some nonsense about electing a "progressive Congress" with the aid of "bona fide liberal forces."

Matthew Woll, vice-president of the AFL, did similarly by urging labor

to "work with the major parties for constructive legislation," indicating that he hasn't any idea whatsoever of what the rank and file of the labor movement wants and certainly of what it needs.

Green, Murray and other leaders of the AFL and CIO appear, however, to be far from the kind of action taken by the miners and desired by other sections of the union movement. The militants in the union movement will have to be on their toes to see to it that the fight against the operation of the bill, and this fight is certain by one means or another, is not dissipated in endless lobbying and in aimless, valueless and dangerous political campaigning for assorted "bona fide liberals" in the Democratic and Republican Parties.

AN EDITORIAL

How Are Our Unions Going To Fight Back?

Elsewhere in this issue we print a brief account of the reaction in the labor movement to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Bill.

We know what close to 200,000 miners did and what shipyard workers are planning to do. We know too that the San Francisco CIO Council has proposed a nationwide 24-hour strike. But the question still remains: What Are the Unions going to do?

We can be certain that the unions will exploit every loophole to harass the operation of the act. We can be certain the leaders of the union movement will plan every conceivable court and strike test to upset its operation and force its repeal. Even the most case-hardened bureaucrat, the staunchest upholder of "free enterprise" in the ranks of the union officialdom, will be compelled to resist because his "bread and butter" depends on the unions.

We know all that. But we repeat: What Are the Unions Going to Do? It is possible that the demand for a nationwide protest will gain new popularity, and perhaps even the support of important union officials. We are all for that, though the time for such action was really before the bill was enacted into law.

However, it will still serve a valuable purpose in rallying the masses of the working people to vigorous, militant action which can lead them to further, effective unity in political and economic action beyond the narrow desires of the union bureaucrats. A 24-HOUR PROTEST STRIKE REMAINS AN IMPORTANT SYMBOL OF LABOR PROTEST, and in the situation it may have to be repeated as occasion warrants.

But the question we ask remains. When threatened with government by injunction in the early decades of this century even the reactionary Gompers leadership of the AFL stated that it would never submit. Except for talk about the bill "boomeranging," there is as yet no such equivalent declaration from Bill Green. And, Murray, steeped as was Green in petitioning the President for veto, has not yet announced the plans that should have been broadcast the moment the bill was voted.

Yes, Murray, Green, Whitney of the Railroad Brotherhoods and the others will use every possibility to make the law "boomerang." They will seek to tie the anti-labor employers into a million legal knots, swamp the courts with countless suits, even call or break miscellaneous strike actions.

All very good, and all very necessary. But all of it is secondary, peripheral to the main line of attack. And here it is that the leaders of the CIO and AFL give the play away in advance to the people, who are responsible for the law. They refuse to lead labor in offensive action, especially in a political offensive.

They will fight for repeal, and they may even succeed. But at the end we will be back where we started, still facing a hostile government, still without an instrument by which we can mobilize the kind of all-embracing political and economic offensive that is dictated in the circumstances.

We hold that the instrument needed to protect and advance our interests as a CLASS is a LABOR PARTY based upon our unions. What the unions do on this is far more important in the long run than a million legal suits.

In our lead article on this page, we present the LABOR PARTY as the essential feature of a DECLARATION OF LABOR'S INDEPENDENCE.

Further, as part of all that this declaration of independence means, and in particular connection with the problem we face today, we hold that the situation dictates the formation of democratically elected boards of union strategy. Unification of the union movement is obviously indicated. Immediate cooperation on a democratic militant level can be a spur to unification.

The demand for democratically elected union boards of strategy, resting in every city and state on local councils of action, to coordinate the activities and plans of the union movement, will have to issue from the ranks. We have been calling for this for a long time. It was demonstrated as essential in the big strikes of a year ago, in the wage negotiations of this year. It is again demonstrated in the urgency of fighting the anti-labor law.

Our efforts must be joined on the level of greatest effectiveness—that is, democratically, by choosing the direct representatives of the men in the shops.

Now, above all times, this matter must not be handled by the top alone. The ranks must be drawn in!

We ask: "What Are the Unions Going to Do? Much depends on the answer. And the answer can be given by the ranks of the union pressing action upon the leadership.

We propose: A DECLARATION OF LABOR'S INDEPENDENCE.

We propose: JOINT STRATEGY BOARDS TO PLAN COMMON ACTION.

We propose: a LABOR PARTY which will break labor's ties with the political parties of capitalism and serve notice of labor's fighting class independence.

We believe that the time has come for labor to issue its own DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

Above all else that means the rapid formation of a LABOR PARTY!

Enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act demonstrates for the millionth time the utter criminality of relying on "friends" among the capitalist politicians, of tying labor to either or any of the capitalist parties.

The Taft-Hartley Act is the product of an offensive against labor undertaken by big business in the conviction that labor is apathetic, and that its leaders will not lead a genuine fight because these leaders are wrapped body and soul in upholding the rottenness of capitalist enterprise.

Why We Need a Labor Party!



Political Trap for Labor Baited With Truman Veto

By DAVID COOLIDGE

A political trap is set for the working class in the United States. This trap is baited with the Truman veto of the Taft-Hartley Bill. Should organized labor, the AFL and CIO, walk into this trap, the only tangible result which will follow will be the capture once again of the "labor vote" for the Democratic Party.

The situation for the two capitalist parties, the Republicans and Democrats, could not have been organized better if the leading political strategists and tacticians of the capitalist ruling class had actually come together to plan this strategy and tactic.

What has happened? First, the Republicans have made a concrete bid for the support of the urban and rural middle class in 1948. They have exploited the prejudices and the stupidity of the middle class by passing a "labor reform" bill. This will please the city and small town middle class immensely. It will also please the thousands of small farmers of the middle West who believe that the mortgage on the farm is the result of the high wages paid to urban industrial workers. The Taft-Hartley Bill will please Southern planters, manufacturers, middle class

elements; and many of the most benighted among the white workers who will feel that somehow the Taft-Hartley Bill will promote the maintenance of "white supremacy."

After the labor bill the Republicans took hold of the tax question and threw half a loaf to the big capitalists and a few crumbs to the little property owners of the middle class. While Truman vetoed this bill and the veto was sustained, the Republicans will say that they did the best they could for "the people."

TRUMAN'S STRATEGY

That was the procedure of the Republicans. That was their vote-catching plan for 1948. How about the Democrats? It would have been strange indeed if Truman had signed this bill. He had nothing to gain by signing. The Republicans would get the vote which we have mentioned above. Truman's only course was to strike out for the "labor vote." This is the political meaning, or better, the partisan political meaning, or the factional meaning, of the veto. Just as the support of the bill by the Republicans was for the purpose mentioned above, so the Truman veto was for a similar purpose.

Truman, in his radio speech, said

that "this is a shocking bill." We will not argue about Truman's sincerity in taking that position? We do not deny at all that it is Truman's position that this bill is a frontal attack on fundamental democratic rights. We can admit this for the sake of argument and still say that what is going on in the contest over this bill is a factional conflict between the Republican and Democratic parties, looking to the 1948 elections.

Furthermore this is not merely a factional conflict between the Republican and Democratic parties. Party lines were crossed in the voting on the bill. It is a conflict within the capitalist ruling class as to what is the best procedure to use in order to keep organized labor and the working class under the control of the capitalist ruling class and at the same time retain the allegiance of labor at the voting booth. That is, the problem before the ruling class is how best to hold labor in check, and at the same time not go so far that the working class will be provoked to break from the two capitalist parties and organize its own independent party.

The strategy, of course, is not simple, nor always well thought out. (Continued on page 4)

In order to force rapid repeal as well as negate the operation of the law immediately AND GO BEYOND THAT TOWARD NEW VICTORIES IN EVER-WIDENING SPHERES OF INTEREST FOR THE PEOPLE AS A WHOLE, it is necessary that labor assume the OFFENSIVE. This cannot be done by chasing after "progressive" Congressmen, as Matthew Woll proposes, or beating the drums for "friends of labor," as the PAC proposes. (See editorials on page 3.)

It can only be done by a clean break with the Democratic Party, the Republican Party and any party, already formed or yet to be formed, which is not the CLASS party of the working class.

We must of necessity look beyond the immediate problem of repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. We must prepare to meet similar situations and problems which will arise with increasing frequency.

We cannot do this if we are unarmed. To be armed to meet the multiple problems of our day we must have a weapon that corresponds to the need. That weapon is a LABOR PARTY.

In our press we have written thousands of times that politics and economics are no longer separable. Especially in the last few years has this been demonstrated daily as government intervention followed almost every action of the labor movement.

So too we have thousands of times noted in our press what is universally recognized as a characteristic of the American working class. Its economic militancy is unparalleled in the history of any nation. But the power and influence of American labor's organized millions are not reflected in political independence.

Labor officials, smooth-talking representatives of the capitalist class, the entire propaganda and education machine of capitalism, have conspired to perpetuate the myth that we must submit to a permanent, self-defeating choice between Republicans or Democrats and that function of unions is only to negotiate wage increases.

It is a myth that needs to be exploded. And it can be exploded only by the demonstration of organization!

The ranks of the labor movement have proved their readiness to back any kind of militant action against the Taft-Hartley Act. Witness the miners today! A call for a 24-hour strike would have been met, and would still meet, with instantaneous response. By the same token we are of the opinion that labor will respond to a call for political action.

Murray and Green will not issue such a call. The demand will have to issue from the ranks, placing an irresistible pressure on the leadership of the unions, forcing action by the very weight of the demand, despite if not with the various union officialdoms.

The Taft-Hartley Act is the work of a capitalist Congress, acting on behalf of capitalism. And Truman and those around him are no less representative of capitalism than Taft. Remember the mine strike injunction!

The time has come for us to sweep away the entire debris of capitalism, to confront the capitalist law makers and those whom they serve with a party of our own which will aggressively champion our cause and move forward toward replacing the Congress of bankers and industrialists with a Workers' Congress, a Workers' Government.

Let us issue our DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE! Let us organize a LABOR PARTY.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Hits Addes Plan on FE-UAW Merger

CHICAGO—Last week (June 23) LABOR ACTION's article on the FE-UAW merger question ended as follows: "The proposal will be submitted to the UAW locals before July 15. The unity argument is powerful, and will be demagogically exploited. UAW militants are confronted with a real problem. Hence, they must obtain all the facts, view the situation in its entirety and determine just what policy will advance the best interests of the workers and their union."

