

## Unions Join in 'Anti-Red' Front with Labor-Busters and Hate Groups—

### Yank the CIO and AFL Out of the Snake Pit!

The CIO and AFL have a first-rate scandal on their hands. There is no indication, at time of writing, that they are aware of it. It is difficult for us to imagine, however, that as soon as the facts become generally known there will not be a tremendous outcry, not only from the ranks but from hundreds of secondary and third-string leaders.

The CIO and the AFL have joined in one of those "anti-red crusades" with as choice an assemblage of labor-baiters, pro-fascists, anti-Semites, "white supremacy" advocates, and other elements more politely known as "extreme rightists" as has been gathered under one roof in this country in a long time.

This is not exaggerated in the slightest. The facts speak for themselves. Over the last weekend, January 28-29, at the Hotel Astor in New York City, there took place the "All-American Conference to Combat Communism." Initiated, sponsored and organized by the American Legion, a large number of national organizations were selected for invitation to participate. Speeches were made by a select battery of orators. Resolutions were passed. In this conference the CIO and AFL officially participated with both feet.

The New York Times on January 27 published a list of 58 organizations participating. Outside of the trade-unions and a handful to be mentioned later, here are the MORE RESPECTABLE ones first: The National Association of Manufacturers, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, Daughters of the American Revolution, American Medical Association, Advertising Council, and several other business groups.

Another section consists of fraternal orders, like the Kiwanis, etc. The Amvets, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and religious veterans' groups are on the list along with the Legion, but not the American Veterans Committee.

### "Extremely Liberal" Groups Rejected

Along with these, several of them bitterly denounced as anti-labor by the CIO and AFL, are some less respectable rightist groups. One is Merwin K. Hart's National Economic Council. Hart is without doubt today the most prominent pro-fascist in the country—pro-Nazi, pro-Franco, anti-Semite, etc.

Another is the Freedoms Foundation, a transmission belt of the same forces that are behind the National Economic Council. A third that is immediately spotted is Spiritual Mobilization, an anti-Semitic, white-supremacy outfit. A fourth is the American War Mothers, associated with the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, a united front of many proto-fascist groups.

In the light of this rollcall, it is enlightening to read that the American Legion announced that "six organizations, not solicited by the Legion, were denied the privilege of sending delegates because they were 'extremely liberal or occasionally followed the Communist Party line.'" They were not named. Were they organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the AVC, Americans for Democratic Action, etc.? No Negro organizations were invited. As an afterthought, it was later announced that the NAACP was invited to join the continuations committee of the conference, but it is reported that it will refuse.

### CIO Took Active Part

One of the chief speakers at the conference was Senator Karl Mundt, sponsor of the notorious Mundt-Nixon bill, denounced as anti-democratic by the trade unions. His California counterpart, Jack Tenney of the Tenney ("Little Dies Commission") witchhunt group of the state legislature, was another. George Sokolsky, a Hearst pen prostitute, in his speech attacked the New Deal which "helped advance Communism"—and no one at the conference defended EVEN the New Deal against him. Mundt in his speech put in a plug for the Mundt-Ferguson witchhunt bill, which was termed unconstitutional even by Tom Clark as attorney general.

A weird assemblage to include, besides the CIO and AFL, also the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith, a couple of other Jewish organizations and a few groups which are merely conservative instead of being reactionary!

In this assemblage the chairman of the resolutions committee was a CIO man, Harry Read, who helped produce a resolution which by all accounts could well have been manufactured at an NAM shindig!

In this assemblage, James Carey, the CIO speaker, gave a talk. Did the New York Journal American (Hearst) quote him correctly and in context when it reported him as saying: "We would even join Fascists in a war to defeat the Communists"? Given the odor of the whole affair, we can no more dismiss this offhand than accept it on the word of the Hearst press. What will the CIO have to say about the business?

### A Field Day for the Stalinists

Do the CIO and AFL leaders think they can ransom themselves off from being attacked as "red" by the reactionaries through joining with the latter in their unholy front?

Do they think they can fight Stalinism through this tainted setup? The Stalinists are already having a field day with the scandal—this time, with some truthful facts on their side. Is there anything they have which can be more useful in convincing workers that anybody who fights the Communist Party must be a reactionary, an ally of the fascists, etc., as they automatically charge?

It is not so much that we are amazed at the willingness of the labor bureaucracy to link hands with the "All-American" gang. Their like have done treacherous and reactionary things like that before—but usually with greater reason even from their own shortsighted viewpoint. The present action of the CIO and AFL is not only anti-democratic and an aid and comfort to the totalitarianists of the right—it is also downright stupid.

But there is no reason for CIO and AFL men merely to hang their heads in shame. They do not want to be in the same organization with Merwin K. Hart. They have to tell their leaders so, protest, and yank the trade unions out of the snake pit they have fallen in.

### Shachtman to Debate Prof. Hayek On Socialism in Course of Tour

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, has started a speaking tour of several cities in the Midwest and the Pacific Coast, speaking on the subjects "New Trends in the Labor Movement" and "Tito and the Split in the Stalinist International."

The first stop on his tour is Chicago, where he will deliver two public lectures on the above subjects. Highlighting his stay in that city is his debate with Professor F. A. Hayek, internationally known bourgeois economist and noted opponent of socialism. The debate will discuss the merits of capitalism and socialism. It will be held on February 3, at the University of Chicago.

From Chicago, Shachtman will make a stopover at St. Louis and then proceed to Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle in that order. Following his return to New York, Shachtman will prepare for a speaking tour of other Midwest cities and the east coast. Readers should watch LABOR ACTION for announcements of these meetings.

### New NMU Group to Fight Curran And CP; Reign of Terror Goes On

By N. R. GADEN

NEW YORK, Feb. 1.—The Curran machine in the National Maritime Union is continuing its hatchet job against all opposition to it in the union. While "book-snatching" in the Port of New York seems to have stopped, the purge continues.

Charges are being preferred against various members for the crime of opposition. The trial committees elected at membership meetings are run on a slate that is distributed to the men as they enter the meeting. Hand-picked Curran supporters are the counters when the votes take place. The overwhelming majority of the members do not vote at all.

At the last meeting at St. Nicholas Arena, with less than 600 members voting, the count was announced as something like 1260 to 68 in favor of the Curran machine. No secret ballot is allowed and at a recent meeting a request for double counters by a member resulted in his being beaten right at the mike by a Curran goon squad. It is no wonder that the membership sits on its hands.

It is in this charged atmosphere that the opposition tendencies to Curran are attempting to function. The Independent Caucus has finally yielded to the incessant "unity" chant of

the Stalinists (Voice of the Membership Group). Together they are calling a "conference of all anti-Curran seamen" for the purpose of getting up a slate in the coming spring elections of the NMU.

By doing this, the Independent Caucus has, in our opinion, dug its own grave. From its very inception, the Independent Caucus was a significant force ONLY because it claimed to be independent of both the Curran machine and the Communist Party. This new tack taken by the Independent Caucus has in all likelihood destroyed the possibility of its playing any sort of a significant role in the fight against the Curran machine.

In the last few weeks a group of rank and filers, many of whom were active in the Independent Caucus and all of whom were active in the fight against the Communist Party machine two years ago, have formed a group called the Committee for Democratic Unionism. They have issued a statement, part of which is printed on page 2.

To judge them by their statement, their formation can be of great importance to the NMU. It is precisely around such a program that the fight for a democratic and militant union can shape up.

### Tito Clamps Tighter Police Control On Labor; Fake Reform Heralded

By HAL DRAPER

As could have been anticipated (and was anticipated in LABOR ACTION), the Tito regime in Yugoslavia has started to throw up a smoke-screen of "democratization" measures, designed to convince Western public opinion that at least first steps toward an easing of the totalitarian system are being taken. At the same time, ironically enough, it has been forced to announce new measures chaining the working class more tightly than before.

The main new decree publicized as tending toward greater democracy has been the "reform" of the electoral system. The new feature is the right of an independent candidate to stand for the Titoist parliament if he gets the signatures of 100 voters in his constituency.

This is the sum of what was immediately hailed in some quarters as the "abolition of the single-list system," "symptomatic of the recent trend toward decentralization of authority," "a radical departure," etc. (The quotations are from the N. Y. Times correspondent in Belgrade, M. S. Handler, whose dispatches are arousing comments about "Tito's Walter Duranty.")

To give Handler his due, however, his report included the statement that "It is, of course, quite obvious that the next parliament to be elected will be almost unanimously for the regime because enemies cannot be tolerated." He adds: "Criticism should be heard more frequently, however, provided it is constructive." That is, as in all the Stalinist countries, criticism is not only tolerated but demanded (as in Russia) provided it is on matters of detail which in no way impugn the basis of the dictatorship.

In any case, it is obvious that the right to run for parliament on the basis of 100 signatures is a right that can be exercised, in Tito's police state, only by a candidate who is perfectly acceptable to the dictatorship. The electoral change makes not an iota of difference as long as Rankovic's secret police operate.

In fact, one of the reasons for the reform given by Foreign Minister Kardelj is that all organized opposition to the regime has disappeared—that is, been wiped out by state terror. There are no opponents of Stalinism above ground even to dream of "taking advantage" of the electoral reform.

### FOR LABOR-CHAINS

This step by Tito is not unique in Eastern Europe in one respect. Its only possible effect is an effort by the electoral stage-managers to produce a few "non-party" candidates for the coming election. Similarly, before the recent election in Bulgaria, the official Stalinist press raised a howl of "self-criticism" about the necessity of putting more "non-party" candidates on the lists. Tito's version of this gambit is, however, specifically designed to make it possible for foreign correspondents to write home about "the abolition of the single-list system."

Five days after the "democratic reform," another ukase was announced which has more teeth in it. This was a drastic decree freezing workers to their jobs, withdrawing food ration

cards from workers leaving their jobs without authorization, and compelling workers to reimburse any loss in production resulting from "unjustifiable" absenteeism.

The system of "voluntary labor brigades" which for some years has been hailed by starry-eyed visitors to Yugoslavia as evidencing the enthusiasm of the masses for the Titoist regime, is declared a failure. Labor turnover, it is revealed, has been more than 80 per cent! Of the "voluntary brigades," Handler reports that "government planners found that a large part of the trained labor force turned in little production because of the failure of authorities to keep the manpower on the job." This will now be remedied with the help of Rankovic.

Behind this measure, whose reality contrasts so strikingly with the fake "democratization" announcements poured out on the propaganda conveyor belt, lies the frenetic drive of the Tito regime toward extreme goals in quick industrialization. This is made quite clear in Handler's dispatches.

