

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 11, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**THEY KNEW HOW TO FIGHT:
Flint Rally Recalls UAW's Tradition**

... page 6

It's a Free Country, Isn't It?

... page 3

Two Squeezed Lemons in Poland

... page 2

Reuther and Lewis Square Off in Flint —

Carry Out UAW Program In Fighting Spirit of '37!

By BEN HALL

John L. Lewis sallies into Flint, Mich., second stronghold of the United Auto Workers, to share the platform with Walter Reuther at a mass rally of auto workers. Ostensibly, the gathering meets as an anniversary celebration of the great sit-in strikes of the '30s; but the local sponsors, who belong to an anti-Reuther UAW caucus, are motivated by a dual purpose. They hope that the audience will greet Lewis with a cheering demonstration in public contrast with the restrained enthusiasm that UAW members have been displaying for their own president.

Such a backhanded slap at the UAW administration gives that strange coalition of the opposition the only slim consolation for its own inability to present an effective and serious platform for rallying the membership of the UAW.



John L. Lewis

However it has been concocted, we are about to witness a dramatic confrontation of two of America's best-known labor leaders whose political and social views are sharply opposed.

When Reuther was rising to power against the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist bloc, he capped his victory at a series of just such spectacular mass meetings where he met and defeated his rivals in open debate on the key questions before the union. This rally will not be a debate—officially—but the speakers and the audience will come prepared for a sort of debate on the problems of the labor movement in which the arguments are insinuated by implications, hints, and allusions.

NEED ACTION, NOT APPLAUSE

Reuther has now been in office for many years and faces the responsibility and duty of explaining and defending his policies and course of leadership before thousands of UAW members in a key auto center in the face of John L. Lewis, one of his sternest critics.

Will the rally become merely the scene of rival partisan demonstrations, with Reuther's friends and foes vying to beat the applause-drums for their respective heroes? If so, Reuther will have suffered a setback; for in his own union before his own membership he will have only held his own. His enemies will be jubilant.



Walter Reuther

But the militants who look to him for real leadership will be disappointed, and even those rank-and-filers who cheer most loudly for Lewis will go home realizing that little has been achieved to allay their own uneasy misgivings about the course of their union.

Or will this celebration be the occasion not only for reminding the UAW of its militant past but for pointing the way to its fighting future? Here at Flint, Reuther and his supporters have the opportunity to restate their program as a prelude for unifying the membership in action to carry it out. UAW militants rallied to Reuther to make the UAW "the vanguard in America and the architect of the future." They now await a program of action to make this a reality. They have the right to expect it and demand it from their leader, Walter Reuther. They cannot expect it from John L. Lewis; nor will they get it from him.

The Flint rally need not be written down as an erratic incident in the life of the UAW; it could become a milestone in its history.

(Continued on page 7)



See page 6
for
**"THEY KNEW HOW TO
FIGHT!"**
The UAW Tradition

Bevan Gains as Tories Squirm on Promises

By GORDON HASKELL

The development of events since the British elections last October, both on the domestic and foreign scenes, has strongly favored the Labor Party, and particularly the Bevan tendency within it. The Tories are riding hard for a fall.

This is borne out not only by an analysis of the events themselves, and of the attitude which the Conservatives and Laborites have taken toward them; recent public opinion polls show a sharp swing in sentiment for a return of the Labor Party to power.

In foreign affairs, the question of Britain's relations to the United States and its foreign policy is rapidly becoming a central political issue. Churchill's visit to the United States and his ambiguous statements about the agreements reached in Washington have done much to arouse suspicion and even fear in Britain that he has committed his government to support an American attack on China in the event the true negotiations fail in Korea.

His denials have also been so equivocal that they have failed to satisfy anyone.

LIFE NOT "BETTER"

One of Labor's most telling arguments during the election was that Churchill would imperil the peace. His actions since have given increased weight to that argument.

On the domestic scene, Labor's predictions that the Tories would attack the social services and seek to place a larger share of Britain's economic burdens on the backs of the poor have also been borne out with a vengeance, in the proposals placed before the House of Commons by Chancellor of the Exchequer Butler on January 30. Charges are to be imposed for pre-

(Turn to last page)

A TRAIL LEADS TO TRUMAN —

How the Old-Party Machines Breed Corruption Scandals

By BERNARD CRAMER

Attorney General McGrath's Justice Department has now found Newbold Morris to start its investigation of tax corruption, and the congressional Judiciary Committee has started its investigation of the Justice Department.

Not under investigation are the two agencies which stand behind both sets of investigators. These are Congress itself (or at least a whole slew of congressmen) and the White House itself. Trails sniffed out in the course of the present inquiries have already led to both.

And here is to be found, in our view, one of the main meaningful lessons of the scandals, even outside of its general significance in pointing up the corruptive influences in a money society.

In the case of Congress, it is a safe bet that there will be no encouragement to follow up on indications, in the testimony and other reports, that many a congressman availed himself of the influence of his office to intervene in tax cases for favored interests. A government bureau which wants generous appropriations from Congress is a little backward about ignoring hints of this nature when they come from members of the body which holds the pursestrings. Members of the congressional King Committee,

which set the present ball rolling on the tax scandals, found themselves involved in this manner.

TRUMAN SAID NO

Now a trail has also been laid to the White House, direct. It is worth noting, even in an election year when the smear is more important than politics, since it comes from a newspaper which has been a vigorous supporter of President Truman — the New York Post.

According to the Post's Washington correspondent William V. Shannon, it was Truman and not McGrath who was responsible for the continuance in office of the cyclone center of the present tempest, ex-Assistant Attorney General Caudle. As Shannon summarized his account the day after he broke it (January 29):

"The Post revealed that McGrath sought to dismiss Caudle, his chief of tax enforcement, nearly a year ago but Mr. Truman frustrated the plan for personal and political reasons of his own. When the president a few weeks ago decided to throw McGrath out of office for his failure to clean up the corruption problem, Senator Green (Dem., R. I.) and other friends of McGrath made it plain to Mr. Truman that they would reveal this earlier Truman-McGrath disagreement over Caudle to the

(Turn to last page)

UNESCO Conference Hits 'Apathy and Fear' in U.S.

By CHARLES STEWART

NEW YORK, Feb. 1—Against the ominous background of intensive preparation for World War III, the 3rd national conference of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) was held January 27-31 at Hunter College in the City of New York. More than 2000 delegates representing schools, colleges, farm groups, trade unions, religious bodies, and cultural organizations assembled around the theme of "The Citizens and the United Nations."

achievement of . . . the objectives [of world understanding] were: lack of international consciousness on behalf of students; lack of stimulation from faculty and administration; restrictions on international exchange of ideas and persons. . . .

This work-group division of college youth further recommended that "in order to promote UNESCO activities on the college campus, a serious effort should be made to protect and extend an atmosphere permissive to free discussion, recognizing that the political phenomenon best known as 'McCarthyism' and any and all other forms of censorship, loyalty oaths and restrictions on speakers are furthering apathy and fear of speaking freely on all issues; in light of the serious and often insurmountable obstacles to student exchange and travel imposed by the Internal Security Act of 1949 and the proposed McCarran Act regarding immigration which have and would stifle our attempts toward good will, we recommend that the National Commission investigate the best means for eliminating these obstacles."

The religious groups came out against "the pressure for conformity which threatens freedom and violates the dignity of the human spirit."

The scientists and engineers, in their work-group, stated: "We deplore the legal barriers in the U. S. which prevent the free exchange of scientists and the consequent mutual interchange of scientific knowledge and skills."

When these sentiments were expressed at the final summary session by several college youths, the remarks were greeted by thunderous applause.

AFL JAPAN, REP BARRED

Although labor was represented by delegations from the various educational departments of unions and the American Federation of Teachers, it was outweighed at the conference by the heavy concentration of delegates from middle-class community, church and educational institutions. The labor work-group therefore asked for increased representation on UNESCO, for exchange of workers, for more labor fellowships, and for support of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

While labor was asking this from the UNESCO conference, the embarrassing news came from Japan that Army General Ridgway had barred AFL representative Deverall from Japan. It seems that Deverall wanted to implement the Declaration of Human Rights and help the Japanese workers organize into free trade unions with the right to strike.