All the facts on the subject are now in. The proposal has been printed, and copies are in the hands of all UAW locals. There is only one conclusion that can be drawn after reading this amazing document. IT MUST BE DECISIVELY DEFEATED!

If space permitted, it would suffice to print the entire proposal, for the text condemns the writers of this document.

What is in the proposal that is so bad? Outside of about 22 constitutional violations, the central idea is the setting up of a Farm Equipment Division, with a director (Grant Oakes), an assistant director (Gerry Fields), and an advisory board (the old FE International Exec.). These officers are to be elected by FE-CIO prior to merger. This director then will appoint the staff (the old FE staff with a few additions), and will be in "COMPLETE CHARGE OF THE OPERATION, SUPERVISION AND DIRECTION OF THE DIVISION." This director in turn would be a member with a consultative vote on the UAW's International Board.

In the above paragraph we see that those who negotiated this merger were willing to violate an essential right of the UAW membership: the right to elect or replace officers democratically. Even if one grants the Addes forces the right to set up a new division which technically is unconstitutional (Art. 12, Sec. 14), one is forced to ask: "How is it that those locals which have been in existence for ten years or more in the agricultural implement field (J. I. Case Local 180 and International Harvester Local 57) and were pioneers of UAW, and are proud of their organization, how is it that they do not have the RIGHT to determine who shall be THEIR REPRESENTATIVES? THEY and all the rest of the UAW agricultural implement plants are simply to be "absorbed" in

the new setup. Is there any wonder then why a delegation of nine presidents representing John Deere, J. I. Case and Massey-Harris went to the board to protest this action?

Further, there is no provision for the next election of the director of the division. Simply put, Addes is willing to sign a LIFETIME contract with FE leaders, to take care of their whole staff, in return for support of those locals that they influence, at the forthcoming UAW national convention.

Not only is the staff "lifetime," but the UAW has to assume all the "liabilities" of FE. This means not only their deficit (Addes' only comment when asked about their status, was that they are "solvent"), but also their contracts, and that means the FE legal staff and the FE editors.

And on and on. The records of the division are to be kept within the division, the records of the FE locals are to be kept within their locals. The director, being in complete charge—that is, a hot one, because no one in the UAW could ever get that much power—forward to the international per capita payment and there is no way of checking it, the membership figures are padded. On finances, they are to use up "as nearly as possible" the amount of the income in per capita payments from the industry or division. As nearly as possible—to Stalinist bureaucrats!

Without even an audit Addes agreed to "assume all the assets (sic) liabilities, debts, wages, contracts (l) etc., of FE-CIO which have been accumulated or incurred in the past or WHICH MAY BE ACCUMULATED OR INCURRED UP TO THE ACTUAL DATE OF THE MERGER OF THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS." Then, in case they have left anything out, there is a provision to amend this proposal by a joint committee of Addes men and FE men. Subject to whose approval, they do not specify.

That in the main is the document. Everyone who can possibly get hold of it should read it through. It is a cynical, "smart maneuver" of the Addes majority on the board, who, afraid of being licked at the November convention, will make any deal even though it basically attacks the organizational structure of the union.

Addes counts on a fast vote—a referendum of locals, in the summer, to begin by July 15. In his letter to

the locals he writes much about the absolute necessity of unity in this field. He forgets that this plan will not give any semblance of unity. The "FE DIVISION" will be an autonomous UNION WITHIN A UNION. It will have ITS press, and ITS executive board. It will in no way help solve the economic problems of the industry, because the first job of the Stalinists after merger will be to conduct a war to the finish against any possible opposition that exists within this setup. (Can anyone in his right mind forget the method of operation these people used against the McCormick and Caterpillar plant leaderships?)

The workers in the plants under FE's jurisdiction and the workers

under UAW contracts sincerely want unity. The past period of contractual negotiations has once again posed the absolute necessity of workers' unity, not only of the CIO forces, but of the AFL locals also. The bosses are the only ones who benefit by this division.

The aluminum workers and the steel workers united by a convention decision of both organizations. We must approach this situation in the same way. The forthcoming UAW convention must take a determined stand for a real, HEALTHY merger. Meanwhile all UAW militants must attend their next membership meeting and help defeat this attempt to strangle bureaucratically the agricultural implement workers.

His Plan Won't Provide Healthy FE-UAW Unity



GEORGE ADDES

ILGWU Leaders Skirt Political Action Need

By GERALD McDERMOTT

CLEVELAND, June 21—A family which laboriously built a fine home, fully furnished, carefully locked and well insured, and then put no roof on it would be pretty foolish.

If they knew it needed a roof, knew how to build a roof, talked about building a roof, and STILL didn't build one, they would be more foolish than ever.

The ILGWU convention meeting in Cleveland as this is written is in just that kind of a situation. The Ladies Garment Workers have a fine ECONOMIC union—well organized, well run and well heeled. But they have no POLITICAL roof over their heads, and the anti-labor storms breaking loose in Washington can ruin all they have built.

A CIO unionist would find the pic-

ture presented by the ILGWU convention not a little startling. Nine hundred delegates are present for a convention lasting half a month in Cleveland's mammoth public auditorium. The delegates—many with wives or husbands along—are in the better hotels and well dressed.

Then, at the opening session, a concert by Metropolitan Opera stars brought from New York was included. Two days later, the delegates attended a private concert for which the entire Cleveland Symphony was hired. The next day, they recessed for a pleasure cruise on Lake Erie to a vacation resort, Cedar Point, in a chartered boat.

It is all the more surprising to see a convention spend money like this when you remember that the powerful Auto Workers have been on the verge of bankruptcy for months.

Not that one can object to a labor organization sponsoring and participating in some of the good things usually reserved for the capitalists. In and of themselves, these projects were good.

There were other good signs. The presence of Negro delegates and Japanese-Americans at the convention shows that the ILGWU has learned a lot about labor solidarity. The large number of Jewish trade unionists present would provide a sobering lesson for those misguided workers who think that all Jews are well-to-do. And the visit to the convention by two spokesmen of the Italian labor movement—Matteo Matteotti and Giuseppe Saragat—is a welcome internationalist note.

But the depressing thing is that this obviously well organized union is proceeding as if it existed in the best of all possible worlds. The hard fact is that the garment workers are taking no steps to protect what they have built and won.

RELIANCE ON TRUMAN

An examination of the political approach of the ILGWU shows this clearly. President David Dubinsky, in his opening address, spoke of "independent labor action" and of organizing millions of labor voters into "cohesive forces working together with the liberal, progressive, professional and small business groups all over the country." BUT, warty as these phrases may be, Dubinsky advised this ONLY if Truman approved the Taft-Hartley Bill. In short, Dubinsky's talk—he proposed no action—is only a very weak club held over the heads of capitalist politicians.

Then, as if to assure his capitalist political friends that he was really still a good fellow, Dubinsky rushed to the defense of American imperialism. Bitterly, he attacked Henry Wallace for even hinting that American foreign policy was imperialist or aimed at world domination.

As if to highlight the futility of his political approach, Dubinsky put forward a program of sorts.

The program included price slashes, spread of the recent 15 cent raise, a higher minimum wage, increased unemployment compensation, continued rent control, a federal housing program, crop insurance, control of speculation in farm lands, and so on. It is good to see the labor movement concerned with broad political issues like this, and no worker could object to the program.

But WHO is going to carry it out? The program is POLITICAL. Can Dubinsky turn to the Republicans, whom he correctly characterizes as "the willing tools of high finance these many years"? Or to the very Democrats who scrapped price control, secured anti-strike injunctions, broke two national strikes, and have a sour record on every other point? How long is Dubinsky going to wait before he begins DOING something about independent political action? Or, more properly, how long are the rank and file of the ILG going to wait before they FORCE Dubinsky to do something or get out. That is the crucial question before the next week of the convention. We will report on it next week.

Reuther Forces Win at State CIO Meet

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 21—In many respects the Michigan state CIO convention held here last week resembled the 1946 gathering. The pro-Reuther forces won all posts by roughly 2,200 votes to 1,800 votes for the anti-Reuther caucus. Walter P. Reuther, UAW-CIO president, was the big influence in the so-called "right wing" caucus. Supporters of George Addes, UAW-CIO secretary-treasurer, Richard T. Leonard, R. J. Thomas and the Stalinists formed the "left wing" bloc. Over 75 per cent of the delegates came from the auto workers' union.

But the convention had many distinguishing features to provide a substantial basis for a comparative analysis of the two conventions, and the two factions.

STALINIST ISSUE

At this year's convention it was a debatable question whether the influence of Reuther over many delegates won victory for the "right wing" or if the disgraceful and disruptive tactics of the Stalinists lost for the "left wing." Certainly, Reuther hasn't advanced anything new in program in the past year. He gave the convention his usual analysis of the social problems of today. He advocated nationalization of the steel and housing industries but he evaded carefully any discussion of the kind of political action needed to bring lasting results to the labor movement.

In the "right wing" caucus, Emil Mazey, regional co-director of the big East Side district, spoke for the Labor Party. He was well received. On the convention floor, one delegate, Doris Fishman, of the Public Workers Union, gave a hard-hitting talk for the Labor Party. But the Reuther-dominated Resolutions Committee supported a miserable third party resolution, which was overwhelmingly adopted even though it contained a section excluding totalitarian elements from this party. The Stalinists were too busy trying to make personal attacks on Gus Scholle, re-elected as president, to put up any serious discussion for their "broad coalition of labor-liberal forces" clap-trap or totalitarianism.

Last year the "left wing" tied the convention in knots on points of order, challenges on credentials and other organizational procedures. This year, a wild attempt by Yale Stuart, Stalinist hatchman, to make a couple of speeches after the convention had voted to proceed with the next order of business, brought a tense situation. Stuart and his cohorts actually tried to jam the stage with supporters, grab the microphone and take over. Between the efforts of some husky sergeants-at-arms and the realization that this disruptive tactic was antagonizing the vast majority of delegates, the Stalinists retreated and the convention went on. During the discussion on political action, Stuart again tried his stunt

and again the convention was disrupted from discussing the issue at hand.

Of course, these incidents intensified discussion on one of the major off-the-convention-floor issues. It was the Communist (Stalinist) Party. On the first day, a bitter exchange between Stuart and Scholle brought charges of red-baiting against Scholle, and "rule or ruin" policy on the part of the Stalinists. As a result, on Monday night, Reuther appeared before his caucus and presented his full views on the problem of the Stalinists.