### CIO Lifts Calif. Council Charter In Bureaucratic Move Against CP

By SCOTT BYER

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 27.—Last Wednesday CIO President Philip Murray lifted the charter of the California State CIO Council, demanded its funds and properly, and called for the formation of a new state council. This was the first time that such action has been taken against a state organization in the Murray fight against the Stalinists.

The steps leading up to the formal ousting of the state council started last December 19 when a committee of CIO unions pressed charges against the Stalinist-controlled council. Murray then appointed a three-man committee headed by Dick Leonard, former vice-president of the United Auto Workers and now national representative for the CIO, to hold a hearing on these charges. (This is the second time that Murray has used a former darling of the Stalinists to do the hatchet work on them. The first time occurred in 1948 when R. J. Thomas was sent here to strip Harry Bridges of some of his power.)

The charges against the Stalinists differ little from those brought against them in every other area and level where this fight between the CIO leadership and the Stalinists is taking place: "They opposed official CIO policy and they used the unions they control to put across their brand of politics." These same charges are soon to be brought against all the city and county councils where the Stalinists have control, three of which are in the Bay area here.

When this job is done the struggle between these two forces will enter a new stage, and at the same time another bureaucracy will enter the fight. The Murrayites have their raiding machine in order, the Stalinists are closing their ranks to defend themselves from these raids, and the AFL is rumored to be waiting only until the split in the CIO is complete be-

## 'Never Such Hypocrisy': Both Parties Vie to Shelve FEPC Pledges

**INSIDE—**  
• Professor Robert Lynd's great speech on Labor and Democracy to the UAW, just published as a pamphlet—page 4.  
• News from Ukrainian anti-Stalinist underground—on page 3.  
• The Women's Equal Rights Amendment—page 3.  
• Behind the coalminers' revolt against John L. Lewis—page 2.  
• The Student Conference on Democracy in Education—page 4.

**NEXT WEEK—**  
• An article from Japan on the situation in the Communist Party of that country and its recent rift with the Cominform.  
• The concluding part of Professor Lynd's speech.

"Never... such hypocrisy, doubledealing and political maneuvering."

That's F. D. Roosevelt Jr. speaking of the Republican Party. "Playing cat and mouse... resorted to every parliamentary trick to avoid the issue... hesitant, apologetic and ineffective." That's Governor Driscoll of New Jersey and Rep. Lodge of Connecticut speaking of the Democratic Party.

Both statements refer to the tragic comedy performed in the halls of Congress last week on the issue of the Fair Employment Practice bill before the House.

And to both statements we say Amen.

Rarely has there been such a public exhibition of hypocrisy, sham and cynical deception as was acted out by the leaderships of the two major parties on a question of elementary justice to the Negro tenth of the nation, with respect to a measure which a majority of both parties has pledged itself to support, to end racial and religious discrimination by employers.

The FEPC bill which is the center of this performance would set up a federal commission to prosecute, adjudge and ask the courts to punish any employer of over 50 people who denies employment to an individual because of race, color, religion, national origin, etc.

During the past weeks the leaderships of both parties have tossed the bill back and forth like a sizzling ingot, demonstrating that to them the plight of the Negro people means nothing in comparison with the need of vote-hording. The fracas has revolved around confusing technicalities of parliamentary trickery but the upshot leaves little doubt of what has happened.

Parliamentary center of the confusion is the fact that the bill is now bottled up in the Rules Committee of the House. Few observers doubt that it would be passed if ever allowed to come to the floor for a straight vote. The bipartisan problem seems to be how to prevent this from occurring. As long as no vote is posed, the Democrats and Republicans who have pledged their support, to corral votes, can still claim that their hearts are still in the right place.

### THE HAND WITH THE DAGGER

Two weeks ago, the Fair Deal claimed a "surprising victory" when a measure was defeated which would have strengthened the hand of the Rules Committee in strangling legislation on its own say-so. Its sponsor, Representative Cox of Georgia, "agreed to a vote on his resolution... on a date, selected by the administration leaders in the House, that foreshadowed the defeat of his resolution," writes Arthur Krock, head of the N. Y. Times Washington bureau.

In his column of January 26 (which we shall refer to again) Krock asks "Why?" and in his own restrained and dignified way hints at the answer. It amounts to this: A deal with the Fair Deal forces who are supposed to be fighting tooth and nail for the passage of FEPC: Truman gets the credit for the defeat of the resolution, and the present procedure is maintained. But the present procedure gives the Speaker of the House the power to release the bill from the clutches of the Rules Committee. The Speaker is Democratic leader Sam Rayburn of Texas, an administration stalwart.

(Continued on page 2)

### UAW Strikes Chrysler For Pension Demands

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Jan. 25.—Refusal of the Chrysler Corporation to grant a minimum package of 10 cents per hour to the United Auto Workers (UAW) has brought a shutdown of all its plants by the union, representing 79,000 production workers.

The events which led to the latest turn in the situation are these:

As the strike deadline of January 25 neared—following six months of protracted and fruitless company stalling and negotiations—the UAW brought every possible pressure on the corporation to make a peaceful settlement.

Last Thursday UAW President Walter P. Reuther entered negotia-

tions personally and did a real job of presenting the union's case for a pension and medical health program financed by the company at a cost of about 11 cents per hour to the corporation.

Chrysler made no serious effort to answer Reuther, but simply stuck to the phony offer it had made previously. The company had the nerve to present a pension program whose total cost would be less than 3 cents per hour, with so many qualifying clauses (including exclusive company management) that no one in the union took it seriously.

As a matter of fact, this Chrysler offer, which was advertised in the Detroit papers, was so clearly unacceptable that for the first time some of the union ranks and the men in the shops began to see that perhaps a strike might be inevitable. Chrysler's insistence on having 1,800 credit hours per year for pension eligibility was a case in point. One major Chrysler department worked only a total of 1807 hours in 1949. If a man was sick one day, or absent for any other reason, he would be denied a year's credit under Chrysler's pension program.

for they make their first raids. For some time the AFL has coveted the large jurisdiction of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, warehousemen's section, controlled by Harry Bridges.

### NO REASON TO REJOICE

Simultaneously with the announcement of the ouster came the announcement by the ILWU and the Fishermen's Union (IFAWU) that they are going to file Taft-Hartley affidavits so that they can use the facilities of the NLRB. The Fishermen are now voting on whether or not to merge with the ILWU; this step may become the pattern for all the smaller Stalinist unions here, to which the ILWU is parent.

There is no reason for anti-CP militants to rejoice at these expulsions. The Stalinists will not be defeated by the anti-democratic expulsion methods of the Murrayites. In many sections of the labor movement they hold may well be prolonged, for they are able to cover their own crimes by pointing (truthfully) to the fact that Murray and the CIO leadership are trying to turn the CIO into an organization controlled as much as possible from the top, one in which the rank and file's right to elect their own officers and make their own policies is being hamstrung.

This is in addition to the fact that the conditions in several of the Stalinist-controlled unions here are among the best in their respective industries; and all of it makes possible a situation where many workers will stand by the Stalinists in the jurisdictional disputes that may soon come and may be the bloodiest that this area has been in some time. The West Coast situation is a good place to learn that an effective fight against Stalinist union control also entails a fight against the bureaucratic methods of Murray.

### Chicago Unionists Call for Rally To Stop Stewart-Warner Purge

CHICAGO, Jan. 29.—The Chicago branch of the American Civil Liberties Union this week hit twice at "loyalty oaths in private work."

ACLU Staff Counsel Herbert M. Levy, in a press release on January 25, urged that the regulations of the Industrial Employment Review Board be reviewed in order to prevent arbitrary dismissals of alleged "subversive" elements. Levy suggested that the Department of Defense make a public announcement to the effect that present regulations are not intended to give contractors power to discharge employees considered "bad security risks" and that only when contracts are actually denied could employers move against employees.

This position is not strong and unequivocal, since it leaves the door open to "purge firing" of workers under modified conditions, but it is at least an attempt to grapple with the problem, something that many liberals and civil-rights advocates are running away from.

The other action of the Chicago ACLU was to convene a representative group of non-Stalinist unions to fight the case of the five Stewart-Warner employees fired recently (see LABOR ACTION for January 16) as "bad security risks."

A meeting was held in which Mike Mann, CIO regional director, and representatives of the United Auto Workers, International Union of Elec-

trical Workers (IUE-CIO), Oil Workers and Building Service Workers (AFL) were represented. A resolution was drafted opposing the action of the company and calling for a mass meeting in the near future. The group in attendance at this meeting were the trade unionists who led the fight against the notorious witchhunting Broyles Bill passed by the last Illinois legislature.

The most dangerous statement on the policy regarding "subversives" has come from William W. Miller, industrial relations chief of the Stewart-Warner Company, when he said, as quoted in the January 21 issue of Business Week, that "the purpose of our policy is to give us two-sided protection: (1) to prevent the destruction of our business system and Stewart-Warner as part of it; (2) to safeguard us from the military angle."

Point 1 should be underlined. It would indicate that, in the opinion of the Stewart-Warner Corporation, workers who oppose "our business system"—that is, capitalism—have no right to earn a living. The would-be dictators of the corporations are not behindhand in pushing forward the meaning of the government-sponsored witchhunt.

The group of trade unionists in Chicago who are mobilizing to fight the vicious precedent being set by Stewart-Warner have an important job to do in rallying every section of labor to stop the trend cold.

# Miners' Revolt Aimed at Coal Moguls

## Rank-and-File Break with Lewis in Continuing Strike Is Not a Staged "Clever Maneuver"

By GERALD McDERMOTT  
UNIONTOWN, PA., Jan. 29—Ninety thousand soft-coal miners in the Southern Pennsylvania and Northern West Virginia fields are in their third week of a no-day-a-week strike.

The rank-and-file revolt is the first mass break with John L. Lewis in many years. Primarily, however, the hungry and near desperate diggers in the heart of the Appalachian fields are striking at the giants among the operators—U. S. Steel's captive mines and the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Company—the huge coal combine of the Mellons, Hannas and Rockefeller.

The background is one of actual hunger. Credit has been cut off at the company stores; the national headquarters of the United Mine Workers is offering no financial assistance. Relief measures in the northern West Virginia fields tell the story—the AFL bakers union, in collaboration with local bakeries, is distributing free bread among the coal camps; one loaf to families of six, two loaves for larger families—and this only occasionally.

The strike is not a "clever maneuver," prearranged by Lewis and sent down the famous UMW grapevine, although it started that way. The daily press has put forward this idea on the theory that Lewis is trying to avoid responsibility for a strike in the face of a Taft-Hartley injunction. Such is not the case.

Lewis lieutenants have been and are working frantically throughout the fields to win a return to the three-day week, which is Lewis' basic strategy. They have not only been unsuccessful, they have even been booed and threatened at wildcat area meetings. Persuasion has proved useless and sterner organizational measures by Lewis are out of the question—more than 50 locals, including many of the UMW's largest, are involved.