Again and again the general apathy of people toward world affairs was noted; and correctly this terror was directly traced to the fear generated by the hysterical witchhunt campaigns.

This dormant state of the people at the same time that they really are torn inwardly by the deepest anxiety about the world was described at the conference as the creeping paralysis of conformity to dominant reactionary forces through fear.

AGAINST CONFORMITY

Among the "chief obstacles standing in the way of the

tion of this monumental task of historiography.

The conference, despite many vague generalizations and false estimates of achieving peace through "collective security," pointed up the problems of race and religious antagonism, poverty, disease, and illiteracy and indicated a desire to attack these problems to the fullest capacity on a local as well as an international basis. The emphasis was not on achieving these ends through the UN or even through UNESCO, but through the coordinated efforts of local farm, labor, educational, and cultural groups.

Polish Stalinist Masters Dump 2 Squeezed Lemons

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The trial of Gomulka, ex-secretary-general of the Polish Stalinist party who was ousted as a "Titoist," involved broader circles of fellow travellers and Stalinists under suspicion. According to the Polish press abroad, also involved are Osobka-Morawski, "ex-premier" of Poland, and General Rola-Zymierski, "ex-marshal" of Poland (before Rokossovsky).

The careers of these two fellow travelers who are now arrested are known to our readers. Osobka-Morawski had not played any part in the Polish working-class movement, nor in the Communist movement, nor in the pre-war Polish Socialist Party (PPS). His "career" began at the time of the German occupation, when the Kremlin looked around for puppets for its future "Polish" government, to be made in Moscow.

Osobka, an unknown and obscure official of a cooperative store controlled by the PPS, was selected by Schwalbe, friend of Stalinist leader Bierut, as the "leader" of the manufactured split in the PPS; his group was organized by the GPU and labeled by it as the "RPPS" (Revolutionary PPS). In this guise he was elected by this party as its delegate to Moscow, and the GPU sent him there through the Russian-German front. He came back to Poland as the "president of the Lublin Committee" and later became "premier" of the "Polish government," nominated by Stalin and accepted by Roosevelt and Churchill.

BACK TO ASH CAN

Up to the time of the Lublin Committee, no one in Poland had ever heard the name of Osobka-Morawski. Osobka's split from the PPS had no political importance. It was organized by Bierut and the GPU in order to set up a "shadow party" to counter the real PPS and in order to convince Roosevelt and Churchill that the Lublin Committee was backed by "Polish democrats."

Osobka was the "premier" from 1945 to 1947 and served to consolidate the Stalinist regime in Poland, loyally serving the Kremlin as cover for the Russian occupation. He was more an agent of secret Russian policy than a political leader. In 1947 he was replaced by the new "leader of the PPS," Cyrankiewicz, who also was entirely unknown in pre-war days and who was "won over" by the Stalinists at the time of the German occupation.

There had been bad reports about Cyrankiewicz's conduct in the German concentration camp, but the Stalinists knew how to recognize a good tool. They were

Long Cleveland IUE-CIO Strike Ends with Gains for Workers

CLEVELAND, Feb. 2—Local 721 of the CIO electrical workers (IUE-CIO) ended its 22-week strike against the White Sewing Machine Company within the last 10 days.

These were some of the gains made in the new contract. Eight and a half cents hourly to be applied to a pension and retirement plan, to be jointly worked out by a committee of union and management representatives; the steward will be a part of the first-step grievance procedure whereas before the worker had no right to a union representative on the foreman level.

Though the union shop was not won the union now has the check-off, which is an improvement over

former contracts. With the new contract the union representative would be permitted to observe and participate in time-study checks and management would make available all records in case of dispute. While handling grievances a steward would receive his regular rate of pay.

The long-strike led by Jake Epstein, president of Local 721, meant hardship for many of older workers who were unable to find employment in other industries. Strike funds were not great enough to pay strike benefits and only emergency expenses were taken care of. Now that the strike is ended many of White Sewing's employees have found other jobs, some with higher rates of pay in other industries.

It's a Free Country, Isn't It? U.S. Purge System Does Not Use Torture...

By MARY BELL

In the Washington Trials of government employees to determine their loyalty a light is not shined in the victim's eyes, he is not beaten with a rubber hose, he is not forced to confess, he is not sent to a Siberian slave camp, and he is permitted to sit down during the hearings.

Old-fashioned notions on rules of evidence, it is true, have been streamlined away. If "reasonable doubt" is held about the employee, he is merely held disloyal—and the man expelled officially from government for treason, treachery and perjury is free to seek another job. . . .

In the recent hearing by the Internal Security subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the case of John Carter Vincent, the highly placed State Department employee, the evidence consisted of the say-so of Louis Budenz, who virtually makes a career of anti-Communism. The latter charged Vincent with being a member of the Communist Party and with guiding Henry Wallace into the CP's path on matters of foreign policy in China.

As Joseph and Stewart Alsop report in their column in the New York Herald Tribune of Feb. 4, Vincent's participation in the Wallace mission to China resulted in the recommendation to dismiss the pro-Chinese Stalinist commander, General Stilwell, and to replace him with the anti-Communist General Wedemeyer.

The Vincent Case

In the committee hearings, the Alsops point out that "No attempt was made to prove he was a Communist. No one ventured a single question suggesting that the real result of the Wallace mission, the recommendation to dismiss Stilwell, was not profoundly anti-Communist. No one so much as mentioned the main facts on the case."

The McCarran committee tried, rather, to show that Vincent had miscalculated in his estimate of the Chinese situation in the post-war years. Carter was grilled on the tendency of excerpts from works of Owen Lattimore and others. The Alsops write that "In the end, this man who had been publicly accused of being an active and trusted member of the Communist Party, was also accused of not knowing what communism really was."

Not only did the questioners reveal extreme ignorance of Chinese policy, but wound up holding Vincent responsible for the directive of his chief, former Secretary of State Byrnes, that the Chinese Nationalists and Communists get together.

The columnists conclude with a scathing comment on the methods of the committee and the state of democracy:

"The lawyers and the senators were able to beat both Vincent and the facts of history over the head with their brass knuckles, without any irritating opposition. None the less, the question remains whether the American liberties and deencies are still worth a tinker's dam, when this sort of investigative procedure can be used in a case involving a capital charge."

Writing in the New Republic of February 4, the Rev. A. Powell Davies, minister of All Soul's Church (Unitarian) in Washington, relates several of numerous cases involving loyalty of government employees that have come to his attention for discussion or intervention on behalf of the accused and dismissed.

"Do You Read Books?"

He tells of an almost blind woman working in a routine job having nothing to do with security who, many years ago while resident in France, had entertained some radical politicians, some friendly to Russia. When questioned, she admitted the truth of this charge and defended her right as an American to entertain whom she wished. She was dismissed and, only as a result of publicity invoked by Davies, was reinstated.

Rev. Davies notes some of the questions asked in such hearings: "Do you read a good many books?" "What newspapers do you buy or subscribe to?" "How do you explain the fact that

you have an album of Paul Robeson records in your home?" "Do you ever entertain Negroes in your home?" Simply to quote them is to show the mentality of the inquisitors.

The case is told of another young woman dropped from government because of a ten-day membership in the Communist Party abroad. She resigned after that brief interlude because a CP official told her what friends and acquaintances she must either drop or cultivate. Viewing this incident as an escapade, she answered under oath her real conviction that she had not joined the party. Her false statement discovered, both she and her husband were dismissed from government. The husband was so afflicted with "loyalty jitters" that he threatened to separate from his wife.

Charge: Marital Fidelity

Another example convinces one that a screening board for prospective mates of government employees is highly in order. The following quotation is taken from a statement of the chairman in the "secret" minutes of the Loyalty Review Board, which we shall deal with later, and which have been circulated by that arsenal of secret information, Senator McCarthy:

"For instance, in the State Department, there is a case of a man who might be said to be a rather weak sister. There is no evidence that he is a Communist. His wife, on the other hand, who is not in the State Department, has a very close association with Communists. She, at one time, saw a good deal of them in the days before they went underground in Washington.