He defended the right of anyone with any political views to function in the unions, but he vigorously denounced the policies of the Stalinists. He warned the delegates that the main goal of the Stalinist bloc was to seize control of the state CIO apparatus as a springboard for action to dominate the UAW-CIO. His only statement about Scholle and Hopkins, the incumbents, was to urge their re-election as a means of blocking the Stalinist drive for power.

In passing, Reuther also warned he would fight "ACTU or anyone else who tried to take over." Of course, Reuther reviewed the CP flip-flops on domestic and foreign policy, and did a devastating job. The only point he made on his foreign policy views was: "Personally, I am against Standard Oil dominating the Middle East and I am against Stalin dominating it."

Scholle repeated what Philip Murray, president of the CIO, recently said about the Stalinists, and his speech was packed with overtones of red-baiting. Later in the convention, a resolution incorporating the national CIO statement of policy on the Communist Party was brought before the Resolutions Committee for adoption. But Emil Mazey convinced the committee to drop it as it would lead to red-baiting and further confusing the issues at the convention.

The "left wing" caucus pulled a very obvious stunt of red-baiting the Reuther caucus, but it boomeranged. A leaflet was passed out on the last day of the convention showing a photostatic copy of a printer's bill for the Socialist Party and paid for by the Michigan CIO Council. This was supposed to prove that the Reuther wing was dominated by "Socialists." In fact, the candidate of the "left wing" for secretary-treasurer was a former supporter of Scholle, who was quoted throughout the convention as "breaking with Scholle because he had too many damn Socialists around him." The individual was John Skrocek, former vice-president of the Michigan CIO.

Naturally, a delegate asked Barney Hopkins, the secretary-treasurer, if he had paid that bill. Hopkins replied: "Yes. We paid that bill as indicated. The trouble with the leaflet is that it doesn't explain what that bill was about."

The Michigan CIO Council had paid printing bills for many liberal-labor organizations for FEPC petitions during the big campaign last fall for a state FEPC law. It had facilitated the work of the drive. This explanation was not challenged by the Stalinists, and embarrassed some of the Negro supporters of the "left wing" caucus.

NEGRO QUESTION

Another major issue at this convention was the Negro question. Before the convention, a disgraceful attack was made at Dodge Local 3, UAW-CIO, by supporters of the "left wing" against the "right wing" slate because it had three Negroes on it. "Left wing" forces used the vilest Jim Crow arguments.

At the convention, on the third day, a parade of Negro delegates supporting the "left wing," packed the speakers' platform, carrying signs, demanding a Negro executive vice-president of the state CIO Council. It was during the report of the Constitution Committee, Stalinist spokesmen heatedly demanded that Negroes be given representation in a policy-making position.

The first speaker against this proposal was the first vice-president of the Michigan CIO Council. "I have never been elected to any post in my local union except on merit. I think I hold this job on merit and I want to be re-elected on my merit as a union man." The speaker was Bill Humphries, of Muskegon, a Negro! Incidentally, he was re-elected. Other Negro supporters of the Reuther caucus spoke in a similar vein. As a result, the Stalinists withdrew the proposal, claiming they were really fighting only for an executive vice-president.

FAILS TO MEET CHALLENGE

What did this convention accomplish? It failed to meet the challenge of the crisis before the labor movement. In this connection, the alleged "left wing" again demonstrated its total bankruptcy. (They never can attack any programmatic speech Reuther makes, for as cautious as he has become, he is still miles ahead of them.) The "left wing" remains an unholy alliance of ignorant bureaucrats like R. J. Thomas, conservatives like Richard T. Leonard, careerists like George Addes, and some red-baiters, all of whom go along with the Stalinist political line in exchange for organizational support. Few people are as uncomfortable these days as Leonard, who as head of the PAC in the UAW-CIO, must go along with Philip Murray in his pro-Truman policy, while the powerful Ford Local 600, dominated by Stalinists, goes pro-Wallace. Is he sweating?

In the Reuther tendency, Walter Reuther dominates all policies or lack thereof. Reuther deliberately provides room for divergent views on political questions in his caucus. La-

bor Party agitation of one kind or another always features big Reuther caucus meetings before conventions. Emil Mazey, Reuther's most progressive associate (he is more progressive by far than Reuther), is distinguished in the UAW-CIO top leadership by his persistent pro-Labor Party views. The conservative wing of the Reuther tendency is ACTU, whose views were outlined in last week's LABOR ACTION. Gus Scholle, head of the Michigan CIO, fits into the conservative side of this picture.

But the Reuther tendency, with all its weaknesses and contradictions, deserves support not merely because it contains pro-Labor Party groupings and provides elbow room for discussing important issues before the labor movement. Above all, what is decisive is that there are elements in the Reuther tendency who understand that labor's fight must go beyond a struggle for wages, embrace a broader social outlook, as was indicated in the program that the Workers Party hailed as the GM Program for wage increases without price increases.

Every important crisis facing the UAW-CIO demonstrated this. Last week's LABOR ACTION article on the question of the FE-UAW merger proposal, once again proved this. The place for all militants in the UAW-CIO is within the Reuther caucus fighting for the Labor Party, and a continuation of the sound, progressive union policies that built the UAW-CIO.

Milwaukee Judge Sentences Local 248 Leaders to Jail

MILWAUKEE—Another blow was delivered to the trade union movement by the boss courts when Judge Roland J. Steinle sentenced 22 members of Allis-Chalmers Local 248, UAW-CIO, to terms of three and five months incarceration for violating an injunction against mass picketing.

The Judge sentenced Robert Buse, the president, and two other Executive Board members to five months in the House of Correction, and 19 other members to three months. The central theme of the 74-page decision was that "nothing constructive was done by the officers or members of Local 248 to prevent the unlawful action of the pickets."

The case is an outgrowth of the Allis-Chalmers strike of last year which was bungled by the Stalinists. The Milwaukee labor movement has suffered considerably as a result.

However, this is a case that can wake up the labor movement. The CIO Council and the Milwaukee RFL Central Labor body must unite and meet this threat with a show of strength. They must put aside their antagonism against the Stalinists and realize that many good anti-CP militants are also going to jail.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Complaint and Reply On Palestine Article

Dear Editor:

Allow me to correct an error in the editorial revision of my article of last week on "Jews Will Gain Nothing from Russian About-Face."

The article at present reads "The beginning of wisdom in the Palestinian question is the recognition not only of the national rights of both Jews and Arabs, but above all independence of the country before any sound and lasting steps can be taken in Arab-Jewish relations."

That is not what I wrote, places the cart before the horse, and is entirely wrong.

As Gromyko stated, "everybody" is for independence. The Revisionists want a Jewish provisional government immediately. The Mufti wants an Arab state immediately. The Zionist leaders want an immediate independent state in a partitioned Pales-

tine. The Socialist Workers Party wants immediate independence with no immigration.

The question is how to get independence and what kind of independence it will be. We say not by reliance on any imperialism. Good. How, then? By Arab-Jewish unity. How is this unity to be achieved?

The SWP says by "complete sacrifice" of all Jewish rights. The Hashomer Hatzair says by political party, the Zionist leaders say by the Arabs accepting them as benefactors. The Mufti says by the Jews remaining as a denationalized minority. The Marxists say by recognizing the national rights of both Jews and Arabs.

For the Jews at present, national rights mean, above all, free immigration to save thousands of Jews from rotting to death, and to live as a nation—in an independent Palestine.

For the Arabs it means national freedom and a democratic majority in an independent Palestine.

No! "Sound and lasting steps in Jewish relationships" is not something that will come after independence. It will only come about in the course of the struggle for independence. The Jews cannot win real independence without the aid of the Arabs. The Arabs cannot win independence without the aid of the Jews. The Marxists have the job of winning over the Arab AND Jewish workers to this point of view.

Fraternally,
Al Findley.

P.S.—As a result of poor sentence structure in one of my previous articles, I gave the wrong impression that S. Israeli, Palestinian correspondent of The Forward, is editor of the Bulletin of the Council for Arab-Jewish Cooperation. He is not.

We think Comrade Findley is squeezing a point which does not really exist, if we understand his letter correctly. Naturally, we take re-

sponsibility for the editorial correction made, but it does not, as Findley believes, place the cart before the horse. For the article as editorially amended, states that the beginning of wisdom on this question is the "recognition" of the national rights of both Arabs and Jews and the necessity for independence, "before any sound and lasting steps can be taken in Arab-Jewish relations." This does not mean that independence must be achieved first before anything can be done in direction, but it does mean that before "any sound and lasting steps can be taken," this much has to be recognized, and not merely that, but fought for. That is what is meant by recognition and it implies struggle and the establishment of harmonious relations in this struggle. Our position on the right of free immigration is too well known to repeat it here.

It is not true that "everybody" is for independence; many are, but only we are for it completely on the basis

of full economic, political and social rights for the two populations, free of any ties with British imperialism. That includes the right of free immigration.

While we do not agree with the SWP on the Palestinian question, particularly their utterly contradictory position against free immigration to Palestine, and while their concrete program for that country is faulty and falsely motivated, it is wrong, as the letter states, that they want "complete sacrifice" of all Jewish rights. We assume this to be a polemical exaggeration on the part of Comrade Findley.

The Editors.