Another theory put forward in the capitalist press is that the revolt is directed primarily against Lewis. The labor-haters would like the public to believe that the miners are trying to force Lewis to end the long contract fight and come to terms.

While the rank and file undoubtedly would like to see an end to the long struggle, it is the big operators, and not Lewis, that they are trying to force to terms. The sudden offer by George Love, head of Pittsburgh Consolidation, to resume negotiations seems to indicate that the rebels are having their effect. At any rate, Love's mines are shut tight.

The strategy of Lewis has been gradually to reduce the supply of coal above ground through the three-day week until a full-scale national strike could be effective. The limited production gradually cuts down coal supplies while permitting the miners at least meager subsistence. In many ways, it has been a sound strategy—the full-scale strike last fall was doomed in advance because of the huge coal stockpiles. The operators knew it and were ready to starve the miners out.

Lewis, however, with his usual disdain for the ranks, did not explain the strategy to the men. He did not take his program to the ranks, explain it to them, or try to win their support for it. He has, instead, been probing the ranks of the operators in the hope of breaking their new solid

front. So far, he has been unsuccessful in any important sense.

Three weeks ago, in an apparent attempt to harass the leading operators, word came down the grapevine to strike U. S. Steel and Pitt Consol mines. Two days later, word went out through Lewis' now famous "suggestion" that the miners return. Apparently Lewis had planned a demonstration of militancy to impress the big operators.

### HELP NEEDED

The demonstration was more than he wanted. From the first day, other mines besides U. S. Steel and Consol had struck. When the "suggestion" was issued, two striking locals in West Virginia called a meeting of locals in the area to decide how to interpret the suggestion. In a stirring affirmation of union democracy the local leaders decided to put the question to the rank and file and then meet again.

In southern Pennsylvania the issue was also put to the men, this time at the suggestion of a Lewis representative who believed the rank and file would follow Lewis. In Pennsylvania, the majority voted to ignore the suggestion. In West Virginia, a close margin was for return to the three-day week.

The rebel locals were not yet ready to give up, however. Pickets in force appeared at any mines which started to resume operations. Within 24 hours the area was again shut down tight, with pickets ready to shut any mine that worked. This was made plain by the statement of one of the picket captains, Milne Serdich of Monongah mine: "If we have to keep going back to the same places, I am not going to try to keep my men orderly," Serdich told the press.

As this is written, there is no indication that the strike will end. Lewis, wisely, is now taking a conciliatory attitude toward the strikers. The op-

erators, by now, must realize the situation.

The real danger in the situation is that the operators, who for the first time in many years have visions of seriously smashing the union, will choose to try to starve the miners out. This cannot and must not be permitted to happen.

Organized labor throughout the nation and especially in the mine areas (which also include much of the steel, electrical, aluminum and other heavy industry) must rally to the support of the strikers with food, money and other help. The strikers, through their area leaders, should send delegates to local unions, central labor bodies, and plant gates for help. If this does not happen, an orderly retreat to a three-day week may be the wisest course for mine militants. But this is not yet necessary. Let the labor movement through its full weight behind the embattled miners, to bring the arrogant titans of coal to heel.

# UAW Strikes Chrysler--

(Continued from page 1)

posals! And 1949 was a good year, the kind no one expects to see again.

This very simple gimmick in the Chrysler plan did more to expose the company than any union analysis or action.

### ALL FOR REOPENING CONTRACT

The first important reaction of the men in the shops came Sunday when Chrysler Local 7 held a huge membership meeting. A motion to reject the Chrysler offer as totally unsatisfactory was adopted unanimously and then a motion was adopted to urge the UAW leaders to reopen the whole contract and make this fight the big 1950 fight, if Chrysler forced a strike on the union. Again the membership voted unanimously for such a broadening of the struggle into one which would directly and immediately affect everyone; for the widespread dissatisfaction of the ranks with the present contract is known to everyone.

This idea was also the answer to a company proposal that, if the UAW would accept its pension proposals, the company would ask for a FIVE-year extension of the present contract, and expect the union to agree! At the top level of the UAW the same general idea prevailed, for Reuther informed management that if it forced the union to strike to get a pension, the union would utilize the situation to make an all-out fight for a better contract.

Norman Mathews, Chrysler UAW director, told the company that "we wouldn't extend our present contract for five minutes, let alone five years!"

As against this sound strategy of putting the heat on Chrysler by threatening and making (if necessary) an all-out fight on the contract now—the contract does not expire until August 1950 but the union may reopen it after a five-day strike—the Stalinists at Plymouth and Dodge locals advocated dropping the pension fight and going for a straight wage

increase. Of course the main purpose of this proposal, made in wires to the negotiators, was to embarrass the Reuther leadership. It was a typical irresponsible Stalinist adventure and it did not get far with the ranks.

On Monday, January 23, the top United Auto Worker leaders made an important shift in their tactics because of the confusion which Chrysler's propaganda had created in the ranks and in the city as a whole.

The Chrysler management has tried to get across the false idea that all that separates the union and the company is argument over "technical details," that the company is ready to give a pension plan as good as Ford's or the steel industry settlement.

### PUNCTURE COMPANY STRATEGY

In a shrewd move to expose this fakery, the UAW leaders took a gamble. They announced to the company and to the ranks through full-page ads in the Detroit papers, that the union would settle for a flat 10-cent package—at the same cost to Chrysler as to Ford or steel!

This 10-cents-per-hour package could be given in one of three ways: (1) a pension plan costing six cents per hour, plus a medical plan costing four cents per hour; (2) a different ratio of the funds for a pension-medical plan if Chrysler had one to offer; (3) a flat 10-cent hourly wage increase.

The purpose of this move was to prove to the ranks and to the public that Chrysler was not concerned with "principles" and that the union was not calling a strike on "technical details," but that Chrysler did not want to give any of its fabulous \$100 million profits of 1949 to the workers, in any form whatsoever.

On Monday night, a national conference of delegates from all Chrysler shops was held and Reuther reported on this situation, clearly telling the ranks that this last offer was a rock-bottom one and that if the union was forced on strike, the UAW executive board was for the policy of reopening the contract now.

A delegate from Chrysler Local 7 made the policy motions which carried almost unanimously, the Stalinist clique voting no. These were (1) to reject the last offer of Chrysler as totally unsatisfactory; (2) if Chrysler refused to accept the ten-cent minimum package, the plants would be closed at 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 25; and (3) if the plants were shut down, the union was to reopen the contract for major improvements, including elimination of "company security," strengthening the seniority clause, wiping out the clauses which deprive the men of holiday pay, elimination of wage inequalities and other vital changes.

The fear of a real coal strike, the protracted character of the Chrysler negotiations, the widespread belief which prevailed that Chrysler would give in without a real fight and the poor buildup and education of the ranks to the key issues involved are factors which have created a psychology in the shops different from the usual one that prevails just before a strike deadline. This is the mood upon which the company is banking. But the latest blunders it has made and the adoption of a sound general strategy by the UAW are fairly sure to overcome whatever pessimistic moods may exist.

## UAW Up Against Fact That Pension Issue Lacks Appeal for Men

By WALTER JASON  
DETROIT, Jan. 30—The contrast between the present Chrysler strike, already involving more than 125,000 auto workers, and the May 1948 strike which broke the "no wage increase" front of Wall Street reveals the change in the over-all situation in the labor movement, and is a key to grasping the essential character of the current walkout.

feats and retreats of the rest of the CIO as its "pattern." The Reuther leadership consciously prepared to strike Chrysler unless a satisfactory wage offer was won in negotiations, and the ranks of the union were ready for the struggle. Even the absence of Walter Reuther, who was hospitalized from the murder attempt failed to slow down the UAW. Once the UAW hit the bricks at Chrysler and prepared a General Motors strike, industry capitulated, and even the steel workers received a wage increase, previously denied them.

The fact that Ford and steel in 1949 gave pension plans (with a strike in steel, to be sure) led the UAW leadership and ranks to believe that getting an acceptable pension plan at Chrysler would not be too difficult. They expected this corporation would follow the "pattern."

Like-wise, the bitter and prolonged struggle of the coal miners for concessions, without any victory, added to the feeling and fervor hope that things would be settled peacefully at Chrysler. The Chrysler negotiations, depending on the Ford and steel settlements, were supposed to conclude the "mopping up" operation for the 1949 pension program. The UAW leadership had its eyes focused on General Motors for 1950, where the contract opens this spring. The GM crisis was to be preceded by a victory for a union shop at the NLRB polls.

Instead the UAW finds itself—unless there is a quick and unexpected settlement—beginning its 1950 fight at Chrysler, and for a program which was supposed to be concluded before the GM fight. The Chrysler contract, which expires in August 1950, was supposed to come up for improvements after a victory at General Motors this spring.

### PENSIONS LACK GLITTER

At the present time it appears that the UAW leadership has recovered its balance, or more exactly recovered from its surprise at Chrysler's die-hard resistance, and the union gives many indications of preparing for a combined struggle on pensions, health insurance and the contract. Chief stewards' meetings have been called to discuss proposed improvements, in line with the action of the national Chrysler UAW conference to broaden the present fight to include contract improvements, which may be done after the strike lasts five days.

Basic to any victory in a long struggle on the Chrysler front is the need to make the ranks feel that they personally will benefit by whatever settlement is made. No pension plan based on the \$100-a-month pattern will do that, for even if a satisfactory plan (with those financial limitations) is obtained, the pension directly benefits so few workers now at Chrysler that dissatisfaction with the settlement is more than likely.

As a matter of fact, one aspect of the pension plan idea which UAW leaders, as well as others have ignored, is that the very raising of that slogan is bound to cause more dissatisfaction, i.e., radicalization in the thinking of the workers; for in

**anvil**  
is here again—

Winter 1950 issue now out  
published by the  
New York Student Federation  
Against War

student articles on  
politics, campus events, etc.,  
poetry,  
guest articles by  
Simone de Beauvoir, Isaac Rosenfeld and Helen Neville

32 pages—15 cents—Order from:  
NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION  
AGAINST WAR  
247 Lexington Ave., New York

# LABOR SCOPE

## New NMU Group Says: Fight Both Curran and CP, Stay in the CIO

The new opposition group in the National Maritime Union (see news story on page 1) has issued a declaration of its views which presents the need for militants to replace the Independent Caucus to fight President Joe Curran's bossism in the seaman's union. The first part of the Committee for Democratic Unionism's statement summarizes the present situation in the NMU, familiar to LABOR ACTION readers from the informative articles we have published.