"I came to this conclusion: that, living with his wife, he was undoubtedly loyal to this wife; and, from all the evidence, he could not be loyal to his wife and at the same time be loyal to the U. S. government in the sense in which I think loyalty deserves to be used. There is no way in which you can get him out of the government service under the present rule, but you can have reasonable doubt as to his loyalty. . . ."

"Reasonable Doubt"—in Doubt

The history of still another dismissed employee told by Rev. Davies involves his attending a few meetings, later becoming hostile to Stalinism, serving with credit in World War II, rapid progress after entering government service, denunciation, admission to his superior that he attended meetings — dismissal. According to Davies, the man, contemplating no future, was intent upon suicide.

In his criticism of the loyalty procedures the anti-Communist Rev. Davies poses several important questions: Why suppose that people who change their minds on other questions cannot do the same in the case of Stalinism? Why should there be a "reasonable doubt" about people who joined the Communist Party and left it, when there is no doubt about others who may have been secretly attracted but never joined? Why should not the Kremlin know far more about atomic matters through its scientists than the American people know?

Seth Richardson of the conservative Washington law firm, who has been chairman of the two main boards concerned with measuring the political loyalty of American citizens, dispels any notion that one can determine what the doctrine of "reasonable doubt" is let alone apply it. Richardson, Truman's appointee, was not even tainted with New Dealism, having served under Hoover, Harding and Coolidge.

In an interview with Arnold Heidenheimer of the New Republic, he reveals: "You know what I did one Christmas. I told the board: 'I'm going to give you all a dice-box, and you can throw the

dice. If they come out even, he's guilty, and if they're odd, he's not. You know, I think we'll do as well as we have been doing."

"There never was a minute," says Richardson, "when I was sure of everything I was doing." He adds, "I've been a lawyer for 50 years and I don't know what 'reasonable doubt' is, and I don't think anyone else knows."

S-54 Reporting. . . .

The "reasonable doubt" clause was introduced by Richardson's successor, ex-Senator Hiram Bingham, last year. While the committee is still instructed to find "reasonable grounds," it may use its discretion on determining "reasonable doubt."

Even so, McCarran was not satisfied that Richardson was a good risk: he was a law partner of Joseph Davies of Mission to Moscow. But the fact that Donald Richberg, who helped to write the McCarran Law, was also a member of the firm did not help him in McCarran's view.

The board's information comes mainly from FBI reports in which operative "T-6 or S-54" charges that the employee attended Communist meetings in 1935 or was active in the "inner circle" of a front group in 1943." The defendant does not know from whom the charges come and his lawyers cannot cross-examine the anonymous accuser.

The minutes of the board are supposed to be secret—but Senator McCarthy obtained a copy and has spread them around. They are the basis for McCarthy's wild utterances against the conduct of the "super-blue ribbon" jury composed of rock-bound conservatives. The minutes are used in the current U. S. News and World Report for another of the typically alarmist stories titled, "State Department Lax on Loyalty Cases?"

Meeting the Quota

In an extract from the "secret" minutes, present Chairman Hiram Bingham reveals the mentality about which Richardson complained—so mildly:

"Mr. Hoag (Board Member): That brings up a question that has been on my mind a little, and I have been accused a few times in connection with it. I have been disturbed about the State Department—their remarkable record of never having fired anybody for loyalty, and yet we do nothing about it as far as the Board is concerned. . . ."

"Chairman Bingham: Your present chairman thought about that for a couple of weeks and took counsel of two persons in whom he had confidence, and then asked for an appointment with the secretary of state. The secretary of state, who is a very busy man, very graciously gave me an appointment last Friday afternoon. . . . I called his attention to the fact that his board was out of step with all other agency boards. In the Post Office Department, 10 per cent of all persons examined were found to be worthy of separation from the government. In the Commerce Department, 6 1/2 per cent. The average was about 6 per cent. The State Department, zero."

In other words, the State Department hadn't met its quota for disloyalty! Another board member charges the State Department with pursuing too "vigorously" the policy of telling an employee that charges will be filed against him unless he resigns. According to the board, the procedure should be to hold the hearing and then, in mitigating circumstances, permit the employee to resign so that his record service will show no charge. The board is exercised because the State Department has shown no loyalty discharge in two and a half years.

The administration has been the butt of so much of the witchhunt and disloyalty charges, that it is conveniently forgotten that today's avalanche of loyalty probes was begun with President Truman's initial push when he launched the "security" program.

But no floodlamps are used, no truth serum, and the defendant is permitted to sit down.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM
by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
The Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME
(PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS APT.....
CITY ZONE STATE

Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.



WITH HIGH INTEREST IN PATRIOTISM

Along with Truman's economic State of the Union report to Congress in January went also, as usual, the report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. One of the three advisers is John D. Clark, formerly vice president of Standard Oil of Indiana, president of Midwest Refinery Company and professor of economics in several colleges. No radical. . . .

In the council's annual review, Clark strongly took issue with his two colleagues about bankers—particularly about the bankers' victory in getting Washington to pay them a higher interest on government bonds.

The bankers had argued for a raise in the interest on the kind of government bonds which banks "buy" (they buy them by making an entry on the books) on the ground that this interest boost would help to hold down inflation. Patriots they are, not profiteers. Clark said the argument didn't impress him.

The result of it, he said, was this: "It enabled banks to increase their profits more than enough to pay the increase in their taxes in 1951."

Other people, even other businessmen, were called on to contribute more to the war budget, but not the bankers.

The rise in the government bond interest rate also enabled the bankers to raise the interest which they charged on loans to private borrowers. (This was also for the patriotic motive of holding down inflation.)

In illustration of what this meant: the magazine *Business Week* cited a typical report as telling its stockholders:

"Your bank took in a lot more revenue from interest on loans in 1951 than ever in its 115-year history. That's because it loaned more money than ever before, and charged a higher rate for it than since the early 1930s."

EMBEZZLEMENT AMONG BANKERS

At the same time we learn that crookedness is increasing among banking officials. The conservative *U. S. News and World Report* says: "All the scandals aren't in the government. That's shown by the steady increase in bank embezzlements—from 270 in 1946 to 638 in 1951."

AND ON THE OTHER HAND—

The Department of Labor reported some time ago that, on the basis of October 1950 costs, the average city worker with a wife and two children needed an annual income of between \$3309 and \$3727—an average of \$3518—to provide a "modest but adequate" standard of living for his family.

The AFL's *Monthly Survey* for January brought these figures more up to date with some significant results. By last November, it found, the same families would need from \$3709 to \$4354—or an average of \$4055—to maintain a similar standard of living. The figures differ for various cities.

On an average, such a family would need \$564 or 16 per cent more a year than it did in January 1950 to make ends meet. Of this increase, \$156 would be needed to pay increased taxes and the rest to buy the same necessities at increased prices.

NO ONE WENT TO JAIL

In January the federal Food and Drug Administration reported that in the latter half of 1951 six million tons of food had been seized as unfit for human use. Such seized food contains all kinds of filth. The Food and Drug Administration can check only a relatively small amount of the food that actually goes on the market and is bought.

The report lists 20 convictions of corporations and individuals during December, for such violations, with fines up to \$3000 collected in single cases. Not a single defendant was sent to jail. In December alone, 140 shipments of foods, drugs and other preparations were seized under the federal Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act.

An Encyclopedia of Current Politics . . .

That describes the

BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION

Still available for the years 1945 to 1949

\$3.00 a volume

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 6

February 11, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Assf. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIXS

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

DEBT OF DISHONOR, by Anne M. Fisher.—The Reporter, Feb. 5.

The crime that was committed against the West Coast Japanese-Americans, when they were rushed from their homes, farms and jobs and into concentration camps on a few hours' notice, is being further compounded today.

The Claims Division of the Justice Department, which is supposed to compensate them for their losses, has spent 10 times as much in investigations than it has paid out in indemnities (\$25,000). In comparison, the claims filed total \$133 million, and "A conservative estimate of the total economic losses suffered by the evacuees has been set at between \$350 million and \$400 million."

The article's details on the red-tape and questionnaire run-around given the claimants by the attorney general's office would be material for a shocking satire on bureaucracy—were it not for the suspicion that here the red-tape is deliberately intended to cheat the victims out of even the paltry recompense which Congress voted.