For a Price List of Marxist Literature in English and Other Languages Available Through Labor Action Book Service, Write to

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

With the Workers Party

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, class lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the WORKERS PARTY. Visit our headquarters listed below to purchase Marxist literature, the NEW INTERNATIONAL and LABOR ACTION. For information of WORKERS PARTY activities in cities not listed below, write to WORKERS PARTY, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

- AKRON: Write to Box 221.
- BALTIMORE: 21 West Preston St. Socialist Youth League meets every Friday at 8 p. m. Public forums every second Friday of each month.
- BUFFALO: 639 Main St., 2nd floor. Office hours: 11 a. m.-2 p. m., Monday through Friday. Open meetings every Saturday, noon-2 p. m. Open house Friday nights at 8. Educational, Refreshments.
- CHICAGO: 1501 W. Madison Ave., 2nd floor, Chicago 7. Telephone: CHESapeake 5798. Office hours: 3-5:30 p. m. daily. Tuesday and Wednesday evenings.
- CLEVELAND: Workers Party meets every Sunday at 8 p. m. Socialist Youth League meets every Friday at 8 p. m. Write to: Bernard Douglas, P. O. Box 1190, Cleveland 3, Ohio.
- DETROIT: 6341 Gratiot, Room 10. Telephone: Plaza 5559.
- LOS ANGELES: 3314 So. Grand, Los Angeles 7, Cal. Telephone: Richmond 7-3230 (if no answer, phone AX 2-9067). Office hours: 2 to 6 p. m., daily.
- LOUISVILLE: Write to: Robert Durant, Box 1181, Louisville, Ky.
- NEWARK: 243 Market St. Office hours: Tuesday-3 to 6 p. m.; Wednesday-12 to 3 p. m.; Saturday-3 to 4 p. m. FORUMS every Friday at 8:30 p. m.
- NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. Open every day from 10 a. m. to 7 p. m. Wednesday and Thursday until 10:30 p. m. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681.
- BRONX BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15 p. m., at Wilkins Hall, 1330 Wilkins Ave., Bronx.
- HARLEM BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p. m., at the Workers Party headquarters, 2143 Seventh Ave. (near 126th St.) Room 16.
- CENTRAL BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p. m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St.
- CHELSEA BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15 p. m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St.
- INDUSTRIAL BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15 p. m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St.
- B'KLYN-DOWNTOWN BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15 p. m., at the Workers Party headquarters, 276 Fulton St., Brooklyn, 2nd floor.
- B'KLYN-BROWNSVILLE BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p. m., at the De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin Ave.).
- SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE: Friday, 8:15 p. m., at the Workers Party headquarters, 276 Fulton St., Brooklyn, 2nd floor.
- PHILADELPHIA: 1139 West Gerard Ave., 3rd floor. Meetings Wednesdays at 8 p. m. Forums every Friday, 8:15 p. m. July 11: The Future of PAC.
- READING: Write to: P. O. Box 1671.
- ST. LOUIS: Write to: Douglas Bridge, 6517 Corbitt Ave., University City 14, Mo.
- SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA: Write to: Labor Action, 465 Tenth St., Room 206 Oakland 7, Calif.
- SEATTLE: Write to: P. O. Box 29, University Post-Office.

INTRODUCTORY OFFER TO LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription to LABOR ACTION as follows:
 6 month subscription (26 issues) for 50c.
 1 year subscription (52 issues), together with pamphlet "Plenty For All," to be mailed to me, for \$1.00.

Name (Please print)
Address
City Zone State

Editorials

Whither PAC?

There is as yet no word on what the CIO's Political Action Committee proposes to do now that the Taft-Hartley Bill has been voted into law. However, the evidence at hand indicates that it will do nothing but continue its reprehensible policy of serving the Democratic Party machine.

Recently, having all but disappeared after the last national elections, PAC came to life again with a "Dollar Campaign." Every CIO member was asked to contribute a dollar to promote the activities of PAC.

A dollar for genuine political labor action would indeed be a dollar well spent. Were it designed to start labor on the road of real political independence, then we would applaud it, encourage it, urge workers to oversubscribe their quota.

But as we saw, and see, it, the dollar is intended solely to back the campaign activities of various capitalist politicians in the Democratic and Republican camps who are presumably "friends of labor." Few more invidious phrases have been coined than that one, "friends of labor"—"friends" who represent the capitalist class, the ENEMY of labor.

A dollar, to elect Truman who broke two national strikes, who reinstated government by injunction is a dollar that is more than wasted. A dollar to elect any of the capitalist politicians, the "friendliest" of them, is a dollar used AGAINST our interests.

There are differences, to be sure, among the capitalist politicians. Some are more liberal, some more reactionary. But none of them represent, or CAN represent, our class, the working class.

Read PAC publicity. It's revolting. We have on our desk the "PAC Pipeline," a newsletter issued by the central office of PAC. It is composed of tidbits and inanities, and not in a single line does it speak the need or the possibility of real, militant, independent political action. Not by a line does it teach class independence. Its content establishes that all Republicans (with the exception of Wayne Morse), and some Democrats like Pass-the-biscuits O'Daniel are scoundrels who must be defeated, while the others must be helped to victory.

If ever the futility and viciousness of this attitude needs demonstration, it was demonstrated by the series of events that led up to the voting of the Taft-Hartley Bill. The situation presses urgently for a LABOR PARTY. PAC fiddles around with capitalist politicians who are "for" labor (so long as labor keeps "its place," and turns out the vote), chaining labor to the endless and wearying merry-go-round of choosing between one set of utter scoundrels and another set of palatable scoundrels.

There isn't a one of them that labor should support. Not the best of them! For, good, bad or indifferent, they are agents of the employers, the men who own the factories, mills and mines in which labor works.

The CIO is the organization of some millions of workers who have formed unions, weapons of economic independence. PAC is an arm of the CIO. Yet it does not duplicate in the political field what the unions do in the economic field. Any man who proposed that the head of General Motors or his agent be elected to a post in the auto workers union would at the very least be sent to a psychiatrist. Why should it be different in politics?

Our aim must be to organize ourselves as a class politically as well as economically, with the aim of establishing our own government, A WORKERS' GOVERNMENT. PAC is not doing that now. It is doing the contrary. But, if PAC is truly an instrument of the CIO, then the members of the CIO CAN do something about changing the nature of the PAC.

TURN PAC INTO A LABOR PARTY! To achieve that goal every union man should stand ready to contribute as many dollars as are necessary!

Third-Partyism

The passage of the Taft-Hartley anti-labor bill, despite a veto by the President, contains a political lesson that the labor movement would do well never to forget: it was a bill sponsored by big business; it was passed by a big business congress; it defied the will of tens of millions of working men and women of this country.

The action was another demonstration that labor cannot fight only an economic battle as long as government remains in the hands of big business and its political parties, the Republican and Democratic, so long as the political machinery of the land is in the hands of capitalism's loyal servants, labor's economic power and victories are lost on the political front. The only way in which labor can fortify its economic gains and win new ones is to coordinate its economic might with its potential political might and wrest political power from big business.

The establishment of an independent labor party with a militant labor program to represent the interest of the majority of the people is a long felt need in this country. Instead, the magnificent economic organization and power of the workers is dissipated by the age-long policy of the labor officialdom of supporting one or the other of the capitalist political parties and their candidates. The sharpest comment we could make on this score is that Representative Fred A. Hartley, Jr., co-author of the present bill, was endorsed by William Green, president of the AFL, and supported by that organization in the last elections! This is merely one example among many similar ones all over the country, initiated by the AFL and the CIO, by liberals of one stripe

or another, and also the Stalinist Communist Party during the many twistings and turnings of its policies in the interests of Stalinist Russia.

More recently, talk of a "third party" has gained momentum. The passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill produced more of such talk. A "third" party in the minds of its sponsors would not be an independent party of labor and the people at large. No, it would be a third CAPITALIST party, more "liberal" to be sure (whatever that may mean), but a capitalist party nevertheless. It would be composed, in the minds of its sponsors, of those "true liberals," in the Republican and Democratic parties, the "independent" supporters of both parties, the great minds of the liberal New York Nation and the half-liberal, half-Stalinist New Republic under the editorship of mankind's new, but utterly confused and unprincipled Messiah, Henry A. Wallace.

This conglomeration of confusion is united on only one idea: to make this rotten, decaying, profit system more effective, more workable, more human, more tolerable, more liberal, more truly in the interests of the common man. They would try to square the profit system, private ownership of the means of life, the monopolization of wealth, with a decent, human life—but without changing one fundamental characteristic of the present system of exploitation.

The irresponsible Wallace talks incessantly about bolting the Democratic Party and creating a third party. The Stalinist dominated Progressive Citizens of America, chief supporters of Wallace, now threaten again the formation of a third party on the ground that President Truman went to a ball game after his veto message and failed to carry his gang behind him to support the veto. And although it does not come out for a third party now directly, it sounds a warning by innuendo, saying: "The failure of the Democratic Party to defeat the Taft-Hartley Bill may well mark a turning point, not only in the history of American labor, but in the history of American political parties as well."

But the strongest force behind the agitation for a third party is the vulgar, unprincipled agent of the Kremlin, the misnamed Communist Party of the U. S. A. Naturally, it is trying to make as much capital out of the present situation as it can. Its purpose in sponsoring a third party as against a labor party truly representative of the masses, is that a third party could corral a segment of capitalism within it and thus better serve the international interests of Stalinist Russia which relies in its world policies upon the schism inside the capitalist super-structure. As is consistent with Stalinism, it merely plays around with the lives and interests of the people.

But it is necessary to say now to the entire labor movement: the third party scheme is a fraud and deception of the working class and the people as a whole. There is no other political way out of the present situation, at this stage of development in the United States, but through the organization of a party of labor, representing the whole of American society, against the parties of capitalism, the parties of big business and of profits. A labor party is one means by which a genuine political differentiation in the nation is possible, as well as a clear struggle in behalf of the masses against the private interests of a tiny minority of wealthy industrialists and financiers.

The fight for a genuine party of labor means a fight against a spurious third party movement, against the confusion it would create, and most important of all against the thousand and one betrayals which it is certain to commit against the people, especially if its standard bearer is Henry A. Wallace.

Polish Borders

Our world is so inured to tragedies that it passes them by as blithely as if they were normal, expected, quite in the usual order of things. There is for instance a tragedy taking place in Europe at this very moment which is unreported in the capitalist press, but which illustrates to perfection why the domination of Europe by capitalism and Stalinism leads to catastrophe after catastrophe.

By July 1, an additional 400,000 Germans are going to be forcibly removed from the "New Western Territories" which the Polish regime has seized in return for the lands it ceded to its Russian master. This area from which all Germans have been and are to be expelled was before the war one of the richest agricultural centers of Europe; it provided all of Germany with over 20 per cent of its foodstuffs. Some eight million Germans lived in it and killed its lands.

Now there are only 400,000 Germans left there and they are being transported at this very moment to a Germany already overcrowded and hungry. They are the last remnant. About a million of the old residents have been certified as Poles and allowed to remain. Another four million fled the advancing Russian army. Some 2,200,000 have already been deported and now these 400,000—WHAT?

The land they are leaving, once rich and fertile, is at present fallow. Whole villages abandoned; no livestock or seed; weeds where once there was wheat; a scarcity of Polish settlers to take the place of the expelled Germans—this is the situation.

But the frenzied nationalism of the new Stalinist Polish regime is such that it has taken these western areas even though it is not in a position to use them properly. That means that Germany, the former industrial center of Europe, will not be able to use the land for food production; hence part of the explanation for the present food crisis in Germany. That crisis results in decreased production and in a whole series of other repercussions which disorganize the entire economy.