"There is a great need for the active trade-unionists of the NMU to stop and consider the tragedy that has befallen our union," begins the statement. Job conditions have gotten worse, unemployment mounting. "The administration that we elected to replace the old corrupt Communist Party machine is devoting its time to consolidating itself in power." Opposition has been dealt with ruthlessly: "it would be difficult to find a

parallel to these actions in American trade-union history."

After describing the "reign of terror" which has existed in the port of New York since Curran's goons seized the hiring hall from the rank and file, the CDU writes:

"Today we are in a sorry mess. Anyone who wants to criticize has to make sure that he's talking to the right guy first. At meetings, the membership doesn't take the deck, and few members vote. They abstain from voting because they're too disgusted with the administration to vote for them and are both afraid and confused about the opposition to vote for them either."

"Many members realize that if something isn't done damn fast, our union will fall apart at the seams. The hiring hall, the instrument we built to guarantee honest shipping, is being used as a club to make us toe the official line and vote yes. The patrolmen, our first line of defense against the shipowners, spend their time getting pledges and confessions signed and collecting money for the so-called fighting fund."

"Because we are seriously disturbed by this situation, the Committee for Democratic Unionism as formed. All of us played an active role in the Rank and File Caucus because we believed then, and still do, that the Communist Party here or anywhere else, is an opponent of union democracy."

### CURRAN USES CP METHOD

A detailed indictment of the Curran dictatorship is given. A powerful indictment is made of the regime's "thought control" and anti-democratic policy. "Expulsion for political beliefs means that a guy we disagree with is denied the right to make a living. Isn't this just what Stalin and his gang have been doing in Russia and the satellite countries?"

The statement then discusses the basis for the formation of the Committee for Democratic Unionism:

"There were two organized opposition groups. The Independent Caucus, led by Keith Drummond and Lawrence, which was gaining support from a large part of the membership, was composed mostly of men who had supported the Rank and File Caucus, and were still opposed to the Communists, but who felt that Curran and his supporters had reneged on the program on which they were elected. This was target No. 1 for the administration. Target No. 2 was the Communist Party sponsored group—the Voice of the Membership—a hardly visible target since the discredited Communist Party never recovered from the blow it received in the last general election."

"The Curran administration attacked both by lumping them together and branding it a 'Communist-Trotskyite' coalition. Then under the cloak of fighting Communism, it proceeded to use Stalin's dictatorial methods."

"The aims of the Communists in the NMU, as elsewhere in the CIO, are to split away, almost certainly with the purpose of forming a third labor federation. Invariably, they have subordinated the real interests of the workers to those of their political ideology. The NMU membership will not support the program of the Voice of the Membership because we

are staying in the CIO—where we belong.

"While we will have no part of their program and methods, we have said time and time again that we will defend, on a democratic basis, the right of any individual to maintain his political beliefs within the Union. We have no doubt that their policies and ideology can be defeated every time by free and open discussion, as indeed they were defeated in the last general election in the NMU.

### WHY THE NEW GROUP

"We feel that there is need for a group that is truly independent of the present administration and the Communist Party. Up until January 1950, the Independent Caucus more or less fulfilled this need. But since then the Independent Caucus has decided that it will co-ordinate at least some of its activities with the Voice of the Membership group."

"It must be pointed out that there are many rank and filers who do not realize that they will be used as tools by the Communist Party. To be sure, the administration is in part responsible for this. The constant and false cry of 'Communist' hurled at any opponent has pushed many a member into thinking that since he is called a Communist anyway, he might as well work with them."

"In this way, Curran and the officials are playing into the hands of the Communist Party, by attempting to force the membership to choose between the twin evils in the labor movement: Either a union dominated by a closed-shop of officials who will not allow the membership to decide issues, or the equally reactionary and undemocratic camp of the Communists."

"For our part we cannot go for either of these evils, nor any group that works with them. We regret that the Independent Caucus leadership has chosen its present course of cooperation with the Communist Party front in maritime. We believe it is impossible to have 'unity' with a force whose very aims and methods are anti-democratic."

"As for the 'Trotskyites' we have heard so much about in the past few months, they are no factor in the situation since they have decided to take no part in the fight for democracy in the union, at the present time."

### PRESENT PROGRAM

The CDU then presents its positive program for the union. We give here only the main headings:

- (1) The right to work; no victimization on jobs because of beliefs.
  - (2) The right to criticize.
  - (3) Freedom of the press. No censorship of the Pilot, NMU organ.
  - (4) The secret ballot in union votes.
  - (5) The elimination of terror. No goon squads.
  - (6) End the "Moscow Trials"—Curran version. Fair trials in union charges, no extraction of signed "confessions."
- Another group of planks deals with better conditions aboard ship:
- (1) Full enforcement of the contract.
  - (2) Increase jobs. Organize the unorganized.
  - (3) Improve food and quarters aboard ships.
  - (4) Protect the CIO, against raids by the Sailors Union of the Pacific.
- In conclusion, the CDU asks the support of all members of the union.

PRESS MANAGERS'

## PRESS ACTION

By L. G. SMITH, Business Manager

Last week was one of the better weeks in the subscription department. As you can see by the scoreboard below, we received a larger number of subs than usual.

When we look at the too-small number of subs gotten even in this "good" week, we can't spend much time patting ourselves on the back. All that such a week can mean to us is a reassurance that even in these tough times it IS possible to get subscriptions to the paper. Some seem to have forgotten this.

How about THIS week latching on to that guy you've been intending to approach for the past month? How about THIS week going after some of the expired subs (you have received lists of them from this office) and getting them to shell out?

The score for this week follows:

Branch	Sub Score	Single Subs
Detroit	2	1
Cleveland	4	2
Chicago	2	1
Buffalo	4	2
Philadelphia	4	3
New York	15	10
West Virginia	1	1
Boston	2	1
Pittsburgh	2	1
Miscellaneous	4	2
Total	40	24

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y. specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc. and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

**Subscribers — Attention!**  
Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

14-6

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

**RENEW NOW**

### No Progress

There are fewer doctors in proportion to population than there were in 1909 in this country. Today there are 137 physicians per 100,000 people, as against 149 forty years ago. Or one physician for 730 people now, as against one for 671 people in 1909. The Federal Security Agency has adopted as its goal a supply of not less than one for every 585. The American Medical Association, the "doctors' trust," running true to type, is opposing any proposals that federal subsidies be used to increase the supply.

## Readers Take the Floor . . .

To the Editor:

Without extending the discussion of "Socialist Policy and German Armament" unduly, here are a few brief paragraphs in re-rejoinder to Eugene Keller's rejoinder to Comrade Fenwick and myself (LABOR ACTION, Jan. 23).

Perhaps it is for military experts to decide whether a militia is feasible in this day and age of military development. However, sometimes even a layman can read the handwriting on the wall, if he only wishes to. It is significant that the only concrete proof Comrade Keller offers that a militia is feasible is that it took only a few months of full-time training to make aircraft mechanics—hardly an illustration of the training of soldiers, as anyone who has been through it knows.

I would submit for consideration that today the old socialist aim of a people's militia must be replaced by the demand for full democratic rights for all branches of the military, to which end there must be cooperation and solidarity between unions and soldiers, with joint committees of workers and soldiers in localities, and so on. In other words, we must proceed from the facts of technical life in a modern army as we do in modern industry, and try to change not the technology but the politics. The militia idea ignores or tries to change, by wishful thinking, the technology.

But to go to the heart of my argument, it is not always necessary or wise to demand everything all at one time and on the spot. Undoubtedly an independent nation has a right to its own army if it desires one. Similarly an occupied country has the right and the duty to demand the withdrawal of the occupying forces,

Sometimes, as we know, strategy requires more or less emphasis at a given time.

In Germany today any armed force that will be adequate against the Russian zone, will be based on the very virile remnants of the Nazi army. At least that is what all the reports from Germany indicate, and they also predict that this is what the Nazis in industry and government will consider their signal to come forth openly into national life. However, there are still the occupying powers posed against the armed forces of the Russian zone.

With the withdrawal of the occupying powers, the urgency for military protection against the East will outweigh every other consideration, and those with the know-how to form an army, namely, the Nazi officers, will take over the job. As between paving the way for the rebirth of Nazism as a challenging power and the evil of the occupying forces, the latter seems the lesser.

Therefore, socialists may do better not to put forth either the withdrawal of the occupying forces or the formation of a German army as action slogans at present. Other demands from the occupying forces must, of course, continue to be made.

The Social-Democrats and the democratic forces of Germany have a three-pronged problem: they must fight Stalinism; they must prevent the resurgence of Nazism; they must rid themselves of the occupying powers. On a national basis it seems like an impossible task. Only through becoming a part of an Independent Western Europe can the German people find the ideas, the spirit and the forces to proceed to a democratic so-

lution of their economic, political and military problems.

Today nationalist ideas are not the only ones heard. Proposals—coming both from the ECA and from vastly different sources—for one and another kind of Western European unity, are very much to the fore. The German Social - Democrats should come out with a militant proposal for Independent Western Union, seeking the support and cooperation of all Western European Social-Democrats and of wider democratic elements. This is not an evasion of the military problem, but calls immediately for the vehicle which carries hope for the democratic solution of military and other problems.

Susan GREEN

LABOR ACTION does not agree that "German socialists may do better not to put forth . . . the withdrawal of the occupying forces" as a slogan today. (We are not sure how Comrade Green's use of the term "action slogan" affects the question. Naturally, the slogan for the withdrawal of the occupying forces is a propaganda slogan today.) We have discussed this question in our columns before, and would only add now—apropos of the question of German rearmament—that if socialists set themselves against the near-unanimous desire of the West German people for complete national independence, this would only add grist to the mill of reactionary German neo-Nazi nationalism. On the contrary, the German Social-Democrats, in our view, should be the most vigorous proponents of the ending of the occupation and the withdrawal of all imperialist troops (Western and Russian) from German territory.—Ed.

## "EQUAL RIGHTS"

### SENATE VOTES TO ADD RIDER TO AMENDMENT

The Senate has passed a so-called women's "Equal Rights Amendment" to the Constitution which has been before Congress since 1923, adding on to it a rider of doubtful meaning. As a result of the rider, both supporters and opponents of the measure claim to be satisfied in whole or part, indicating that the controversial issue is far from settled.

During the 27-year history of the dispute over this proposed amendment (which still has to go to the House and to the states for ratification) there has been little doubt among labor and liberal elements on what is at stake. It has NOT been the issue of legal equality of the sexes.

Leaving the last-minute rider aside for the moment, the amendment has been fought as an anti-labor measure, which it is—specifically, as a measure which would strike a hard blow against working women. It reads "Equality under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex." As has been proved in the current controversy even more clearly than before, the sponsors of this legislation are completely unconcerned about the fact that it would knock out all state and national legislation protecting women in industry.