"In August 1951, the Evacuation Claims Act was amended to give evacuees an alternative to

waiting. By slashing their claims to one-fourth and answering massive questionnaires, they were promised speedier payment." The questionnaires to be filled out required minute information on the history of every pot and pan (e.g., "type, size, brand, model, year of manufacture," etc.) as well as on how it was sold, when much of the selling took place under the forced pressure of peddlers while the people were virtually being herded out of their homes.

Quoting the following from some government notices to claimants: "Claimants possess occurring during internment not compensable. Losses during that period payable only to extent of wife's interest therein."—Miss Fisher comments: "Inherent in that ruling, if it is allowed to stand, is a dangerous international precedent that could open the door for confiscation of property of U. S. citizens in foreign countries." "The idea of the evacuation was born in California's rich Santa Maria Valley, where Japanese farmers held a dominant position in supplying and marketing fruits and vegetables for the vast Los Angeles market, and it was there that the FBI immediately took into custody every prominent Japanese farmer. . . .

New Issue of 'Vpered' Discusses

Kremlin Nationalism & 'Super-Kolkhozes'

The latest issue of VPERED is in (No. 7-8, 1951). As our readers know, VPERED is the organ, published in emigration, of the Marxist wing of the Ukrainian anti-Stalinist resistance movement. As usual, its English page summarizes the important articles.

Below is its summary of two. The "Russian émigrés" whose views are discussed in the first are the right-wing Russian émigrés whose best-known figure is Kerensky. (See LA for last July 16, "Holy Water for the Tsar.") The English is a bit rough in spots but we present it as is.

"Stalinism, the Modern Form of Russian Imperialism" is the theme of an article by A. Babenko. The main argument of the Russian émigrés was that bolshevism is not a Russian national but an international manifestation. We understand the motives of the Russian émigrés, but this thesis is not only false, not only does it contradict the facts, but it even does harm, since it tries to whitewash the slavedriver in the East, Russian imperialism, and to put the blame for its crimes on international communism.

The facts are diametrically opposed to this thesis. As long as bolshevism remained international, it allowed the peoples dependent on Russian bolshevism to criticize the latter and to appreciate the merits of national heroes for the liberation of the nations (e.g. in the Ukraine Mazepa, in the Caucasus Shamil); it allowed the Ukrainians to work for the deepening of their national consciousness and even carried through the de-Russification of various nationalities.

As soon as Bolshevism appealed to the Russian nationalist traditions (cult of Peter I, Suvorov and other leading Russian imperialists) the tradition of Russification became alive again.

The Russian émigrés put forward the argument: in the Kremlin are not only Russians, but also Ukrainians and Jews, and Stalin himself is a Georgian. In history all the different absolutisms were international, since the dynasties in the different countries were intermixed by marriages and so on. But never in history would a ruler of any dynasty have chosen a policy opposed to the interest of the country he ruled over. The German Catherine was a Russian Czarina and she never followed a pro-German policy.

That is characteristic for all the rules, even the bolshevist one. In the past Russia has made even the Comintern the tool of its politics. For instance during the N. E. P., i.e. a purely internal change in Soviet politics, the Comintern prescribed to the Western CP's the line of collaboration with the peasantry, and right-wingers of the Party were forced into leading positions even against the will of the membership. (In the German CP Masloff and Ruth Fischer for example were dismissed and replaced by Brandler.) But when Stalin made the "right" turn, all over the world the rightists became persecuted.

Another example: In 1925 the Ukrainian CP protested in the Comintern against the Russian CP, because the Russian party followed an imperialist policy in the Ukraine. This protest was supported by all CP's. In spite of that, the protest was rejected both by the Russian CP and the Comintern.

Such sins were committed even in the very beginning, but in the thirties the transition to Russian imperialism was admitted quite openly. It would naturally be false to confuse Russian imperialism and the Russian people. There can be no doubt that even to-day all honest Russians are sickened with the chauvinist cries of the Stalinists.

The national policy of contemporary bolshevism has nothing in common with internationalism nor with world revolution. What has, for example, the expulsion of the Germans of East Prussia or the compulsory study of the Russian language in Czech-

oslovakia in common with the interest of international communism? Was it in the interest of international communism that during the mass famine in the Ukraine in 1933 thousands of Ukrainians went to Russia in order to buy back the bread they were robbed of?

If the Russian émigrés really want to fight Stalinism under the banner of Kerensky or of others who call themselves democrats, they have to change their ideology. They must stop calling bolshevism a "Jewish-international communism."

One has to understand the actual state of affairs in the USSR: The fight of the new, propertyless society for freedom and democracy against Stalinist reaction which speculates on the primitive Russian chauvinist instincts in order to safeguard better its rule. . . .

An article by Vs. Felix is entitled "The Significance and Prospects of the New Reform of Collective Farms." It thoroughly analyzes the recent situation in Soviet agriculture with regard to the reform of consolidation of small kolkhozes.

The author points out that the recent reform is "of a totally bureaucratic character"; it has been carried out illegally—without any formal decree without any open discussion in the Supreme Soviet of the Union (the highest legislative body of the USSR), and even against the existing agricultural laws and legislation: the special law of September 1932, which has never been abolished, forbids the consolidation of kolkhozes.

The purely economic reasons for this new agricultural reform, Vs. Felix says, have been the following: The urgent need for the rise of productivity in agriculture; the need for some effective utilization of agricultural machines because there now exists an underproduction of them; the need for preservation of the relations in production because "the new productive forces inside of the kolkhoz-system have already come into conflict with the old productive forces"; and the need for a new release of labor force from agriculture into expanding heavy industry. Vs. Felix describes the reform in general economic terms as the "highest and last stage of concentration of capital in agriculture."

The social purposes the reform serves are the following: Complete liquidation of the peasantry as a social class; liquidation of social-economic differences between the city and the country,—that is the complete socialization of labor,—and the further strengthening of the class control of the bureaucracy over the processes of production and distribution.

The first result of the reform of consolidation of kolkhozes is the following: The agricultural quota under the Five-Year Plan (1946-1950) has not been fulfilled. However, Vs. Felix considers this a temporary issue, assuming that the organization of production in the big consolidated collective farm has not yet been mastered. But on the other hand, this issue can be also considered as the first sign that the bureaucracy becomes an open hindrance to the economic program.

Another result of the reform has been an increase in the quotas of obligatory deliveries of agricultural products to the state (a rise of more than 20 per cent). As to the prospects of the farther development of the reform, Vs. Felix says it has become quite possible now to transform the kolkhoz-members into simple agricultural workers giving them their wages in money rather than in agricultural products. In the author's opinion this is one of the aims of the recent Stalinist policy.

In conclusion, Vs. Felix demands the reconsideration by the émigré political parties of their agrarian programs in the light of that reform because "many a program still stinks of restorationist anachronism and corresponds neither to historical necessity nor to reality in our country."

Youth and Student Corner

A College Puts ROTC Across—with Suitable Methods

By JESSE A. BIEBER

SALEM, Ore., Jan. 31—Willamette University is not a large school, but it is the oldest university on the Pacific Coast, and has long been highly regarded in the humanities field, it is affiliated to the Methodist Church, but neither its small size, its age, its standing in the humanities nor its religious emphasis is enough to protect it from the growing militarization which now affects almost every campus in the country.

Early in 1951, without any previous notice or discussion, the administration presented the students with a form bearing the following question: *What is your reaction to the establishment on the W. U. campus of an Air Force ROTC unit on a permanent basis? What is your reaction to the establishment on the W. U. campus of an Air Force unit for the duration of the present emergency only?*

Nowhere was it indicated whether AFROTC would be required or whether it would be offered as an elective. The *Willamette Collegian* carried an article three days later stating that "[President] Smith did not know if membership in the unit would be compulsory." In view of the fact that the decision whether ROTC is to be compulsory is always left up to the school, the truth of this remark is questionable.