Multiply the situation on the Polish-German border by any number of similar situations and you have the agony and crucifixion of Europe on the cross of capitalist and nationalist antagonisms which force the land to lie fallow and the people to starve.

GPU Makes "Jail" Life Easy For Murderer of Leon Trotsky

On the occasion of the maneuvers of Doctor Chapa,* the newspapers published hundreds of reports disclosing the privileges which the GPU underling, Jacques Mornard (the man who murdered Trotsky), enjoyed in the penitentiary. They report something which is not precisely a secret: that thanks to the power and money of the GPU, the assassin of Trotsky has been for a long time the strong man of the penitentiary, at times more powerful than the Penal Director himself.

Mornard did not have a cell (the entire penitentiary, and even the city on some nights, have been his field of operations), he ate from the best restaurants, has suits, "teachers" of languages, friends and protectors (among whom the Doctor Chapa and the Penal Secretary were the least significant), facilities to circulate freely in prison and even outside of it, private feasts and even bacchanals, conjugal visits with every sort of person, freedom to interview anyone who wanted to see him and at whatever hour he wished, the visitors' list well filled and even a title of professor of alphabetization (orthography) and a post, Assistant of the Deputy of the Department of Social Prevention of the Secretary of Government (the Dr. Chapa, surely!); furthermore, a retinue of assassins no less "assistants" of the doctor and a virtual army of agents from whom he received fidelity and reverence.

Accordingly the press reports that never before was there a prisoner in the Penitentiary of the Federal District who enjoyed major privileges and who made a show of so much money and political influence. Therefore it is understood that the Penitentiary of D. F. has been for the Stalinist assassin merely a place of refuge to protect his precious existence. It is natural that all these privileges would end by inciting the hatred of the majority of the inmates which, spontaneously or not, burst forth in recent days. But nothing in this story was a secret. Why, then, in apparent surprise, do the newspapers now discover the news

of the privileges for Trotsky's assassin?

The Doctor Esther Chapa is without doubt a miserable servant of the GPU; but we cannot concede great importance to the Stalinist family. The Secretary of the Penitentiary himself, José Farah, of whom it was said that he is the medium through whom Mornard receives the orders of Stalin, is in reality nothing but a simple instrument which is left visible in order to conceal forces a thousand times more powerful. A complete investigation of the preparation and realization of the assassination of Trotsky and of the protection of the assassin will uncover a monstrous mechanism in which the high functionaries of the government, of today and yesterday, will reveal its repugnant face entirely.

The press scandal around Mornard fits in with the plans of Yankee propaganda against Russia. In this sense, we Trotskyists are the first to be prepared against the confusion.

WHY THE PRESS CAMPAIGN

Neither the government nor the capitalist press are ignorant of the princely life of the agent of Stalin. If now they write pages disclosing these privileges it is simply to utilize the repugnant assassin in the campaign against Moscow. But the bourgeois press identifies the crimes of Stalin with communism, because it tries to deprecate not the traitorous bureaucracy of the Kremlin, but the revolutionary ideas of the international proletariat.

We are not ignorant of the fact that the assassin Mornard can be converted into a valuable hostage in the hands of the Yankee police. And in virtue of this, the effort of Stalin to secure the fight or the assassination of his agent is not diminishing. But we can affirm that if Stalin had wanted to assassinate Mornard or to lead him on to the road of flight, he would have been able to do it with the greatest impunity. The functionaries of the government themselves, who have filled the days of the assassin

with ease and pleasure, are able to free him or to assassinate him. For this reason, we do not believe that the doctor and such as Farah had of necessity to furnish a scandal. The coffers of Moscow are not exhausted and the Mexican functionaries are not too dear.

It is not necessary to forget that in the government of Aleman there are installed in the high places not a few Stalinists; we cite, for example, Perez Martinez, the Minister of Government; Mario Souza, the Chief of the Agrarian Department; German Parra, the Subsecretary of the National Economy, and even the confidential Alejandro Carrillo, Secretary of the Central Department. As one sees, Stalin does not exactly lack agents on high.

If indeed North American imperialism challenges Stalin with Mornard, it is not discounted that Stalin will leave Mornard on top of the table as a proof that his aggressive plans against Wall Street are not so dangerous nor so decisive nor so short term. But, in any case, the role of Mornard is important and the working class has the obligation to take a position in this respect.

We do not take seriously any of the affirmations of the mercenary press which is sprinkling incense in the "moralizing" labor of the new Procurator. In bourgeois justice, the "moralization" has a price—maximum in the case of Mornard. The revolutionary workers know that the only justice which can be effective against the assassin of Trotsky is the justice of the working class. Late or early, Jacques Mornard will have to appear before the revolutionary tribunal, as will the Cain of the Kremlin if he does not have the good fortune to die in time. The Mexican Stalinist participants in the crime will not be an exception. The grim Siqueiros and his gangsters can still walk freely through the streets, but in the end, they will not escape.

Translated from —LUCHA OBRERA, Mexico City.

June 1, 1947

Motorcade A Dismal Failure Stalinist-Led Caravan No Substitute for Real March on Washington

Special to Labor Action

By DON MURREN AND MEG TYLER

WASHINGTON — After months of post-card, petition and advertising campaigns, and one week before the Taft-Hartley Bill went to the White House for signature or veto, word, or rather whisper, filtered through the country that some labor action had started against the machinations of Congress.

A car cavalcade was started in Los Angeles, by the introduction of a resolution in the Central Trades Labor Council by the AFL Retail Clerks, to have a March on Washington. Following this, the CIO Council held a hasty meeting—not attended by most of the important CIO unions—and joined with the AFL to send a 40-car caravan. Word was sent ahead and others joined from various parts of the country.

Here was an opportunity for the AFL and CIO leaders to reverse their do-nothing policy and rally the entire labor movement to a March on Washington of tens of thousands to demand the defeat of the anti-labor bill. Only such an action of aroused workers—a "bonus march" on a grander scale—would have scared the puppets of big business. Instead, this movement was allowed to degenerate into an affair of the so-called "left wing" (Stalinist led) which mustered, at most, 1,500 people. Among these there was just a sprinkling of auto workers, steel workers and other members of other labor unions.

LOBBYING GETS MONOTONOUS

These 1,500 arrived in Washington for the purpose of lobbying, in groups of five, to put pressure on Congressmen and Senators. This was soon found to be ineffective as in most cases the worthy legislators refused even to see the delegations. The small groups of five in the main reached only the secretaries. Those that had a little more luck and did manage to corner a Congressman or Senator had little effect. One could well see these stooges of big business saying: "Just a bunch of Reds—Wouldn't vote for me anyhow—What's a few people down here—No large section of labor is aroused."

Many delegates became disgusted very early. "What's the use of spending all this time and money?—We aren't accomplishing anything—This costs dough and is getting monotonous," were comments frequently heard. Your LABOR ACTION reporters found unanimous agreement when they said: "What we need here is at least 50,000 and no begging. We should barge in with thousands and tell 'em what we want." General agreement also greeted: "What we need is our own guys up here. We should have an Independent Labor Party."

Timed to meet this growing disillusionment and the beginning of a drift back home was a pep and political rally Wednesday night. The meeting was led off by Senator Taylor from Idaho, who spoke 55 minutes on his personal history and ended—with a song. In between the prattle were a few tidbits against the worst aspects of capitalism and some organizational lessons on how to out-pappy Pappy O'Daniel. Taylor was followed by Congressman Hollifield of California, who gave a straight Stalinist line. He blamed the workers for not electing more liberals! The delegates of this supposed grass roots movement of rank and file workers were chastised by a pedagogue from the Democratic Party for not being enthusiastic in the last elections! Then, with a warning of coming fascism and that unions would be smashed because the workers did not vote for more liberals—liberal Democrats—he instructed the audience to rectify these mistakes in '48. The hall, being well packed with Stalinists, instead of genuine rank and file militants, gave this vicious dribble a tremendous ovation.

made this into a genuine March on Washington. The Stalinists, however, bear a part of the blame even though they presumably led the only action that occurred at all. First: they did not prepare for the cavalcade by any previous demand in the unions. (So far as we know, only LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party pounded away week after week on the necessity for a March on Washington.) Second: they did not notify and pressure any other unions but the ones they controlled, to go along. Third: they marched down to Washington and prepared their program to end the day of the veto and, thus, had no action prepared for the main fight—which was to sustain the veto. Fourth: the whole action was only a slight step beyond the petition campaign as it did not rely on mass pressure but insisted on polite lobbying contact with Congressmen by groups of no more than five.

DRIBBLE AND MORE DRIBBLE

Congresswoman Gahagan (Douglas) ended her short talk with one worthwhile note. She said a much weaker labor movement survived the goons and the scabs of the 20s and that the movement now would not be beaten by a punitive law.

The keynote speech, laying down the Stalinist line, was given by Marcantonio, who besides a few flourishes reminiscent of the third period—such as "The solidarity of the international working class will meet American imperialism" and "The toilers are superior to any other class"—said: "If Truman doesn't veto the Slave Labor Bill with a strong message a new political party will arise."

Senator Pepper ended the meeting with a detailed analysis of the bill and a whitewash of the Democratic Party. "At least," said he, "more Democrats opposed the bill than Republicans." He was sure that Truman would veto the bill and pleaded for continued support to the friends of labor. And he had to plead! After Marcantonio's speech the old Stalinist hacks were fired by the ration of "radical" lingo. Even they had to be convinced, for the minute, of the regular line of supporting "progressive" Democrats and of the theory of the lesser of two evils.

Thursday saw a parade, the only highlight of which was the attempt of the Caravan Committee to remove posters calling "For an Independent Labor Party" and "For a 24-Hour Work Stoppage" from a few cars. The program was ended Friday with at least half the delegates already gone home.

STALINIST OBJECTIVES

The big crime, we can see, is the failure of the labor leaders to have

made this into a genuine March on Washington. The Stalinists, however, bear a part of the blame even though they presumably led the only action that occurred at all. First: they did not prepare for the cavalcade by any previous demand in the unions. (So far as we know, only LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party pounded away week after week on the necessity for a March on Washington.) Second: they did not notify and pressure any other unions but the ones they controlled, to go along. Third: they marched down to Washington and prepared their program to end the day of the veto and, thus, had no action prepared for the main fight—which was to sustain the veto. Fourth: the whole action was only a slight step beyond the petition campaign as it did not rely on mass pressure but insisted on polite lobbying contact with Congressmen by groups of no more than five.