For this reason the added paragraph in the version adopted by the Senate has been represented as taking the curse off it: "The provisions of this article shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law upon persons of the female sex."

It is an undoubted fact that very real and unjustifiable discrimination against women exists in many fields solely on account of their sex, as a hangover of the old English common-law attitude of regarding women as chattels with no rights of their own. In some states women cannot sit on juries, hold certain public offices, manage their own earnings as they see fit, and suffer various disabilities in owning and disposing of property.

#### LABOR HAS OWN BILL

In the light of such real abuses, the Equal Rights Amendment has had a deceptive lure. But whatever good it would accomplish in abolishing them would be more than counterbalanced by its effect on those laws which establish essential "inequalities" between men and women who work: prohibition of work dangerous or injurious to the health of women, laws on weight lifting, rest facilities, separate sanitary facilities, minimum wage and maximum hour laws, etc., all of which labor has fought to achieve for a long time, special laws justified by differences in inherent physical structure, biology and social function.

As a matter of fact, organized labor, which has fought the Equal Rights fraud, has been the pioneer in the fight for equal pay for equal work.

#### Proof

The magazine Business Week defends Detroit businessmen against the suspicion that any of them might have hired the scoundrel who attacked Walter and Victor Reuther: "However aggressive an employer may think the UAW is, he would hardly dare the consequences of murder and arson—and in any case would hire professionals to do the job right." If an anti-labor assassin is more successful next time, Business Week will have some explaining to do.

and, while battling for special measures of protection, has also been a leader in the opposition to unwarranted discrimination.

As its counter-proposal against the Equal Rights Amendment, labor has supported the Women's Status bill in Congress, introduced by Senator Kefauver of Tennessee. This bill squarely tackles the problem of real discrimination while preserving every gain for women. It does not throw the baby out with the bath water. It was defeated by the Senate, 65-18.

The chief proponent of the Equal Rights Amendment in unmodified form has been a lobby and propaganda organization called the National Woman's Party. This organization is concerned only and exclusively with the problems of professional, heavily-propertied and well-to-do women, and has consistently refused to take the problems of working women into consideration.

Alice Paul, described in the press as the "chief strategist" for the National Woman's Party drive, has announced that her forces will continue the fight to have the House bury the rider which the Senate passed, thus specifically coming out against the principle of special protection for women workers. Olive Huston of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs described the Senate vote as "a victory, but with a halter on it"—the halter being the provision for protective legislation.

Whatever may be the shortsighted motivation of some defenders of this viewpoint, there is no doubt that a part of the support for their fight has come from sources which are simply interested in opening up women to greater exploitation in industry. The National Woman's Party is no heir of the advanced feminist movement which fought for woman suffrage and no friend of the great mass of women.

#### OPPOSITION SPLIT

Opponents of the Equal Rights trap have split in their reaction to the double-barreled Senate version. Senator Kefauver voted in favor of it after his own bill was lost; Frieda Miller, director of the U. S. Women's Bureau, has withdrawn objection if the rider is retained. On the other hand, Senator Lehman of New York remained a last-ditch opponent on the ground that the modified amendment still jeopardizes protective legislation.

There is no doubt that from the point of view of labor, the Women's Status bill is still the measure to be supported, as the only clear progressive answer to the legitimate issues involved. Certainly, success for the reactionary attempt to kill the rider in the House vote would also make the issues perfectly clear; the amendment without the rider would be unqualifiedly reactionary.

Only an expert lawyer—and not all of them—can determine whether the Senate version does really protect women's legislation adequately; in all likelihood that question will be resolved eventually only by the Supreme Court. The above-mentioned "chief strategist" Alice Paul has indicated that in her opinion the two paragraphs cancel each other: "It is impossible to imagine the Constitution containing two such paragraphs," she said.

It may indeed turn out that Mrs. Roosevelt's closing comment on the measure is the most accurate: "As far as I can see, it's all a waste of time." In any case, in addition to a fight for the Women's Status bill, the battle will go on within the states for the elimination of anti-women discrimination at the source.

# Ukraine Partisans Organize 'Commando' Political Rallies

By Vs. F.

WESTERN ZONE, Germany, December 1949—Since the last news in LABOR ACTION about the activities of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground fighters behind the frontiers of Russia [see issue of August 1, 1949—Ed.] more information has been received.

During the night of August 20, 1949, two more military units of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Army (UPA) crossed the Czech-German frontier, after a defensive battle in which one of their soldiers was killed and several wounded.

These two units had been sent from the Ukraine charged by the underground staff with the special task of strengthening connections with Ukrainian refugees from Russia. In the course of three to four weeks, they crossed the whole of Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The September issue of Vpered carried an interview with the commanders of these newly arrived detachments. (Vpered is the paper published by socialist Ukrainian refugee groups in close connection with the UPA.) Following are the highlights of the interview.

Question: Where is the UPA operating in Russia right now?

Answer: "The operation areas of the UPA cannot be considered to be only those where armed resistance exists. The armed resistance of the military detachments of the UPA exists mostly in the Ukrainian Carpathians. But the armed-political underground network exists all over the Ukraine, mostly in cities and larger towns like Odessa, Kryvyj Rig, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkov and the Donetz coal fields.

"In addition, I can assure you that the activities of the UPA are well known all over Russia; in this way our underground movement is able to strengthen the passive resistance of all the Russian workers and peasants to the Kremlin. The close connections of the UPA with other national undergrounds (the Byelorussian, for instance) serves greatly to lighten our struggle against Russian imperialism and its social exploitation of the toiling masses."

#### POLITICS AS THE WEAPON

Question: What are the tactics and main tasks of the UPA today?

Answer: "The headquarters and political staff of the UPA nowadays mostly concern themselves with the political-propagandist struggle. This struggle is carried out by small, fast-moving detachments of the UPA; these are assigned to given territories, together with a base of operations, and are always on the move in their raids.

"The chief task of such a raiding group is propagandist action; this is carried out through short meetings with workers and peasants, and through the circulation of leaflets, papers and magazines published by the underground. In this way the revolutionary fighters of the UPA prepare the toiling masses of the people for the revolutionary struggle against Stalinism.

"Besides, on occasion, such raiding detachments have the task of destroying the police-terrorist groups of the enemy, the release of prisoners and deportees, as well as sabotage activities; for instance, breaking into provision warehouses and distributing the food seized to the hungry population, workers and veterans, is very popular."

Further information about the activities of the UPA behind the Iron Curtain has been reported recently by several European broadcasting stations. Radio Vienna broadcast a report of the great battles near Lviv (Western Ukraine) between the Ukrainian partisans and military units of the Russian police; it stated that this report had been confirmed by Western diplomatic circles in Moscow.

#### FOR THE THIRD CAMP

Another report has been received from Stockholm describing the activities of the raiding detachments of the UPA in Eastern Prussia, where the Ukrainian population from the so-called Curzon line was deported by Polish Stalinist authorities.

The latest report came from Radio Vienna and Munich; according to it a new detachment of 15 UPA signalmen is making its way through Czechoslovakia in order to reach Western Austria. The commander of this detachment has been killed; two of its soldiers committed suicide by throwing grenades under themselves, in order not to be taken by pursuing Czech

police. The rest of the detachment has been dispersed.

Radio Berlin reported on the day of Stalin's birthday celebration that among the Russian soldiers in the Eastern zone of Germany many leaflets were circulating, calling on them "to struggle against Stalinism and Russian imperialism" and demanding "freedom for the workers."

More information on the ideology and program of the movement is contained in a new issue, No. 10 (46), of the central theoretical organ of the Ukrainian underground revolutionary movement, the periodical Idea and Action. This number was recently received from the Ukraine and reprinted in emigration.

In the international resolutions adopted by the last political conference of the underground movement, we see that the UPA stands uncompromisingly "against all the imperialists and imperialist blocs of nations in the world." Besides Russian imperialism, American imperialism is especially emphasized. Furthermore, "the movement stands for the uncompromising independence of the Ukrainian nation as well as of other national republics of the USSR. Any form of national federation with Russia is rejected."

In the national resolutions, we see that the movement stands "for the new revolution in the USSR. The new revolution will be national as well as social. Social revolution will be directed against the class of bolshevist magnates [the movement's term for the Russian bureaucracy—Ed.] for the construction of a new classless society based on all the political freedoms and real people's democracy, economically based on the socialization of the means of production, with the planning and distribution of the common national wealth controlled by the toiling people. Any restoration of capitalism is excluded."

The best proof of the correctness of this program in the situation which now exists behind the Russian frontiers, is the broad support given to the heroic struggle of the UPA by the Ukrainian and other sections of the Russian masses.

#### MOSCOW ACTS OUT A COMEDY

The Stalinist "magnates" are really feeling uneasy about the mood of their subjects. This is especially visible in the Ukraine, and it can be attributed to the activities of the Ukrainian underground. Some of the latest political actions of the Kremlin clearly support this thesis.

Recently, on direct order of the Kremlin, the Ukrainian "Soviet Socialist Republic" acquired a new "national flag" and a "national hymn." Up to now, all the national flags of the sixteen "Soviet republics" have been red; there is now an exception, the "independent" Ukraine. The new flag presented to the Ukraine by the Kremlin is red and blue. (The real national colors of the Ukraine are blue and yellow.) Similarly with the new national hymn: there has up to now been a single hymn for the whole Russian empire ("Soviet Union") but now the Ukraine has its "own" which proclaims in song that the "independent Ukraine is eternally united with Great Russia."

It is easy to understand this comedy which the Kremlin is playing with its Ukrainian flag and hymn. It is calculated to make an impression on the unformed world outside and on backward elements of the Ukrainian population, to prove to them that a "really independent" Ukraine exists in the USSR and that the Ukrainian struggle for independence is a "simple reactionary bluff."

But despite these Kremlin efforts, new developments continue to make clear that all is not in order for Stalin in the Ukraine. On the day after Stalin's "Christmas," the Kremlin suddenly dismissed the real Russian governor of the Ukraine, the general secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, M. S. Khrushchov. This is the second time during the post-war period that a Russian governor has been fired from his post; the first was L. M. Kaganovich in 1947. Kaganovich's fate at this time is unknown. There are rumors that he has been arrested and deported to Siberia. If this is true, it is possible that Khrushchov will follow him.

In addition, there are reports of a great new purge going on now (it would be the third in the post-war period) among the Ukrainian CP members and in the administrative apparatus. The Kremlin is feeling uneasy indeed.

## The Militarization of America—VII SHADOW OF THE MILITARY DARKENS THE SCHOOLS

A statement attributed to Major General Maxwell D. Taylor that the army intended "to put the best heads of America in the brass hats of tomorrow" [This Week, April 4, 1948] sums up one purpose of the military in their work in educational institutions.