On March 12, about a month later, the Student Council considered a revote with an explicit statement on whether ROTC was to be compulsory or voluntary. The next day, President Smith told a group from the council that "there is no need for a revote, because the question of its being compulsory is purely academic, since if one is not in the ROTC, he will be drafted." A letter in the *Collegian* from Smith on March 16 said in part: "The question of whether or not this program will be required of all men students cannot be answered at this time, and it is almost completely academic. . . . The rights of conscientious objectors who are opposed to military (service on religious) grounds are recognized and they are exempt from ROTC on the same basis as from other military service. . . ."

Squeeze Put on Students

On April 21 at a meeting of the Oregon Methodist Student Movement, a group of over 50 Willamette Students who were opposed to ROTC was organized under the name of the Student Christian Social Action Committee, which promptly published a statement which resulted in much comment and discussion.

On the 27th of April, the *Collegian* carried the results of the February poll indicating that both students and faculty had voted heavily in favor of an ROTC unit, although it was known earlier that the faculty had been made to understand at the time they voted that the course would be offered as an elective. On May 1, the *Collegian* carried an article disclosing that ROTC would be made compulsory for entering freshmen starting in the fall, and that the unit had been established permanently.

Shortly after this, several students were urged by various faculty members to cease and desist in their opposition to the establishment of an AFROTC unit.

During the following summer, the Annual Conference of the Methodist Church in Oregon, which supposedly controls Willamette, voted in Salem 89-74 to ask the unit's removal at the earliest possible date. The conference appointed a committee to look into the whole affair, and to consider the establishment of a Peace Department at Willamette.

Despite the repeated assertion by President Smith and other university spokesmen that ROTC would be required only of those students subject to the draft, specifically exempting conscientious objectors, a freshman, Lawrence Monk, a CO, had his petition exemption denied on the ground that, being under 18½, he was not eligible for the draft, and hence had not received classification as an objector. He was given three alternatives: to leave Willamette, to take the course, or to register as a part-time student taking less than eleven hours' credit. Other students have since been denied exemption on the same basis.

Reaching the Faculty Members

Since these events, two of the faculty members who signed Monk's petition, Dr. Alfred Sheets and Dr. E. C. Kollman, have been told they will not be rehired next year. Although Dr. Kollman is the whole Philosophy Department and Dr. Sheets is one of the two members of the Sociology Department, and many students major in each department, the firings are ostensibly for financial reasons. Shortly before President Smith told Kollman that he would not be rehired, he had questioned Dr. Kollman about his part in the conference which resulted in the establishment of the Social Action Committee. Kollman had defended the students' right to form the committee. Dr. Sheets, who was supposedly on the committee which fired Dr. Kollman, was never notified of its meeting. Interestingly enough, Dr. Kollman had just been promoted to Associate Professor from Assistant Professor the same year. Over 400 students have already signed a statement protesting his dismissal.

Dr. Sheets, who is probably the most popular professor at Willamette, was told that his contract would not be renewed only two days after he had publicly challenged the statement of Dean Gregg (a self-styled "fighting Quaker") that participation of students in ROTC would not jeopardize their CO status with Selective Service.

The firings, allegedly for reasons of economic "retrenchment," can be evaluated in the light of the fact that 1064 students registered this fall as compared to 1069 in the same semester last year! As a result of the "retrenchment," one professor will teach both philosophy and religion. Keep in mind that Willamette is a denominational college!

Fittingly enough, President Smith has told Dr. Kollman that, with the coming of the ROTC to Willamette's campus, the emphasis at Willamette would change from the humanities to natural science and business.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

ON A VACATION IN SUNNY CALIFORNIA

To the Editor:

You may be interested in my reactions as a socialist on a 2000-mile vacation trip to "sunny Southern California."

Slowly and inexorably and with the certainty of fate, the conditions of many sections of the working class in the "Golden State" are worsening. Every winter with the advent of cold weather, thousands of workers leave the adjacent states and head Californiaward to bask in its sunshine. The interior of California is an immense agricultural empire composed of two vast valleys, the Sacramento and the San Joaquin; these are about 150 miles wide and hundreds of miles long. As far as the eye can see the fertile and level lands stretch far away. Here are some of the largest ranches and farms in the nation. Here is employed an army of almost half a million agricultural laborers. The city of Sacramento is the center of this area; it is the biggest migratory labor market of the Pacific Coast. The average agricultural wage in Sacramento is \$5 and \$6 a day, plus board; this, of course, is a mere

pittance in these days of inflation. A working-class meal that could be had 2 and 3 years ago for 50 or 60 cents costs a dollar today. A decent and clean hotel room cannot be obtained for less than a dollar and a half a night. While inflation has upped the prices of the necessities of life about 20 per cent in the last two years, wages have remained almost stationary.

Into this rich agricultural region there have come during the last few years thousands of "Okies" and "Arkies" from Oklahoma and Arkansas. These persons lost their all in the dust storms of their native states; the "native son" of California regarded their coming with apprehension, but they stayed, and every slack season they become a "problem" for the county relief authorities. Whole communities have had to be subsidized, for their miserable wages will not carry them over the year. John Steinbeck dramatized their life in his famous *Grapes of Wrath*—for the moving picture rights of which he received \$60,000. But a socialist will look in vain for a

solution in his book.

California has become the second state in the union in regard to population, ranking next to New York. This is also the home of the Bank of America, the world's largest bank; its branches are in every city and town of consequence in the state. It is easy to understand the power such an organization wields in politics; this was already demonstrated at the time of Upton Sinclair's campaign for governor on a ticket to relieve unemployment during the depression days, when the Bank of America was largely instrumental in defeating him.

California has become one of

the most important states in capitalist America and volumes could be written on it. But the story of its potentialities from a socialist point of view has yet to be written. Discounting what the real-estate sharks of Los Angeles say, still its climate is generally attractive; blue skies above, golden sunshine all about you the greater part of the year, a wonderfully fertile and productive soil. Can we not say, paraphrasing Marx: "What wonderfully productive forces slumber in the lap of social labor" in such a region organized under a socialist economy? John HOWARD

In English for the First Time!

Rosa Luxemburg's THE ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL

Yale University Press • 475 pages • \$5
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

THEY KNEW HOW TO FIGHT! Flint Rally Recalls UAW's Great Struggles

By WALTER JASON
DETROIT, Feb. 3—Since only a small handful, certainly not over 10 per cent, of the active leaders of the great sit-down strike victories of 1937 that organized the auto workers' union are still functioning in the union movement, the celebrations in Flint and later in Detroit of the 15th anniversaries of the General Motors and Chrysler strikes assume special importance.

They afford a rare opportunity to refresh the memory of the union movement about those historic days that marked a genuine turning point in labor's struggles, and to draw inspiration from the deeds of the early militants who risked everything for their belief in unionism.

It is not accidental that the enthusiasm for and planning of the celebrations came from local unions in Flint and in Detroit. It is in keeping with the early traditions of the UAW-CIO. And these traditions stand in powerful contrast with the present-day trends and developments in the auto workers' union.

For the early history of the auto workers' union centers around two key words: democracy and militancy.

In its organizational structure, the UAW-CIO was born out of a bitter, sharp and never-ending struggle against the bureaucracy of the AFL which was not broken until the May 1936 convention at South Bend, Indiana. The concept of a democratic union, with frequent conventions and elections, with power in the ranks, and organized on an industrial-union basis, was the guiding conviction of the young unionists who finally defeated the AFL hierarchy.

In its union building, the UAW-CIO grew out of a series of class struggles that take their place with labor's greatest strikes. From the Toledo Auto-Lite strike, through the General Motors sit-down strike, the pattern was one of violence against unionism. Sheer physical force on the picket line was the only real weapon labor had against the National Guard, the cops, the injunctions, the double-dealing. This union was built the hard way!

Perhaps the strangest fact about the triumph of the auto workers' union was that it wasn't planned that way.

John L. Lewis, creator of the CIO in November 1935, and his ten AFL dissident international union presidents, saw the key to industrial unionism in the organization of the steel industry first. And they poured a million dollars into an organ-

izing drive to accomplish that aim.

But the sit-downs in Akron, the Goodyear strike victory early in 1936, and the spreading wildfire of sit-downs in the auto industry changed the picture. GM workers didn't go by strategy. They resisted efforts to keep them "under control." By January 1937 major GM plants in America were shut down tight. And John L. changed his plans.