One can only understand all this if the objectives of the Stalinists were:

- (1) To utilize the rank and file sentiment for action to lay the basis for a third party threat to back up Wallace's and Pepper's pressure within the Democratic Party.
 - (2) To garner for themselves the credit of seemingly militant action at the expense of other groups and leaders in the labor movement.
- But it did not contribute materially to labor's fight!

By Leon Trotsky:

Living Thoughts of Karl Marx \$1.50
Stalin (a biography) 5.00

Cash with orders—We pay postage
Send for our complete list!

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Sq., Long Isl. City 1, N. Y.

New York Picnic
TIBBETTS BROOK PARK
SUNDAY, JULY 13
10 a.m., Field PP2

Take Van Cortlandt Park train to last stop and change to Tibbetts Brook car. Or take Lexington Avenue Woodlawn subway to last stop and change to bus.

Games. Nearby swimming facilities
Refreshments and food provided

KATYN MASSACRE: A TRAGEDY THAT BLEEDS

We herewith present the first part of an article by Comrade Rudzienski whose articles in LABOR ACTION and the New Internationalist have constituted the principal source of information in the United States on the Polish situation. In the concluding section, which we will present next week, Rudzienski discusses the responsibility of the British imperialists, the scandalous policy of UNRRA, the role of the government-in-exile and General Anders staff as "an inferior employee of His Majesty's government," and the duty of class-conscious workers to voice their protest and support the formation of the "third front of the World's Socialist Revolution."

By A. RUDZIENSKI

There exists wide-spread knowledge of the assassination of 23,000 Polish prisoners of war, soldiers and officers, "liquidated" in classic GPU manner (a shot in the nape of the neck) in the camps of Kozielsk, Starobielsk and Katyn. When the assassination en masse of these innocent victims was uncovered, the Russian government categorically denied it, utilizing the occasion to break off relations with the Polish government-in-exile in London. The Stalinists—Molotov, Beria, etc.—denied the assassination, attributing responsibility to the Germans. But the organ of Marceau Pivert, "The Masses," in its February-March 1947 number, reveals that the assistant chief of the GPU (NKVD) Merkulov, told the puppet Polish general, Berling, who headed the Stalinist-Polish army, that the 23,000 prisoners of war "had been liquidated through an error." An error coldly and deliberately decided upon. An error that accuses and will continue to accuse the Stalin regime until its miserable end. How many hundreds of thousands, how many millions of Russians, Ukrainians, Jews and Germans have been liquidated in the same manner as these Polish prisoners of war? We do not know because no voice was raised in protest.

The tragedy of Katyn has been the fate of the entire Polish underground. The Warsaw Uprising was cold-bloodedly handed over to the Nazis so that the Stalinist police might be saved the executioner's job. When the armies of the Russian invader occupied the ruins of that wasteland which was once the capital of a nation, the flying squads of the GPU began their labor of persecution against that Underground which had tenaciously fought the Nazis for so many years. With Stalin's army, the agents, the spies, the persecution and assassinations of the GPU were the first to enter the occupied cities, towns and villages. Their work had been laid out by the spies of the Stalinist party, who long ago had drawn up the black lists of militants and leaders of the Polish Resistance.

The number of political prisoners has reached into the hundreds of thousands. The hangman Radkiewicz, chief of "Security," admitted to the figure of 80,000 political prisoners in a country with 24 million inhabitants. Hundreds of thousands have been secretly carried off to forced-labor camps in Russia in the absence of any control by courts or normal legal procedure. Only those who joined the illegal armed groups were able to save themselves from the clutches of the Stalinist police. The Polish Underground was swept away on two fronts, handed over and sacrificed by the "Western Allies" to Stalin in order to fulfill the imperialist agreements of Yalta and Potsdam. Thus did Poland fall subject to the domination of the Russian conqueror.

Yet there still existed remnants of Polish resistance and independence outside the country, in the Polish army commanded by Anders, and the exiled Polish government, based on a coalition of four parties (nationalists, Christians, Peasants, and Socialists), the ghost of an independent Poland that stalked through Stalin's dream, inheritor of the imperialist policies of the Czar. The Kremlin mobilized all its means of propaganda, all its lackeys and servitors in order to present the government of the reformist, Arciszewski (old fighter against the Czar, and himself a worker), as a "fascist" government; and the Polish army which fought on all fronts against the Nazis, from Norway to Africa and Italy, which fought in Holland, Belgium and France, as "fascist condottiere."

I know, dear readers, that I touch upon a "dangerous" and unwelcome theme, because the Left is still in the habit of viewing these events through the spectacles of Stalinist propaganda. Nevertheless, I cannot abstain from dealing with this problem. In its large majority, the Polish army is composed of those deported by Poland after the Russian invasion of Poland in 1939. These hostages and political prisoners, condemned to death in Stalin's forced labor camps, are in the main the humble Polish workers and peasants, as well as the intellectuals, of Eastern Poland, who would never have gotten out had it not been for Stalin's pressing need, after the German invasion of 1941, to sign a Polish-Russian pact in 1942, to secure the alliance of Poland and England.

The vanguard of these men is composed of the militants of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), the unions, and the Peasant Party, as well as many ex-communists who were as a rule condemned to forced labor by the GPU. Another important section is made up of the Jewish soldiers, many ex-members of the Bund and other Jewish parties, as well as a high percentage of Ukrainians and White Russians, Polish citizens who entered the Polish army to escape the Stalinist inferno and return to their homes and lost land. The remainder is composed of Polish Pomeranians and Silesians, pressed into the German army, and the Poles deported far forced labor into Germany and Western Europe, whom the Stalinist press stigmatizes as "Volksdeutsche" (converted Germans); finally, there are the Polish miners of France and Belgium and the emigrants of South America, the U. S., and Canada.

The existence of a Polish army in England, and of an emigration, politically organized, constitutes a serious danger for the Russian autocracy. History teaches Stalin that the great stream of Polish emigration into England and France, after the revolution of 1831 converted itself into a center of revolutionary opposition to Czarism, and European reaction, became a creative source, of Polish culture and political resistance. Even though the present-day emigration possesses, neither such conditions nor their possibility, still Stalin strives to annihilate all possible Polish political opposition outside of Poland, confident that in time the GPU will conquer all opposition inside. Here is the reason for his continuous and constant pressure on the Labor Party government: in London to hand over the "anachronistic remains" of Polish independence.

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF LABOR
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Ass'n
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: Htonsides 6-5117
Vol. 11, No. 26 June 30, 1947
EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor
EDITORIAL BOARD
ALBERT GATES HENRY JUDD
IRVING HOWE
Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, Foreign). Re-entered
Second Class Matter, May 23, 1940, at the Post
Office at New York, N. Y. Under the Act of
March 3, 1874

WORKERS PARTY INFORMATION BLANK
I am interested in joining the Workers Party of the United States. Will you please send me all information as to your Program and how I can become a member.
Name.....
Address.....
City..... State.....

Marshall Plan for the Imperialist Domination Of Europe Underlines the Need for Socialism

By IRVING HOWE

The international scene this past week has been dominated by discussion of the Marshall plan, which proposes to aid the economic revival of Europe by a five billion dollar program to be applied to Europe as a whole. If, argue the proponents of this plan, it can be carried out, its advantages are obvious: economic aid is rendered not to one or another country where it serves merely to provide temporary relief, but rather to Europe as a whole so that a genuine continent-wide recovery becomes possible. That is the formal argument in behalf of the Marshall plan. Let us see what its actual purpose and significance is. These lines are written before a Russian reaction to the plan is available, and hence must be tentative estimates. That is why we wish at the moment only to offer a few notes:

1) *What is the relationship of the Marshall plan to the Truman Doctrine?*

This was the first question that arose in everyone's mind. Presumably the Truman Doctrine was supposed to lay the basis for U. S. foreign policy for some time to come; why then the addition of the Marshall plan?

It seems now that one reason for the Marshall plan is the skeptical popular response accorded to the Truman Doctrine in Europe and among sections of the American people. A program which stated bluntly that its purpose was to oppose the spread of "communism" (i.e., Rus-

sian domination) by buttressing the military establishments of such notoriously reactionary régimes as those in Greece and Turkey, was hardly calculated to arouse popular enthusiasm, even if it was surprisingly frank in its imperialist motivation. The Truman Doctrine established the essential goal of U. S. imperialism, but it was too unadorned with humanitarian rhetoric and flim-flam to stand alone.

On the other hand, the Marshall plan says nothing about aiding the military systems of the European nations under Anglo-American influence; it speaks merely of the economic recovery of Europe. But the obvious fact is that a nation which has improved its economic position is in an excellent position to strengthen its military position. Thus, if the Marshall plan, by establishing a modicum of order in Europe, succeeds in improving the economic position of, say, France and Greece, these and similar countries would then be able to create a military power as a counterweight to that of Stalinist Russia.

In this sense, the basic imperialist purpose of the Marshall plan and the Truman Doctrine is the same: to call a halt to Russian expansion, perhaps to push them back and to stabilize the positions of western capitalism.

2) *Military Support and Economic Aid.*

Yet there are some important differences between the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan; or more accurately, the latter represents a

modification in U. S. imperialist policy as enunciated by the former. The Truman Doctrine was frankly an emergency measure; it reflected the growing concern of U. S. imperialism with the expansion of its Russian rival. It was designed to reinforce weak positions. The Marshall plan is more ambitious; it is designed to attempt nothing less than a partial reorganization and recovery of European economy under U. S. domination. There is no contradiction between these two proposals, only a supplementation.

For it becomes increasingly clear that emergency relief measures are of no ultimate value. The crisis of Europe is due to its inability to resume production on an organized, continent-wide basis—which is due, in turn, to the inter-imperialist conflict of the major powers victorious in the Second World War and to the general disintegration of European capitalism. To take the first steps toward the most limited economic recovery, Europe needs large scale production of coal, of fertilizer, of steel, of war-shattered buildings; it needs a rationalization of industrial-agricultural relations; it needs a sensible reordering of its manpower. But all of these prerequisites to economic recovery depend in the very first instant on the political reorganization of Europe. How is German steel to be produced if the major powers cannot possibly agree on a rate of German production? How is the industrial heart of Europe, the Ruhr, to be revived if the great powers can agree on neither its pur-

pose nor disposition?

If considered in terms of its formal purpose—the basic reorganization of European economy along rational lines—the Marshall plan is preposterous at the very outset: for it proposes to maintain and invigorate the very social relationships of capitalist production and organization which are the cause of the European crisis. Yet it can serve certain other purposes.