This effort to capture the best minds of the nation for military purposes is being aided by large military appropriations. No similar appropriations are aimed at helping the best minds go into needed civilian service in the realm of career diplomacy, medicine and teaching, for example.

Aside from indicating the value we place on a profession whose aim is to destroy, as compared with those whose aim is to create and heal, this emphasis contributes to the militarization of the educational leaders of America.

Part of the military program in colleges and universities is aimed at faculty and student scientists. The Office of Naval Research spent approximately \$20,000,000 on about 500 projects at colleges and universities during the year 1948-49. These projects are carried on in more than 150 educational institutions by roughly 2,400 graduate students and 2,000 scientists.

"This program has enabled the navy to retain the interest of scientific institutions, though in preceding years it has greatly exceeded the amount spent by the navy. For example, in 1947 out of an army research budget of about \$280,000,000 "about \$70,000,000 was earmarked for fundamental studies at universities." —[Business Week, Sept. 14, 1946.]

Emphasis on Destruction  
In addition to its research in colleges, the army "is preparing to create an elite corps of officer scientists." Plans call for the army "to pick annually fifty top rank scientists and engineers from the nation's foremost technical schools, commission them after two years with troops, and send them to technical schools for further training." —[AP Dispatch from Phila., April 24, 1948.]

Scientists who teach in colleges are encouraged to think favorably of the army as a result of military awards and consequent newspaper publicity given to them. At a series of ceremonies in September, October, and November 1948, sponsored by the army, military citations were presented to top army and navy men to scientists from New York University, Cornell, Princeton, Yale, Wesleyan, University of Connecticut, Ohio State University, and other educational institutions.

As a result of the military influence in the science departments of our educational institutions there are a number of by-products:

(1) In the words of Dr. Paul H. Kirkpatrick, a physicist of Stanford University, "because the military favors such projects as may be of value in warfare, the direction of research in general is being changed." —[AP dispatch from Palo Alto, May 3, 1947.]

(2) Colleges and universities are gradually being made dependent on military agencies for funds for science.

(3) Psychologically the university scientists and engineers as well as college administrators who maintain financial relationships with the military tend to think and act in the interests of the military. As Dr. Philip Morrison puts it: "We cannot tie science to the military and hope to see it used for peace, no matter how ingeniously we write the contracts nor how circumspect the men of good will remain." —[American Scholar, Summer 1947.]

## B. C. Bennem

It is with profound regret that we announce the death of our old friend and comrade, B. Clayton Bennem. He was a long-time friend of our movement and a determined socialist, always devoted to the cause of improving the life of his fellow workers.

Clayton Bennem was not a young man as years go. But he was a worker confident of the ideas of socialism and its future victory. He gave everything he could to the movement because that is where he belonged. Even though his years and illness prevented him from working like others more fortunate than he, he never ceased to be with us and to help us as best he could.

Our comrade passed away on January 5, when his body could no longer withstand the ravages of the disease (a form of sclerosis) which finally conquered him.

In the name of our movement we say farewell to our socialist comrade, B. C. Bennem.

## Los Angeles Public Meeting—

Max Shachtman

on

THE MEANING OF TITOISM  
and the Split in the Cominform

FRIDAY at 8 p.m., February 10

at

Embassy Auditorium, 9th and Grand

## 'States Rights' Fails to Stop The Slaughter of the Innocents

By KATE LEONARD

The "sovereign state" of Mississippi, the darkest corner of the continent, has distinguished itself again.

Atrocity is integral to the Southern way of life; but even when the competition is heavy, all Mississippi needs is a bit of time to notch up another first. Sallis, Miss., is just next door to the Delta, eulogized so frequently by the Greenville Liberals, Hodding ("What's Wrong With the North") Carter and David L. ("I Remember, I Remember With All Its Charm Where I Was Born and Raised") Cohn. Sallis is hardly a stone's throw away from this erstwhile paradise of the demi-liberals.

Just across the line in the next county, Sallis was the scene on January 8 of rape and murder which—if it didn't stun the "entire" nation—stunned the best part of it, and has at least caused the swine in power in Mississippi to squirm.

The Harris family, Negroes, were all but wiped out in Sallis at midnight on January 8 by Malcolm and Wendell Whitt and Leon Turner, white escaped convicts. On December 22 these men had raided the home of two Negro families on the Allen plantation, the Wards and the Harrises. Rape and robbery were attempted in both houses.

#### SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS

Jailed, the three men "escaped" after eight days and hid out drinking liquor another eight days. Then they called again on the Harrises to "bother" the 14-year-old daughter and to take vengeance, thinking that it had been Mr. Harris who had turned them in. They shot four of the children in the family and Mr. Harris. Mrs. Harris and her seven-month-old son almost miraculously got away

out the back door.

This slaughter has embarrassed the state of Mississippi. It can't be explained away.

Mary, aged 8, raped nobody. She was shot dead in her bed.

Ruby Nell, aged 4, raped nobody. She died nine hours later, found in a praying position beside her bed, with the blood drained out of her.

Frank, aged 12, raped nobody. He was shot in the back as he tried to climb for a kitchen window.

Verlena, aged 14, raped nobody. She was "bothered," shot in the chest and arm; she hid under the porch and crawled through the mud to the next shack.

Mrs. Harris raped nobody. She now suffers from shock and cannot speak, for the human organism can stand only so much.

Mr. Harris raped nobody. Nor can they fix up a charge of rape against him. He could not have raped Malcolm Whitt or Wendell Whitt or Leon Turner. Paralyzed from the waist down, he cannot even shoot up the countryside, if so inclined.

#### STATES RIGHTS WON'T DO IT

An ambulance came nine hours after the shooting. Ruby Nell was still alive at one o'clock when a cousin went to the house. He reported: "I looked in the bedroom and saw the children. The little light one looked like she was dead, but the little dark one was still breathing. I didn't bother them and I didn't look for Thomas because I thought he had got away. I left the house and walked to my own place and found Thomas's wife and her daughter. They told me that they'd got word to Judge Allen, so I didn't bother any more."

This is how life is lived in Mississippi, right next door to the Delta,

which the Mississippi liberals assure us was characterized until yesterday by a relationship between owner and tenant that "whatever its defects, was often marked by tenderness, understanding, sacrifice frequently on both sides, and enduring friendships between master and man, white and Negro"; and therefore "without parallel in the dog-eat-dog economy that exists everywhere else in the United States."

The state of Mississippi squirms not only because this outrage cannot be explained away. This is the last thing they want, especially now. It is hardly evidence that civil rights and the protection of citizens can be "left to the states." District Attorney Henry L. Rogers promises to demand the electric chair for the Whitts and Turner. They will plead "not guilty."

Somewhere along the line it will be explained to Rogers that Mississippi does not have an electric chair. Electric chairs don't fit in with the Mississippi way of life. However, even the demand for the death penalty in such a case is new for Mississippi.

The swine in power in Mississippi squirm. Perhaps now their liberals will hush their cocky sectional talk. Perhaps now, also, it will be demonstrated that "states rights" in the South cannot ensure even elementary protection to the Negro, and that national legislation to curb the "Southern way of life" is a must.

Subscribe! \$1 a Year  
LABOR ACTION

## New York Labor Action Forum—

### WHAT'S HAPPENING TO OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES?

ROWLAND WATTS  
National Secretary,  
Workers Defense League

ALBERT GATES  
Secretary,  
Independent Socialist League

Chairman: STAN GREY  
Labor Action Writer on Civil Liberties

SUNDAY at 8 p.m., February 12

at

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street

Admission 25 cents

## LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.  
114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.

GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.  
Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 14, No. 6

February 6, 1950

Editor: Hal Draper

Asst. Editors: Mary Bell, L. G. Smith  
Edit. Bd.: Hal Draper, Emanuel Garrett, Albert Gates  
Business Manager: L. G. Smith

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.

JUST PUBLISHED: Professor Robert Lynd's Great Speech to the United Auto Workers (CIO), on—

# Labor and Politics—Democracy and Classes

By ROBERT LYND

As I work with problems such as planning for full employment, I am constantly stopped by the fact that in our democracy there is a serious gap between what it makes sense for us to do, what millions of us people want, and getting clearance to get those things done. This ought to warn us against over-confidence in using the word "democracy."

Big business is talking a lot about democracy in its propaganda nowadays. It claims that capitalism—which it calls the "free enterprise system," which capitalism is not—is the necessary prior basis of all our democratic freedoms. The fact that business is so busy calling capitalism and democracy two sides of the same dollar suggests to me that we had better take a good look at that democracy before we simply hitch on and say, "Let's go, we can do it better democratically."

A kind of democracy that is necessary to capitalism and that capitalism is willing to shout about may not be the kind of democracy labor wants.

What are the hitches in our present kind of democracy that prevent us from doing badly needed things that nearly all of us agree ought to be done?

When we talk about the democratic way of doing things, we must distinguish between democracy that is taught our children in the schools, and, on the other hand, the tough, everyday version that includes things like the Mohawk Valley formula.

The first of these—the official version—says that all of us are free and equal; that nobody can shove us around; that public opinion is free, and everybody can know the facts so as to make up his own mind on all the issues; that power rests with us individual citizens, not in corporations and organizations like the NAM; that we go to the polls as citizens and register our will there, and that what is registered at the polls is actually the intelligent judgment and wishes of the majority of the people; and that there is unlimited opportunity for everyone. That is democracy, according to this official Fourth of July version.

Now, if we don't live by this kind of school-book democracy, what is the other democracy—the tough one that is out, for instance, to "get" organized labor, as the Taft-Hartley Act aimed to do?

(1) The first thing that I want to stress is that the most fundamental social fact about the United States is that the people are divided into classes, and the walls between the classes, instead of growing less, are getting higher.

Class barriers are increasing. Business is staging a big campaign to tell us that classes don't exist in the United States, and that if you talk about classes you are un-American. You people have seen these ads. . . .

There is a continuous barrage of such ads. Did you see the one showing a gray-haired old lady, who looks like the mother of any of us, asking the nice, clean brakeman on the rear-end of the caboose, "How's our railroad doing, young man?" The text goes on to say, "That's the beauty of America—the voice of the people is the voice that runs things."

And then *Life* magazine in its splurge last summer on "The Pursuit of Happiness" (remember our right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in the Declaration of Independence?) came up with the conclusion that happiness comes "from within"—from your guts or somewhere—and that it can't be got by economic changes. So don't any of you radicals start to stir up anything! . . .

## "Classless America"?

We are a class-stratified society and are getting more so. And no amount of talk about "labor-management cooperation" can disguise this fact.