When General Motors turned down all union demands on January 4, and obtained an infamous injunction from Judge Black ordering the sit-downers to leave the plants, every union leader in the UAW-CIO knew what that meant. The company and the cops would try to bust the strike.

They tried on January 11, at Fisher plant No. 2. Four hours later, the cops retreated in what became famous as the "Battle of Bulls' Run." Fourteen union men were shot, dozens injured, and hundreds of strike sympathizers were tear-gassed, but the sit-downers held firm. And the street was in the possession of the strikers.

Governor Frank Murphy ordered out the National Guard. It was unnecessary. The union had everything under control. General Motors demanded the Guard be used to drive out the sit-downers. This suicidal course was rejected.

Getting the men to leave the plants became a matter of negotiations. It almost worked. The union agreed to evacuate the plants, although the men in the plants grumbled at the agreement. Fortunately, a reporter discovered a telegram showing that GM intended to doublecross the union once the plants were cleared. The boys in Flint sat tight. Elsewhere it was too late to get them back in the plants.

But time, hunger and poverty began to work their way into the desperate ranks of the General Motors workers. Something big and dramatic was needed to supply a new punch to the strike. It came. It was the strategy of seizing the key Chevy plant No. 4, where all GM motor assembly was done.

The Ladies Auxiliary led by Genora Johnson raised hell at Chevy 9. It was a brilliant diversion. Inside that plant, unionists and company guards fought man to man. It looked like the major move of the union. Taking Chevy 4 during the excitement was relatively easy. The stool-pigeons and the cops had been fooled.

If words could destroy a strike, the editorials in the daily press certainly massacred the sit-

downers. Calling them "Communists" was wild language. It was an insurrection, according to the magazine *Business Week*.

The spirit of the strikers was high. Morale was tops. What was needed now was a first-rate leader at the top, to handle the company, to resist the pressure of the anxious Governor Murphy, to scorn the editorial barrage against the union.

The Flint leaders called John L. Lewis. For he fitted the bill. And he came, ignoring the pleas of President Roosevelt that the strike be called off, blasting the arrogant company officials, and calming down the excited officials in Lansing.

Lewis seemed to thrive under the pressure. When Governor Murphy said he would have to use the troops to clear the plants, Lewis told him he'd be at the front line of the pickets defending the plants.

And in the plants, the sit-downers had informed the world through special resolutions that they weren't going to be driven out, no matter what sacrifice it took.

General Motors capitulated on February 11. It signed an agreement with the UAW-CIO for seventeen plants. On March 8, Chrysler was shut down by sit-down strikes. Five weeks later, John L. Lewis signed his name to the first agreement with Chrysler, on behalf of the union.

Three things stand out from that struggle. The rank and file knew and believed in unionism, as an organization capable of fighting the company.

They were inspired by the young hard-working organizers and union officials—no one called them porkchoppers in those days. For being a union representative meant being first on the picket line, first in jail, first in sacrifice. Is it a wonder that the ranks had confidence in the union leaders? The union leaders responded to the faith of the ranks, by outdoing themselves in organizing and working for the union. This was the real spirit of 1937! This is what is so tragically lacking in the auto workers' union today, as it tends to become more and more a porkchoppers union, with "lost-time" as the reason for union activity.

As a symbol of the militancy of those times, John L. Lewis also made his contribution. The greater the pressure, the stronger the union stood firm. Both he and the union held the politicians in contempt, the daily newspapers in scorn, and the industrialists as mere mortals, not masters!

Thomas and Left Prepare for Showdown in SP

As the Socialist Party nears its forthcoming national convention, it would seem that both tendencies in it are preparing for something like a showdown, judging by two developments made public in the SP press.

Norman Thomas, element whom the right-wing elements are grouped, has published a call for the formation of a new "Cooperative Commonwealth Association." In his own column in the *Socialist Call* (Dec. 21) he writes that "Some of us are working on the formation of a kind of educational society or fellowship of democratic socialists which will be neither a political party nor a substitute for a political party." Two "preliminary conferences" have already been held in New York, comprising members of the Social Democratic Federation and unorganized socialists as well as SPers, and an "organizing conference" is planned in "about three months."

Thomas writes that "this projected society can never take the place of a Socialist Party," but the project has understandably aroused articulate suspicion in party ranks, particularly of course among the left-wingers who are opposed to Thomas' line on war and electoral action.

The reason for the suspicion is clear when one remembers that Thomas is for the virtual aban-

donment of electoral action by the SP, and the confining of its activities to—more or less the same sort that he now outlines for a Cooperative Commonwealth Association!

READING SPEAKS
It is to be doubted that Thomas is directly aiming at liquidation of the SP. It makes more sense perhaps to suppose (a) that he is preparing for the defeat of his own point of view at the party convention, and/or (b) the waning-away of the SP as a result of his own proposals and the gradual substitution of the new group for the old party.

Likewise in preparation for the forthcoming convention, an important section of the Socialist Party, the local in Reading, Penn., has adopted a left-wing resolution of its own with some vigorous and forthright language on the SP's orientation. (It was published in the *Reading Labor Advocate*, Jan. 25.)

"At a time when America and the world needs a strong American Socialist Party, members of the party itself approach their forthcoming national convention in Cleveland in a state of confusion," begins the resolution. The confusion is ascribed to the way in which the anti-Thomas resolutions of the last convention have been "lost by hesitation and inde-

cision," a rather diplomatic way of putting it.

"Without questioning the motives of individuals, we find the party split apart by conflicting loyalties," it continues. It points to those in the party "whose sensitivity to the threat of communist world domination leads them to believe that our major task lies in the defeat of that threat even to the point of making common cause with capitalism." For their part the Reading Socialists raise "Neither Moscow nor Washington" as "the rallying slogan of our program," laying it down as the task of socialists to fight both capitalism and Stalinism.

FOR CLEAR BREAK
Noteworthy about the resolution is its view that it is the war question which is behind the struggle, with the issue of electoral action derivative. "However," it states, "we wish to lay before the membership of the party the real issue of this convention—whether the Socialist Party shall have any further reason for its existence and how that existence can be made worthwhile." It is certainly acutely true that the orientation pushed by Thomas would not only leave no room for the existence of a Socialist Party, but indeed flows from a political position which gives it no reason for existence

as an independent anti-capitalist (as well as anti-Stalinist) movement.

"On the issues of the day that would mark us off as being apart from the governing bodies of our nation," says Reading, "we have been politely silent and in some instances collaborative. We have indeed had little reason for existence except as a tradition and a muddling hope."

"What this convention must do therefore in order to meet the very real crisis in our existence is to make a clear break with certain tendencies in the party and if need be with certain individuals . . ."

"What then are the crucial issues upon which the American people deserve to be given the opportunity to express themselves? War and mounting reaction are the paramount challenges confronting socialists throughout the world. Let us prepare a program against both and clear the decks of our party for the struggle. Even if only a fraction of our membership can be involved in this fight we can save our party from organizational death. . . ."

"If such a program of opposition is evolved at the convention and an NEC is elected that has the will to carry it out, those who are busy apologizing for American imperialism, and who want us to become a national coalition in the

manner of MacDonald, may leave the party. But at least we shall have a Socialist Party that is socialist, and has not betrayed the heritage that we have the privilege to uphold."

In these words the Reading Socialists undoubtedly speak for many sections of the SP and its youth group who are opposed to seeing the party go down the road pointed to it by Norman Thomas.

Enemies of socialism may take heart over the Thomas wing's apparent orientation toward liquidation of the Socialist Party in one way or another; and ex-radicals of various years' standing may be gladdened that, in his own peculiar way, Thomas is giving comfort to their reasons for retreating from the fight for socialism; but the sympathy of Independent Socialists will be with those who refuse to falter in the struggle against "war and mounting reaction."

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.
SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Carry Out UAW Program

(Continued from page 1)

This will be Lewis' second appearance before the UAW ranks in less than a year. In June, he was the featured speaker at a 10th anniversary celebration of the founding of Ford Rouge Local 600. The administration of this local, headed by Carl Stellato, has been fighting Reuther since the last UAW convention and undoubtedly invited Lewis as a rebuke to Reuther. Reuther, who was also invited, disdained to appear on the same program with his prominent rival, erroneously believing that without his support the rally would be a well-publicized flop and the Lewis bubble in the UAW would burst. But thousands of UAW members from all over the Detroit area jammed the hall to cheer Lewis and snicker at his hardly concealed quips and digs at Reuther and Reutherism.