3) *Where does Russia come in?*

Marshall specifically stated that Russia was to be included in the plan, if it wished. This is apparently a shift from the Truman Doctrine which was directed against Russia. Does it mean that the Marshall plan is still another attempt to work out a temporary truce with Russia in Europe by means of mutual concession—the halting of territorial expansion by Russia and perhaps its withdrawal from some areas, and the granting of economic credits by the U. S.? Or is the offer to Russia merely camouflage with which subsequently to create a "western bloc?"

At the moment, it seems likely that the Marshall plan allows for both alternatives. By its inclusion of Russia as among the possible recipients of U. S. aid, the plan clearly offers to the Stalinist regime still another proposal for some sort of temporary working arrangement in Europe.

This offer is not without attractiveness to the Russians. They need U. S. credits and need them badly—what they loot in Hungary, or a dozen Hungarians, doesn't compensate

for what they might get from Detroit if U. S. credits were available. And there is a report from Frederick Kuh, Chicago Sun correspondent, that the governments of the eastern puppet states—Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland—are urging Moscow to agree to a Foreign Minister's conference: these economically wobbly régimes are also entranced by the prospect of some U. S. dollars. But in turn the Russians would have to pay. As Edwin James, managing editor of the New York Times, writes in his authoritative comment on June 22:

"It stands to reason that if and when the United States puts up money to help the reforms suggested by Secretary Marshall it is not going to do so in a manner to help the Red-dominated régimes..."

So that if the Russians balk, or no agreement with them can be reached, the second possible perspective of the Marshall plan can be applied: the attempt to achieve a measure of economic recovery by organizing the western capitalist countries of Europe as an economic entity. In a word, the "western bloc."

This rather more subtle character of the Marshall plan, as contrasted with the Truman Doctrine, puts the Russians in something of a quandary, reflected in the careful treatment accorded the plan in the Stalinist *Daily Worker* which neither supports nor denounces it but merely adopts a skeptical attitude. Our guess is that the Russians will agree to attend a conference—at which all of the old stumbling blocks will again appear.

4) *Can the Plan Work?*

That depends on what one means by the question. If some transient agreement is reached with the Stalinist dictatorship, it is possible that some of the more blatant barriers to economic life—the division of Germany into four closed economic zones; the occupation of the east European countries; the deliberate restriction of German production; the imposition of impossible reparations on Germany—may be modified. That might ease the present absolutely impossible economic situation—but even if that unlikely event took place, it would only be a breathing spell after which all of the present and irreconcilable conflicts for the control of Europe would break out in even greater ferocity.

If the Marshall plan, however, develops into an economic basis for a western bloc, it will only sharpen the already severe conflict in Europe. It will then only hasten the conflict between Russian and U. S. imperialisms.

One thing, however, can be declared with certainty: the Marshall plan, or any other plan of its kind, cannot bring genuine security and freedom to Europe. It cannot destroy the stupid economic divisions, the national antagonisms and the artificial restriction of production which today leave Europe in prostration.

No matter what the subjective intentions of its author, the plan is objectively a means for the tightening of U. S. domination of at least western Europe. But it cannot succeed in establishing a genuinely planned and freely controlled European economic unit, because it is premised on the very fact which makes such a situation impossible: the continued existence of capitalist states on the continent.

The inadequacy of the Marshall plan in this respect only underlines the need for the rebuilding of Europe on a unified Socialist basis. Given a United States of Socialist Europe—a continent in which all resources were rationally planned, freely controlled by the masses of people; in which artificial national economic barriers were dissolved—the recovery of the continent could proceed speedily. Such a revolutionary reconstruction of Europe, and nothing else, can bring order and freedom and plenty from the present chaos.

Commission Doesn't Bring Promise of Peace to Palestine

By AL FINDELY

The UN Commission has arrived in Palestine and is touring the country, but it has not brought the promised temporary peace. Twenty thousand Jews still suffer in the concentration camps of Cyprus. The British military courts continue their oppressive "judicial" work. The terrorists of the Irgun and the Stern group continue their activities, their latest act being the kidnaping of two British policemen whom they were forced to free under the pressure of official Zionist leadership of the Haganah and of the British army.

The people of Palestine expect nothing from the UN Commission, have no confidence in it. All reports from both Jewish and Arab sources indicate this. The leaders of the Arab Higher Committee have decided to boycott all the activities and investigations of the Commission; it called a general strike on the day of its arrival.

While the Jewish masses have no confidence in the Commission, the bourgeois Zionist leaders have learned nothing. They just continue to hope, as though they learned nothing from the failure of any of the so-called imperialist friends of the Jews to do anything or say anything to relieve the suffering of 250,000 of their displaced fellowmen. Exactly the contrary has happened—all countries from Romania and Poland of the so-called "new democracies" in the Russian sphere, to France, England and Italy of the "old democracies" ruled by Social Democratic parties, have placed the greatest obstacles in the path of immigration of the Jews. After this experience they continue and intensify their attempts to woo and compromise with one or another of the imperialist powers.

While the Jewish masses have no confidence in the Commission, the bourgeois Zionist leaders have learned nothing. They just continue to hope, as though they learned nothing from the failure of any of the so-called imperialist friends of the Jews to do anything or say anything to relieve the suffering of 250,000 of their displaced fellowmen. Exactly the contrary has happened—all countries from Romania and Poland of the so-called "new democracies" in the Russian sphere, to France, England and Italy of the "old democracies" ruled by Social Democratic parties, have placed the greatest obstacles in the path of immigration of the Jews. After this experience they continue and intensify their attempts to woo and compromise with one or another of the imperialist powers.

COWARDLY ACT

The most glaring and cowardly act in this wailing of the imperialists, has been the suspension of "illegal" immigration into Palestine. The New York Times of June 12 reports: "Another placatory Haganah move was indicated tonight in reports that unauthorized Jewish immigration was being suspended during the next few weeks. Reports claiming the authority of Haganah's High Command said the British Government's representation to the French, Italian and Greek governments had caused difficulties in visualizing chartered ships and also that Zionist bodies did not want to embarrass the United Nations inquiry." (Emphasis mine—A. F.)

It is little wonder then that with the Zionist leaders following a pro-imperialist policy, and the labor officials tail-ending them, that the semi-fascist Irgun and Stern group assume a so-called "revolutionary" leadership of the youth in the struggle against British imperialism. The Stern group or FFI (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel), has grown from 400 to 2,000 in the past year, and the Irgun has grown from 5,000 to 9,000 in the same period. S. Israeli, of the Jewish Forward, from whom these figures are taken, also reports that the "palmany," the active combat units of the Haganah, have circulated a document denouncing the present policy of capitulation. The Jewish Morning Journal reports another group within the Haganah, calling itself "No Ehoonal Hamerec" (meaning Believers in Resistance), this week issued a statement decrying reliance on the UN Commission, and pointing out that only a real resistance struggle can influence the situation. This group at the same time, correctly attacked the Irgun and Stern groups for their reactionary politics.

On March 31, 1947, LABOR ACTION warned against the victory of the elements in the Haganah who wanted to narrow the concept of resistance to the smuggling of immigrants: "Victory of such a narrow concept of resistance will destroy any possibility that the Haganah and the working class forces that it represents, will be able to lead the struggle against the British." Unfortunately, this seems to have happened, with the result that the Irgun and the Stern groups are growing. The complete cessation of resistance, even in the limited form of illegal immigration, can lead only to a greater loss of leadership by the Haganah. It is the duty of the labor movement, the Hashomer Hatzair and especially the Mafpai, to reconsider their do-nothing policy, and to launch a "real mass resistance on a scale that will insure the anti-imperialist leadership to the only socially progressive class—the workers"—where it belongs.

IMPERIALIST JOCKEYING

The imperialist jockeying for position continues. The Arab Higher Committee of Palestine demands a puppet state of independence as similar to the status England gave to Transjordan. They threaten war if they do not obtain it. Not war against the British—the oppressors of the country, but war against the Jews in the style of 1929 and 1936. The reactionary feudal leaders of the Arab movement are willing to make many concessions to British

imperialism, but none to the Jewish workers and to Jewish immigration.

The bourgeois leaders of Zionism too, are willing to make concessions to imperialism, but none to further Arab-Jewish unity. The Palestinian Jewish National Council, at the insistence of the Aliyah Chadoshah Party and the Hashomer Hatzair, will put forward as its representative, Dr. Weitzman, who advocates a pro-British policy and supports partition. The Hashomer Hatzair is thus placing itself in the most ridiculous position of being opposed to partition and in favor of pro-Russian orientation, while at the same time vigorously supporting Dr. Weitzman, strongest advocate of partition and a pro-British policy.

Moishe Shertok of the Jewish Agency, in his testimony before the UN Commission, denied any possibility of Jewish-Arab cooperation in an independent Palestine. Ben-Gurion, head of the Jewish Agency, in a speech before the Jewish National Council, attacked the bi-national solution for Palestine and opposed a UN trusteeship. He correctly pointed out that a UN trusteeship would only result in one or another of the powers playing the Jews and Arabs against each other. He personally advocated a Jewish State in those sections of Palestine where the Jews have the majority and in the Negev (the sparsely populated semi-desert Southern Palestine). For the rest of Palestine he advocated a continuation of the British Mandate.

His reason for favoring partition was that the U. S. Government is unofficially committed to partition, as are elements in the British cabinet, and that Gromyko in his UN speech was also in favor of partition. Dr. Wise of the U. S. went so far as to predict the certain establishment of a Jewish state in 1947.

STALINIST INTRIGUE

This hope in aid of the Big Three to establish an independent partitioned Jewish Palestine is a very slim one. The United States government is already shifting its position. An inspired report in the New York Times says the United States government has asked the Jewish Agency to clarify its demands, as if these were not well known. Major George Fielding Elliot in an article in the New York Post of Friday, June 13, said that the War Department was convinced that Palestine was too small a country to be able to be properly defended if further divided or partitioned.

Russian diplomats in the Near East are engaged in a diplomatic campaign to convince the Arab leaders that Russia is on their side despite Gromyko's speech. The Kremlin rulers are now playing a double game attempting to win the sympathy of both Jews and Arabs. If therefore allows its stooges, the Arab and Jewish Communist parties of Palestine, to have two distinct and mutually contradictory policies. The Arab Stalinists have negotiated an agreement with the Maffi's Arab Higher Committee and have joined the boycott against the UN Investigating Committee.