We have had a lot of opportunity in our American past and, judged by the standards of the more closely-packed European nations, we have been pretty lucky. But the open frontier is gone; the continuous stream of cheap European labor that put a privileged floor under American-born labor is gone, too; monopoly is growing and our government can't stop it; and here, as elsewhere in all capitalist nations, the middle class which labor has aspired to join is being thwarted and squeezed.

The picture is becoming clearer and clearer: on the one side, big industry, property and its managers; and, on the other side, labor.

When they talk to you about "classless America" and "unlimited opportunity," tell them to go read page 55 of Monograph 1 of the Senate Temporary National Economic Committee, which says: ". . . it is a widely recognized fact that substantial opportunity for promotion does not exist for a large proportion of the workers [either in large corporations or in small companies]. . . . Most of them, therefore, must look forward to remaining more or less at their current levels, despite the havoc this may visit upon the American tradition of getting ahead."

It is this arbitrary power to force people to live out their lives on the level at which they happen to be born that is the bone and gristle of the capitalist class system. . . .

So the point I am making here is that, when we talk about doing things "democratically," we have got to bear in mind that a class society is an arbitrary system of power that works directly against democracy, and that class barriers are becoming stronger. I should be interested to know the reaction of your labor-education people to my strong belief that your educational work should be pitched in terms of making members of the UAW aware, in season and out, of the nature of classes; why classes exist; and how classes mess up and thwart the things that democracy tries to do and, in the end, render real democracy impossible.

I don't mean to wave the bloody shirt, but the discussion of this fundamental fact about our society seems, from what I have heard at this conference, rather startlingly lacking. Class seems to be just one of those also-rans of which a speaker here might say, "Oh, yes, of course, there are also classes in our society, and that causes trouble, too." But we don't seem to be talking straight out about the important fact that our arms are pinned to our sides before we ever start when we try to do things "democratically" in a class system.

## Capitalism Vs. Democracy

(2) This leads into the second point I want to make about this tough workaday version of democracy we live by; namely, that we have in the United States only partial democracy.

Our nation was founded on a compromise between private business power and democratic political power, and the result has been, all down through our national life, that we have been trying to make two contradictory things work together—political democracy and economic un-democracy. . . .

That kind of straddle was written into the American system at its very start, and this conflict at the core of democracy needs to be dinned into every worker in every union in the country. Right now American business, as I have said, is drenching us and our children with the claim that democracy and the American enterprise system are one and the same thing, two necessary sides to the same coin.

They aren't. Instead, they are increasingly in this era of big enterprise and monopoly fundamentally opposed things. And this effort by business to sell the

The United Auto Workers (CIO) education department has just published in pamphlet form one of the most dynamic and important speeches ever made to a trade-union gathering in recent decades.

A little over a year ago, at the UAW's education conference in Milwaukee, Professor Robert Lynd of the Columbia University sociology department, famous author of *Middletown* and other books, spoke at the conference theme, "You Can Do It Better Democratically." As the Briggs-UAW educational director, Frank Marquart, has written in his local's paper, it was a "bombshell": "His speech had an electrifying effect, and from time to time he had to wait till the enthusiastic applause died down. When he concluded his talk, the auto workers rose from their chairs to a man and gave him a thunderous ovation."

LABOR ACTION takes the greatest pleasure in publishing here extensive sections of this speech. A second and concluding section will be published next week. We know of no better introduction for trade-unionists to the ABC of labor and politics.

The UAW, as is noted on the flyleaf of the pamphlet, does not, of course, take responsibility for the analysis and opinions expressed by Professor Lynd. But it is to be congratulated on making the speech available in well-printed and illustrated pamphlet form. You can get copies for 10 cents each from the UAW-CIO Education Department, 28 West Warren, Detroit.

unfree enterprise system as democracy and as necessary for democracy is one of the most dangerous propaganda "phonies" in circulation at the present time.

(3) In this hybrid system we have tried to pretend that economic and political power are separate things; that democratic power would, of course, always be top dog; and that if economic power tried to shove democracy around, democracy would always be strong enough to reach over and pin back the ears of the economy.

Actually, economic power is political power. There is only one fundamental power in industrial society, no matter what political tags you pin on the society. Don't let anybody fool you about that.

Economic power is direct political power. And the bigger industry gets, the more integrated its technology, and the more interdependent its parts, the more dependent the whole society and its government becomes upon those who own and control that technology. This growth of industrial power at the expense of so-called independent democratic political power has been helped by our unnecessary and increasingly unworkable assumption, deep in our American traditions, that government should have as little power as possible, that "that government is best that governs least," since government should be only a neutral umpire.

What all this means is that, with the growth of big industry and monopoly, big business' share in total power in the United States has grown enormously, while the democratic government's power has lagged behind. We have now reached a point where all the palaver in Washington about breaking up monopoly and the return to competition is just so much eye-wash.

Fifty years of less and less successful trying have shown that we can't stop monopoly. And we are not going back to free competition. State power and economic power are being merged because from now on all over the world in every industrial society, neither the state nor the economy can operate without the other.

As state and economic powers merge, the aces are in the hands of private business. Democracy is handicapped because, from our beginning as a nation, we have been so afraid of power that we have never developed a positive theory of democratic power as a collective instrument.

We have never faced squarely the question: If something concerns the welfare of the majority of the people, how does democracy get the power to do that thing if a powerful minority opposes it?

Thus, practically the whole resources, present and future, of science have been fenced off from democracy on the superior legal basis of private business rights. They are suppressed or doled out at the will of the owners for a price set by the owners. And as Monograph 26 of the Senate Temporary National Economic Committee, on "Economic Power and Political Pressures," states, this private control over science today gives big business tremendous political power, even as against our government itself.

## What's Happening to Democracy?

(4) A fourth aspect of this only partial kind of democracy that we have appears in relation to the problem of national planning.

With the whole "works"—government and industry—flowing together, with national welfare acutely dependent upon everything working together smoothly, and with broad over-all policies and decisions having to be made at increasing speed, there is obvious need for national planning to make things mesh and hang together.

But here again liberal democracy of the kind that we have is in a jam. All our history and all our institutions have discouraged this kind of continuous collective thinking-ahead by democratic government. Liberal democracy has no over-all collective plans for itself as a whole, except as regards such minimum things as national defense and general law and order.

And it doesn't have these plans because our theory has been that, beyond these minimum things, we have no collective purposes, only private purposes. Welfare among us is not basically planned for, but happens as an unplanned result of everybody's trying to get rich on his own.

As a result, our democracy doesn't know where it is going until it looks at last year's statistics and sees where its 60 million personal strivers went during that last year. This throws the welfare of all of us under the feet of a knock-down and drag-out battle-royal among power interests. I submit that that is a disorderly and grossly inefficient way for a democracy to secure continuing welfare here in the middle of the twentieth century. . . .

My second warning concerns the way things seem to be going with democracy in these United States of ours. As I size up the real position of democracy in the United States today, as over against the organized power of industry, the score looks to be going heavily against democracy.

We Americans have been lazy about democracy. We have taken it for granted as a kind of built-in permanent part of American life, and we have assumed that if any nation on earth did any democratic thing, we'd do it first and best. Of course, no such thing is necessarily the case.

Democracy is something that has to be worked at hard and continuously if it is to exist. It either grows or declines in a dynamic time like the present, for it can't just stand still. So, if we want to keep what democracy we have, we have got to work at the job of building more democracy, and fast, fighting every inch of the way. . . .

As I look at labor's present strategy, it seems to assume that its most appropriate move is just to ride

the tail of business profits, pressing steadily for a bit more and then a bit more of the business take. The garment unions have actually wedged themselves into the position of being co-partners with the owners and managers of that industry. Industry generally seems to be encouraging some such cautious emphasis of junior-partner collaboration by labor in its emphasis on labor-management cooperation, but it is reserving to itself the right to deal with whatever things it calls "management problems."

Another assumption in this labor strategy of riding the tail of the profit system seems to be that things will go on indefinitely substantially as they are, with industry cashing in and with labor shaking it down time after time as the two of them ride the glory train together.

## Why America Is Rich

Here I think we need to ask: What kind of theory of social change and what view of the future really make sense here in the middle of the twentieth century?

We Americans have been lucky. There is no question about it. And what we have done is to translate the fact of our luck into a confident proof of the inevitable rightness and finality of our American institutions.

Our good fortune has consisted in the facts that our nation was born at the same time as the rise of machine industry—what we call the Industrial Revolution; we had a big, rich, new continent with lots of wealth in it and few people, beckoning for us to "come and get it"; cheap European labor brought itself over here at its own cost, so that we didn't even have to pay the freight; and this labor fed itself into our furnaces, broke the plains, rolled steel rails, and built our cities.

As a result, the rising American standard of living has been, through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, the envy of all the rest of the world. Living in that kind of a world, we got used to taking progress for granted.

We have believed that all we have to do is to keep going along, and things would get better and better. So we have assumed that the thing for labor to do is to keep inching along and eventually to promote itself into the middle class, on the theory that after a while everybody would be in the middle class and there wouldn't be any working class anymore.

Now I don't believe we can assume this kind of permanent progress. Even the United States doesn't carry that kind of rabbit's foot. And I want to stress this point hard, for it is crucial for labor.

Right now American business is having a fat time with year after year of bigger profits in its history. I don't need to tell you auto workers that. But all over the world capitalism is in trouble. The depression of the 1930's really hurt American business—hurts its prestige, hurt its claim to be an economy fit for a democracy, and hurt its self-confidence.

While I hate to say it, I believe big business has learned more since 1929 than has organized labor. And that means a lot in a time that has seen the rise of the CIO and strong industrial unionism of the UAW-CIO sort. But I think business has been learning more and

faster about what the score is and what to do about the situation, while labor has been organizing and digging itself in largely along the old lines.

And it is what big business has been learning that ought to warn labor against taking permanent progress for granted and thinking that labor can go on permanently riding the coat-tails of business. . . .

So what has happened since 1933 is that big-business strategy has moved from fighting labor at the plant level and merely influencing government, to the recognition that for capitalist big business, from the middle of the twentieth century on, the aim must be to pull the teeth of both organized labor and of interference with the big-business system by government. And this was to be done by moving in on the whole democratic process, including the government, and taking over.

## What Kind of Collectivism?

In respect to the handling of both organized labor and government, it is highly probable that American business leaders learned directly from what they saw their German opposite numbers do.

Big industry in Germany brought Hitler and Nazis into power in order to break the power of German labor and to free German industry from the rising burdens of regulation by a democratic government and of taxation for social legislation. German capitalism in trouble was showing the way which capitalism, in trouble all over the world, was to take.