The UAW leadership had miscalculated badly. The rally became an important expression of a mounting discontent in the ranks of the UAW. The meeting in Flint is an attempt by Reuther's opponents to repeat their performance of June.

What Can Lewis Offer Now?

But this time Reuther is compelled to mount the platform to recoup what was lost in June. His decision to do so is an open admission of the growing internal difficulties of the union and a recognition of the need to face them.

What the UAW requires at this point is a call from its leadership to translate the social program of the union into action. That, above all, is what is lacking. Those who support the union and its program, those who put the present administration into office, must insist that it fulfill its responsibility.

John L. Lewis has led many inspiring and heroic miners' struggles; but it detracts nothing from the record of these battles to say what must be said now. Lewis has little or nothing to offer in finding a solution to the basic problems of the UAW.

Militants are justified in criticizing the UAW leadership for not carrying out its own social program with militancy and determination. But John L. Lewis ridicules not the weaknesses of this program but its strength.

Where the UAW demands that the power of government be utilized to control the big monopolists and to further the interests of the working people, Lewis praises the virtues of uncontrolled "free enterprise" capitalism. Where the UAW, in pursuit of its objectives, demands adequate price controls, Lewis scoffs. Where the UAW, in its own not too effectual manner, talks of a more independent labor political line and even hints at the idea of supporting a new political party, Lewis categorically rejects the formation of a labor party on "principle" and can think no further than oscillating between the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Sniping at Social Programs

In his Detroit speech, Lewis could offer no more than flowery oratory, empty generalities, and homely not-too-useful advice that labor leaders must devote themselves to the interests of the rank and file. Everything that the UAW has come to mean in the labor movement, all its potentialities for leading the working class around a new banner, Lewis dismissed contemptuously by sniping at "fancy economics" and "social engineering."

The Stellato coalition protests against trends in the UAW toward bureaucratism and in many instances they are correct. The leanings in the UAW away from its traditional rank-and-file democracy are disturbing and dangerous but so far they still remain only trends. The UAW remains



one of the most democratic unions in the United States; and to offer Lewisism as an alternative seems like a stupid joke.

In the United Mine Workers union, bureaucracy is a solidly entrenched and finished product under the Lewis regime, where all vocal opposition was ruthlessly wiped out long ago and where criticism of the leadership is all but illegal. A Stellato group, in fact any anti-administration group, functioning in the Mine Workers Union with relative freedom to speak up would be almost inconceivable.

The injection of the figure of Lewis into the internal life of the UAW is a futile, useless, and pointless maneuver by an opposition which has no perspective, no conception of what the problems of the UAW are and how to solve them. This at best, it was a move solely calculated to embarrass Reuther and in this pitifully aimless objective it succeeded.

Dissatisfaction Rife

The organized opposition to Reuther consists mainly of scattered remnants of the old Adde-Thomas group, the Stalinists, and a few small groups of sincere militants. (We refer here to the organized anti-Reuther opposition and not of course to the many rank-and-file activists who are dissatisfied with what the leadership is accomplishing.) The group is now headed by Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, whose only claim to fame before his emergence as leader of the anti-Reuther forces was the coarse, stupid, and bureaucratic anti-Communist campaign he instituted in his local while he was still a Reuther follower.

How he was finally driven into the arms of the Stalinists and conveniently forgot his blood-feud with them is another story: the story of the high-handed drive of the UAW top leadership at the last convention to force every delegation into line on a single issue, the dues increase.

But the UAW members who rejoice at the appearance of Lewis at their gathering are NOT thinking of the intricacies of UAW internal life; they are NOT thinking of Lewis' conservative, backward social outlook which still bears the stamp of musty AFL yearbooks.

What They See in Lewis

When Lewis takes the stand they see the man who led his members in bitter strikes during the last war against the whole government bureaucracy and in the face of silent opposition and outright sabotage from the rest of America's labor leadership. And they remember that while the miners fought with the solid support of their union, they, the auto workers, were compelled to fight a series of unauthorized, so-called "wild-cat" strikes while their own leaders, above all the Adde-Thomas-Stalinist bloc, were found on the side of the auto companies demanding an unconditional return to work.

They remember that only a short time ago this same Lewis led his union in another series of strike struggles in the teeth of government injunctions and court-directed fines. In their minds eye is the picture of the militant miners, led by their militant union, headed by the man who in this elementary degree at least has offered militant leadership; and this they will applaud.

The same spirit and the same vision that led the UAW militants to throw out their old leadership and rally to Reuther inspires them when they applaud Lewis. It is a demonstration, not in re-

putation of the UAW's program but for militant leadership to carry it out. It was the same spirit that greeted the fighting resolutions and uncompromising words of Reuther at the last auto convention.

Two hundred thousand auto workers are now unemployed. Blame the rulers of our country, the old-party politicians and big-business monopolists who plan the war economy with the greatest sensitivity for preserving the profits of the owning class and the most callous disregard for the needs and sufferings of the working people. The UAW program for defending the interests of its members is excellent, on paper. It demands simply that all unemployed receive their full wages while they remain out of work through no fault of their own; that human beings receive at least the same consideration as capitalist private property; that wages be at least as well-protected as profits.

The UAW leadership writes, phones, telegraphs, appeals, beseeches, and begs assorted government bureaus, congressmen, governors, administrators, and even employers' associations for benevolent assistance . . . so far in vain.

Let Reuther announce in Flint that the UAW intends to return to the fighting methods of the past, that it has decided to stop begging, that it calls upon the members for mass picket lines, rallies, parades, and we will see how quickly the entire membership will answer the call of its own leadership.

Honor the Past — in Action

Enthusiastic delegates at the last UAW convention heard Reuther disavow any no-strike pledge and appeal for a fighting fund to support union struggles to come. They listened, then cheered, when Emil Mazey excoriated the record of the Truman administration and demanded not the satisfaction of a few of labor's "grievances" but a "whole new contract." The convention seemed virtually united in favoring the formation of a new political party as an ultimate objective; and the top leadership pledged to call for a nation-wide political conference of the labor



movement to map out a united course in preparation for the 1952 elections.

These convention actions remain in the record. At the Flint rally, Reuther will have to do more than simply restate them if he wants to restimulate the spirit that prevailed when they were adopted.

For the UAW militants know that the Truman administration has not altered its course; yet the UAW has returned to the government war boards. Despite the repudiation of any no-strike pledge, UAW strikers have been sent back to work upon request of Truman's wage board. And up to now, the promised new political moves, the nation-wide conference of labor, remains but a resolution.

The UAW domestic program is not perfect; it does not grapple with all problems but it is the best in the labor movement. In commemorating the great sit-in strikes the UAW can revive the spirit of the past by announcing to its members assembled in Flint that it now intends to take its program off the printed page and publish it in the field of working-class action.

"NEXT—
A LABOR PARTY!"
by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting Presentation
Of the Need for an
Independent Labor Party

25 cents
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

A brilliant study of labor leadership and the labor movement—

"THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

\$3.00

A Random House Book

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Bevan Gains, Tories Squirm — —

(Continued from page 1)
scriptions and special medical appliances.

It is rumored that when further proposals for retrenchment are made in connection with the presentation of the budget next month, a drastic attack on the food-price subsidies is to be expected. This would mean real rationing via the pocketbook, that is, at the expense of those whose pocketbooks have the least in them.

A sharp reaction to this by the British people is quite to be expected. Although the Tories were not able to muster a majority of the popular vote at the last elections, their parliamentary majority was acquired by the shift of a small part of the electorate in key constituencies. Many of those who shifted their vote did so, no doubt, because they were convinced by promises of a "better life" if the Tories were returned to power. These promises have now been proved to be completely demagogic.

Inside the Labor Party, reports indicate that Bevan's position is

growing in strength and popularity day by day. Attlee and Morrison are not in too good a position to capitalize on the Tory economic dilemma. For in many respects the Conservatives are simply carrying out policies, even in an extreme form, which were initiated by the Attlee government.