The Arabian Stalinists continue their opposition to Jewish immigration. They claim that the Russian diplomacy still supports all the anti-Zionist positions. In confirmation they point to the support that the Arabian delegation at the world trade union conference in Prague has received from the Russian representatives.

JOINT STRUGGLE POSSIBLE

That there are concrete and practical possibilities of joint Jewish-Arab struggle in Palestine at present, is shown by the recent strike of 40,000 Jewish and Arab workers against British Army Ordnance. Henry Nassar, leader of the Palestine-Arabian League, speaking at the World Federation of Trade Unions in Prague, pointed to the similar problems confronting the Jewish and Arab workers in Palestine. He also declared in favor of Jewish immigration, and declared the talk about a "minority" and "majority" in Palestine.

This is sufficient evidence to prove that Jewish-Arab unity is not a utopia, visible only to the Workers Party, but can become a dominant factor in Palestinian politics. All that is needed is a correct class policy on the part of both Jewish and Arab trade unions.

Notice to Readers of

The New International

The July issue of the magazine is now on sale. Subscribers' copies are now in the mail.

Due to technical and financial difficulties we are skipping the May and June issues of the New International this year.

With your support we hope to have the magazine come out on time each month.

Single copies, 25c Six Issues—\$1.25
Twelve Issues—\$2.00

Anti-Stalinist Forces Win at Milwaukee

AVC Convention Registers Progress

By S. BERG

MILWAUKEE, June 24—The American Veterans Committee's second convention, held at Milwaukee, ended today after four days of hectic caucusing and discussion. In some fields distinct progress was recorded by the convention, in others setbacks.

As has been pointed out in previous articles in LABOR ACTION, AVC suffers from two chief handicaps—namely, the large foothold of the Stalinists in many area and state organizations, and the predominantly middle class composition of the membership. The convention demonstrated that the first of these handicaps is beginning to be overcome. The administration slate, calling itself the "Independent Progressives," made a clean sweep of leading offices, electing national chairman and vice-chairman, seven out of eight Regional Vice-Chairmen, and every National Planning Committee member-at-large. This compares very favorably with last year's elections, in which the CP-controlled Borden caucus and its allies elected no less than one-third of the NPC, including a number of the Regional Vice-Chairmen.

The predictions made in the convention issue of LABOR ACTION as to CP strategy were fully borne out. We pointed out that the growing unpopularity of the CP would force them to fall back on a presumably independent center slate that would end up making a coalition with them. This was exactly what took place. The relatively obscure figures that had been organizing a center slate up to the eve of the convention gave way to no less a figure than Michael Straight, publisher of the New Republic, who proceeded to set up the "Build AVC Caucus." This caucus was promptly joined by those leading AVCers who were not completely identified with the Borden caucus but had worked with it—Mendel Lieberman of the NPC, George Ebey, California State Chairman, and Franklin Williams, N. Y. Metropolitan Area Chairman.

STRENGTH OF CAUCUSES

Thus, far from representing a truly independent group, it almost from the beginning openly stood for cooperation with the Borden caucus. Nevertheless many honest independent militants continued to support it hopefully, full of naive illusions as to its role. Their hopes were dashed to the ground on the last day of the convention, when the slates were completed. The Straight slate included no less than seven members of the CP-Borden caucus on its NPC ticket! In its leaflet advertising the ticket, this group came out in favor

of an all-inclusive leadership—that is, one including the totalitarian CP. The result was catastrophic. Despite all the enthusiasm that its appearance at first created, the vote of the Straight group for those of its candidates not endorsed by the CP turned out to be only one-seventh of the convention. The respective strengths of the three caucuses emerged in the ratio of four for the Independent Progressives, two for the Borden caucus, one for the Straight caucus.

In its pre-election maneuvers, the Straight caucus sunk so low as to offer the nomination for AVC chairman to Elliott Roosevelt! Despite the various unwholesome phases of his career (working for Hearst at one time, more recently stooging for Russian foreign policy), they proposed to give him the leadership of AVC to play around with.

ADVANCES IN PLATFORM

The platform adopted by the convention demonstrated great advances on the whole in the fields of domestic and veterans affairs. Despite the reaffirmation of AVC's anti-bonus stand, a forward step was taken in the form of the demand for immediate redemption of terminal leave bonds, despite the fact that the self same hoary inflation argument used against the bonus, has in the past been used against the proposal to cash these bonds. Likewise, the delegates showed no hesitation in adopting a far more comprehensive series of demands on veterans affairs than the organization had previously had.

Under the heading of Domestic Affairs, AVC came out for the first time in favor of large scale government subsidized housing, scheduled a mass march and conference on housing in Washington to coincide with the 1948 convening of Congress, and came out for organization of mass action against evictions, together with tenants leagues and unions. The labor section of the platform, very weak in the National Committee's draft, was greatly strengthened. The only anti-labor plank in the draft,

which favored legislation banning jurisdictional disputes, was voted down in the convention's domestic affairs sub-committee (the "sub-committee" consisted of over 200 delegates). At this writing the results of voting by the plenary session on this question are not available, but they probably will back the sub-committee's recommendation.

The most noteworthy fact about both veterans and domestic affairs platforms is the complete independence with which the delegates went about overhauling the draft submitted to them. The planks finally adopted bear very little resemblance to the draft, and are in sum total a thousand times more progressive.

At this writing the voting on universal military training is not available, though sentiment seems to be against it, since the overwhelming majority of the domestic affairs sub-committee opposed it. The newly elected chairman, Paterson, and vice-chairman, Bolling, are both on record as opposed to conscription.

The least productive sub-committee session was that on international affairs. Here the advocates of "World Government" fought it out with the Stalinists, who proposed emphasis on "Big Three Unity." Even under this section of the platform, however, there was some improvement. The section on occupation policy in the draft, which came out in effect for the Morgenthau plan for Germany, was dropped, and an entirely new section adopted, very vague in tone but at least not out-and-out chauvinist like the previous one. In addition, over the opposition of the Stalinists, the sections opposing fascism were supplemented by a plank opposing "totalitarianism of both the right and left."

LABOR GROUP EMERGES

With the beginning of Stalinist decline, the major problem before AVCers interested in making their organization a mass fighting veterans organization becomes that of orienting it toward the labor movement, not in terms of mere sym-

phony, but in terms of all its day to day activity.

This convention saw the birth of a small group interested in pushing such an orientation. The "Labor Veterans Group," as it called itself, centered its convention activities around a three-point program: (1) For the bonus, (2) For an independent labor party, and (3) For mass action against evictions. The Stalinists, for the sake of their relations with their liberal allies, forsook the bonus fight in favor of an investigation of the bonus question. The Labor Veterans Group was left alone in pushing the bonus at the Veterans Affairs Sub-Committee, yet missed by only a few votes the 20 per cent minority needed in the sub-committee in order to get a minority report on the convention floor.

Members of this same group were responsible for proposing in the respective sub-committees the anti-eviction and cash payment of terminal leave planks whose adoption was reported above. Likewise this group was active in helping to clean the Stalinists out of office, putting out leaflets which endorsed the Independent Progressive slate, but at the same time criticized sharply the inadequacies of the present AVC program and leadership.

Certainly the crisis in AVC is by no means resolved. Claiming 100,000 members, AVC could only report a voting strength of 65,000 on the part of the chapters actually represented at the convention. Further, it is well known that many of these chapters had substantial voting strength only because the bulk of the memberships paid in in the early days of AVC's initial growth had not yet expired. The real membership of AVC will only be measurable when the time for renewals has passed, and will probably reveal a figure of no more than 60,000. Only the barest beginning has been made in answering the need of the veteran for a fighting organization. The coming year will determine whether AVC is capable of reorienting itself in the manner needed to become that organization.

Bait Labor Trap With Truman Veto - -

(Continued from page 1)

For instance, the Republicans are hoping that the ranks of labor will be split despite the bill. This plodding outfit believes that there are hordes of workers who will "vote Republican." By the same token, the Democrats believe that they will receive appreciable support from the middle class. The fact is that the capitalist ruling class is not particularly concerned with the bureaucratic aspirations of either the Republicans or Democrats. The ruling class knows that both parties are the servants and the political deputies of capitalism and the big capitalist rulers.

HOW CONTROL LABOR?

That is enough for this ruling class. They know that both parties serve the capitalist masters: for a price. Therefore the ruling class is not vitally concerned with the question of which party wins the elections. Their Taft can force through a Taft-Hartley Bill and their Truman can veto the bill. Their Republican Party can incur the wrath of labor and win the friendship of the

middle class while their Democratic Party can incur the wrath of the middle class and win the friendship of labor. In either case the capitalist ruling class is the victor.

This is the trap for labor that lies hid in the underbrush of capitalist politics. We say again that this trap is baited with the Truman veto. To put it bluntly we mean by this that should labor rally to the Democratic Party again because of the Truman veto, the capitalist ruling class will profit and not the working class.

When we say all of these things we are not saying that there is no difference between Truman and Taft. There is, but this is not the relevant way to pose the question. For one thing Taft is finished. He will not get the Republican nomination next year. If by some extraordinary piece of skulduggery the Republicans nominate him, the Republicans will certainly be defeated. Truman will be nominated by the Democrats.

What does all this mean? Nothing of any fundamental significance to labor. Taft thinks the bill is alright and Truman thinks it is "shocking."

But the bill is the law. Also, it must be remembered that Truman, like Roosevelt, is capable of acting in an extremely harsh manner against labor when he believes it to be necessary! Truman and Roosevelt, the Democrats, and Hoover, the Republican—all used or proposed to use the army against labor, all acted as strikebreakers! Need we remind anyone of Truman's action in the mine or railroad strikes?

This means that, while Truman and Taft do not see eye to eye on how to "control" labor, they both seek to establish control. There is a distinction between them based on the fact that they represent a divergence of opinion within the capitalist ruling class on this question. Taft represents the most reactionary, the "let them eat cake" section of the ruling class, while Truman represents the faded remnants of New Deal capitalism and a sort of backwoods democratic emotionalism.

The point we are stressing is that the working class cannot afford to rely on these superficial distinctions. Neither Truman nor Taft is a friend of labor. The same can be said about Morse and Hartley, Wagner and

Bound Volumes of Labor Action and New International for 1945 Are Still Available

Price: LABOR ACTION, \$2.00 NEW INTERNATIONAL, \$3.00

1946 Bound Volumes have been delayed in binding. As soon as they are ready, it will be announced in Labor Action