This involved the recognition that, in the tightening pressures of the twentieth century—between nations internationally, and internally within each nation between industry and labor—the economic and political systems of a nation have got to work together. National states cannot afford anything less than maximum efficiency in their economic affairs, while national economies require strong and continuous backing from the state apparatus. For the economic and political systems to try to coerce, and thus frustrate, each other step by step has become too inefficient, unreliable and nationally dangerous.

And, once a big advanced industrial nation like Germany has shown the way to ease its pressures by linking up industry and government, the business leaders in other nations began to follow.

You and I may not like these things that our big-business leaders are learning. We may call it "un-American." But I am telling you that this merging of economic power and state power is here to stay.

Every industrial nation is on the move toward some form of collectivism, and our only choice is "Which kind?" For us here in the United States the nineteenth-century straddle between democracy and capitalism is no longer a workable permanent choice.

I believe that the only choices we face are these: Either democracy will move in on our private economy, socialize it and run it for the purposes of democracy, or big business will move in on the democratic state, take it over, and run the whole works for the profit of big business.

# Stalinists Licked in Student Meet

N. Y. Conference on Democracy in Education Plans Sessions for March

By SAM FELICKS

NEW YORK, Jan. 29 — The youth groups of the Stalinist movement have suffered a smashing defeat in the organization of the projected Conference on Democracy in Education, which they originally initiated but which has been taken out of their control by a coalition of anti-Stalinist student organizations and clubs.

At a planning session of participating student groups held yesterday, attended by about 110 students representing about 60 organizations, the best attended planning meeting so far held—the Stalinist forces were decisively outvoted. Seized with panic as they saw their group on the conference cut off, they wound up by virtually walking out of the meeting.

The conference, originally supposed to have been held in mid-December, had to be postponed at that time because of inability to obtain campus facilities. It is now planned for early March. The postponement has, in fact, resulted in a resurgence of interest and enthusiasm on a broader basis of campus participation than before.

## BACKGROUND OF MEETING

The conference was originally conceived by the Stalinist as an attempt to branch out in student activity after the disastrous Wallace campaign and the feeble response to the CP's newly formed Labor Youth League. The initial organizing efforts were conducted in typical Stalinist fashion—that is, they attempted to keep it within a small group who would be incapable of offering serious opposition to their leadership. Later, when all the plans were fixed, the conference would be called with the Stalinists holding the reins.

As was recounted in the December 26, LABOR ACTION, this neat plan misfired when the New York Student Federation Against War accidentally found out about a planning session, and participated in it, attempting to broaden the base of the conference. To this end, a Democratic Coordinating Group was formed consisting essentially of the affiliated New York Federation clubs and several Students for Democratic Action (student ADA) chapters in an attempt to activate other liberal groups.

The Democratic Coordinating Group proposed to the Executive Committee of the conference that another planning session be held to allow for more democratic planning on the basis of wider interest and the hope of attracting other clubs. The Stalinists voted this proposal down, but their opponents were able to reverse the decision at a subsequent meeting.

The Democratic Coordinating Group illustrating excellently the ability of different political campus tendencies to work together, set itself the task of activating a wide section of the student body into the fight for democratic education and of preventing

ther Stalinists from turning the conference into a circus for support of Stalinist foreign policy. While there was agreement on the formulation of a basic resolution on democratic education, the crucial issue was over the panel on "International Tensions."

## HIT AT RUSSIA

The resolution that was agreed upon for presentation to the planning session as a statement of principles for the conference said in effect: while we are concerned about the dangers to democratic education and to democracy in the United States, we are at the same time cognizant of other places in the world where they are in danger and do not even exist, as in fascist Spain and Argentina and in totalitarian Russia; but at this time, because we live in the U. S., we are concerning ourselves with our own country.

At yesterday's planning session, the Democratic Coordinating Group included the affiliated clubs from the New York Federation, SDA, Young Democrats, AVC, and students representing several student councils. The planning session consisted of the above-mentioned groups plus the Stalinists.

The main points which the Democratic Coordinating Groups agreed to push at the meeting were the following: (1) moving the date of the conference from February 18-19 to the first week of March, to allow for functioning of campus clubs when the new semester begins in mid-February; (2) new elections to the Executive Committee because of the interest and participation of many clubs which were not previously present; (3) merging the panel on International Tensions with the panel on Academic Freedom to maintain chief emphasis on democracy in education, and not on a discussion of the cold war as such; and (4) the above mentioned resolution on a statement of principles.

## STALINISTS LICKED

The decisive point of the planning session came when the voting rights of the leading Stalinist hack from the Labor Youth League was challenged on the ground that he was not a student and that no provision existed for dual representation for a campus club as well as its intercollegiate group. The Stalinist lost, and they could not seat their leading person.

The work of the Stalinists on the floor was simply incompetent. The only opposition they could raise to the resolution on principles was that Russia and Spain should not be discussed since they are outside the domain of the conference. Then, in the next breath, they opposed merging the two panels on the ground that the subject of International Tensions was so important that it had to be discussed separately.

At this point the Stalinists became

panicky as they saw their influence in the conference falling away. They began to stall, calling points of order and information. Then during the election of the Executive, it happened. It was clear that they were going to have a difficult time electing their people. A fantastic episode was precipitated which could be cooked up only by the Stalinist mind.

A student suddenly shouted out that he had just heard a Jim Crow remark—by someone in the audience, not from the floor, and from someone about 8-9 yards away from him! The accused student denied the charge. In any case, Stalinists all over the hall jumped up with the cry that this was a Jim Crow meeting, that the accused student should be thrown out—without an inquiry, in true Vishinsky style. A stream of wildly chauvinist statements poured from them—"all white people are Jim Crow," "Negroes should be given special privileges," etc. (This aspect will be discussed at greater length next week.)

When the meeting refused to be stamped by their cries, the Stalinists took the opportunity to declare that no "democratic person" could stay, put on their coats and walked—to the back of the room. They were clearly confused as to whether the right tactic was to bolt or not, but higher order seemed to be lacking.

The meeting proceeded with its plans to make the Conference on Democracy in Education the outstanding student event since the mass student movement of the 1930s.

## Experienced Personnel

The Library of Congress reports that there are at least 27 ex-congressmen who are now making a living in plushy jobs as lobbyists in Washington. It can't be said they never learned a trade. Pays well too—the crew pulled out a neat \$8,952,000 last year.

## Tying Wages

When the United Auto Workers (CIO) signed a contract with General Motors which contained an "escalator clause," linking pay raises to the cost-of-living index, the Stalinists howled "betrayal." In January it was announced that Harry Bridges, Stalinist head of the CIO longshoremen, has signed a 20-month contract, covering 20,000 Hawaiian sugar workers, which does indeed have little resemblance to the GM contract.

The agreement signed by Bridges, over the protests of several Hawaiian locals, ties the sugar workers' wages to prices on the New York spot sugar market—a speculative exchange like the cotton exchange!

# FEPC --

(Continued from page 1)

Rayburn is deadset against FEPC. Then it was Rayburn who shelved FEPC and not the Fair Deal Democrats?

Rayburn's was the hand that held the dagger. But Krock (and every opponent of racism in the country) has asked "why the FEPC bill was 'never mentioned' at the White House conference Monday between the president and the Democratic leaders of Congress, though all were aware that a couple of hours afterward Speaker Rayburn, who was present, had sole power to put the FEPC on passage or keep it off the floor?"

Krock delicately answers that the "cynical explanation" for this "mystery" is that "the president will not be displeased if it is unfinished business when the voters go to the polls in 1950. That is also the reason why he shows no displeasure over the fact that Mr. Rayburn twice used his plenary powers to prevent the House from passing the bill."

## MURKY MANEUVERS

Krock adds:

"These explanations of the murky maneuvers on the bill are very cynical indeed. But they were naturally evoked by what has been happening. Very seldom do informed observers agree with Representative Marcantonio, yet a good many did when he remarked . . . 'It is obvious to everyone . . . that everybody wants civil rights as an issue but not as a law, and that goes for Harry Truman, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.'"

"The general comment was that, though Mr. Marcantonio is not noted for candor about his own animosity [Marcantonio is a party-line-toeing Stalinist—Ed.] this talent was forthcoming where others were concerned."

Why has the Rules Committee botched up the bill? A majority vote in the committee can release it. Is it solely the guilt of the well-known Republican-Dixiecrat coalition? Krock wants to know why four of the eight Northern Democratic members do not vote to report it out.

Sideshow in the affair has been the rivalry between Roosevelt Jr. and Congressman Powell for the honor of circulating a petition which, if signed by 218 members could jerk the bill out of its graveyard. Powell and others accused Roosevelt of grandstanding to help his gubernatorial aspirations in New York, though there is no doubt that Roosevelt is for the bill; while FDR Jr. in turn caustically asked why Powell had not used his opportunity "at any time" since last August to file the petition.

In any case, the petitions circulated by both congressmen also put their colleagues on the spot. The number of excuses for NOT signing the petition, by congressmen pledged to support the bill, were as varied as their authors: Roosevelt is making a play for fame (which may be entirely true but not entirely relevant); Powell sent congressmen a "threatening" letter, etc.

Powell's "threatening" letter was a note to House members asking them to declare themselves on the petition and adding that the responses would be publicized in the Congressional Record. This nasty, mean threat—that their real aims, rather than their campaign pledges, would be spread on the record—was considered ungentlemanly: Shafer of Michigan tore the letter up before the House with a show of indignation at the idea that such a dirty trick should be played on politicians who have committed no crime but only made pledges they had no intention of fulfilling if they could possibly avoid it.

## PATIENCE HAS AN END

Following all of which, President Truman informed the press that he stands by his full civil-rights program.

This, of course, is accurate: Truman stands by the civil-rights program; Rayburn stands by Jim Crow; Truman stands by Rayburn; the civil-rights issue stands by until the elections take place; and no one's ox is gored—except that of 13 million Negroes.

This insult to the American people has been perpetrated just two weeks after some four thousand delegates of the Civil Rights Mobilization swarmed into Washington and received assurances from the leaders of both major parties that FEPC and the result of the civil-rights program would get top priority in legislative action. These delegates came from hundreds of National Association of Advancement for Colored People chapters, union locals and other mass organizations.

There is a vast host of people in America today who are determined to end racial and religious discrimination. For years the leaders of the NAACP, of the labor unions and of other organizations which oppose discrimination have told their people that the "practical" road of struggle for them leads through the Republican and Democrat Parties. They have counseled patience and loyalty to these political organizations—and particularly in recent years, to the Fair Deal wing of the Democrats led by Harry Truman.

Patience and loyalty will have their end. The conviction MUST some day break through that to break discrimination the Negroes and workers of all races in America must break from the Democratic Party and form a party of their own, a party controlled by them and subject to their will.