After Butler's speech to Commons, the Labor parliamentary delegation held a caucus meeting to decide on the attitude they should take toward it. One report has it that Bevan carried the field against the party leadership for an all-out attack on Butler's proposals and a demand for a vote of censure.

WILL BEVAN LEAD?

Next day in the House, the Labor Party's official leadership made weak and ineffective speeches. They could not very well attack the military budget, for they had initiated it. They could not be too harsh on the proposals with regard to the health program, for they had instituted the charges on eyeglasses and dentures when in power.

On all these matters, however, Bevan had a clear record. He made a slashing speech, which was cheered to the rafters by the Labor members. Interest was centered as much on the differences between his approach and that of his colleagues as on the struggle between the government and the opposition.

Bevan's strength among the ranks of the Labor Party and the workers in general will continue to increase. Yet the problem remains: How is this strength to be translated into real power in the Labor Party? To date, he has shied away from attempting to form any kind of organized "faction" or grouping in the party. As long as the labor bureaucrats support Attlee in the councils of the party, and as long as they continue to control the votes of their delegations to party conferences, it will be very difficult for Bevan to take over actual leadership.

Further, it must be said that Bevan's position is greatly eased by the fact that his party is in opposition. Although this is a statement which can be made about almost any aggressive politician (it was true for Churchill too), it has a special importance for Bevan's tendency and for the left wing of the British Labor Party in general.

BEYOND COASTS

Britain's economic plight is desperate. To place a greater share of the burden on the backs of the

poor is a vicious policy, and if Bevan were the leader of a Labor Party in power he would not doubt be looked to for reversing it immediately. But even if a much larger share of the burden were placed on the capitalists of Britain, this would not begin to solve the crisis of the economy as a whole. A drastic cut in the arms budget would help matters greatly, but even that could not solve the problem.

For a solution, Britain must look beyond the coasts of the island. To the extent that she has been doing this, her governments have looked primarily to the United States for help. Such help has been and will continue to be important. But as long as it remains the chief if not sole orientation of British economic policy, it can only be bought by making political concessions to the foreign policy of the State Department.

If Bevan is determined to steer an independent course in foreign policy his party will have to seek a new base of support. In the immediate circumstances, the one which lies most readily available is in the socialist movements in Western Europe and elsewhere.

It may be argued that a policy thus oriented cannot bring immediate economic relief to hard-pressed Britain. Socialist parties are not in power in the major countries of Western Europe or in Asia. Thus even a clear-cut and aggressive pronouncement by the British Labor Party that it will

henceforth work for the economic and political union of its country with other socialist or labor governments in Western Europe, and that it will give appropriate aid to all movements with a similar orientation, could only be of value in the long run.

FOR INDEPENDENT EUROPE

That is true. Yet any alternative policy appears to be hopeless. Unless Britain can widen her economic base, her prospects are for one crisis after another, all on a descending scale of economic misery for her people. If she seeks her salvation through indefinite dependence on American "generosity," she will continue to be "dragged too far behind the wheels of American diplomacy." She will forfeit her chance to be the "one hope for mankind" described by Aneurin Bevan when he resigned from the Labor government last April.

What is needed is a concrete policy of aid, encouragement and support by the Labor Party of the socialist movements in Western Europe oriented around a slogan of an independent and united labor Western Europe. The elaboration and advocacy of such a policy by all genuine, thinking socialists in the Labor Party would be a tremendous contribution not only to the eventual solution of Britain's economic crisis, but to the cause of peace, democracy and socialism for the whole world.

Corruption — —

(Continued from page 1)
public in order to protect the attorney general's reputation. Mr. Truman yielded to the pressure. McGrath stayed on."

Behind this report is the known fact that Truman was considering firing McGrath a month ago and that Senator Green intervened for him. It would also tend to explain Truman's prolonged period of inaction after categorical promises to start some clean-up machinery going.

By no means implied in this picture is the notion that Truman himself is in any way involved in the graft. The tax scandals dealt with penny-ante forms of big-business corruption of government, like most other scandals of its nature which are inflated by political rivalry to national proportions.

POINTING TO CLARK

What then were Truman's "personal and political reasons of his own"? The correspondent does not say, but provides the answer nonetheless. The finger actually points, not at Truman's dollar-honest morality, but at the way in which the Truman machine works.

For one thing, the figure who, from the beginning, has been allowed to remain in the background is that of McGrath's predecessor as attorney general, the man who appointed Caudle, and who was elevated by Truman from

the attorney general's office to the highest judicial post in the country—Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark. "Most of the present scandals," Shannon reminds, "had their origin in the 1945-1949 period when Clark was attorney general."

Before Newbold Morris agreed to come to McGrath's rescue, Shannon wrote: "The larger significance of this development [McGrath's inability to find an investigator] is that it represents a triumph for Associate Justice Clark of the Supreme Court in the undercover struggle for survival that McGrath and Clark have waged against one another for months. . . . Clark is worried that a sweeping investigation of the Justice Department by either a congressional committee or a special prosecutor would show the rottenness of his own regime. His efforts to prevent such an inquiry and to protect his own appointees have so far impeded McGrath's efforts to clean house."

There can be little doubt about what Shannon thinks were Truman's "personal and political reasons." Truman was protecting an influential figure of his political entourage.

OIL FOR THE MACHINE

While no one in his senses will believe that Truman is personally involved in the petty larceny of government corruption on the mink-coat level, it is a fact of life that it is just this kind of petty larceny which oils the political machines of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The famous porkbarrel which goes along with election victory does not consist only of the president's right to bestow postmasterships.

The president himself need not and should not know of such goings-on, according to the rules. The machine just works that way.

It goes without saying that there is nothing peculiar to the Democratic Party or Truman in this. This is one of the reasons why, while Washington resounds with injunctions to clean out the rascals without fear or favor, the clean-up always peters out as soon as it bids fair to pry into channels leading to the very centers of the festering cesspool, after disposing of the immediate prey who are to be thrown to the wolves.

The centers of the cesspool are the old-party machines, which taint anyone or any group which ties up with them.

This is something to be remembered by well-intentioned liberal investigators named Morris, who think they can have a "free hand" in cleaning up this rat maze, and—more important—by labor leaders who want to "reform" the machines instead of forming their own labor party.

Making It Simple For the Kiddies

"Last Friday afternoon, Washington Irving High School was represented by Ann Broder and Marilyn Davidoff at a Manhattan high school press conference with Matt Cvetic, a member of the FBI, who was working for the Communist Party in the United States for seven years. The topic discussed was 'Youth Under Communism.' . . .

"Mr. Cvetic, who has lectured in many high schools and colleges, stated that communism is not managing to infiltrate the high schools as easily as the colleges and universities. This is mainly true because one is not only older physically in college but mentally."—News item in Washington Irving (High School) Times, Jan. 18 (New York).

Hm-m-m . . . who's Mr. Cvetic working for nowadays?

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

LONDON LETTER

Labor Party Heads Move Toward New Policies in Fight on Tories

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Jan. 30—It is yet too early to assess the full extent of the Labor Party's reaction to the preview, or first installment, of the budget to be presented on March 4 by Butler, the chancellor of the exchequer. At time of writing, the only important comment has been made by Arthur Deakin, president of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress. He said: "I don't like the Health cut or the limit on hire-purchase."

The right wing of the party will fight on the issue of the Health Service and the Education cuts primarily. The Bevan wing of the party will fight for a reduced armaments expenditure in order to preserve and extend the social services.

There is now hardly a field of policy which has not been re-examined by one or another Labor leader during the last few months. Let me outline the Labor Party's "new outlook" under the following headings: foreign policy; colonial policy; home policy; and Labor Party organization.

FOREIGN POLICY

Kenneth Younger, former undersecretary of state for foreign affairs, has expressed grave disquiet regarding Churchill commitments with America on China. In no uncertain terms, Younger stated that the Labor Party will not support the "counter-revolutionary" forces of Chiang Kai-shek nor will it be party to an extension of the Korean war.

Then again, we had Hugh Dalton, in the first post-election BBC political broadcast, indicating the Labor Party's fears about West German rearmament. And even more recently we had the powerful opposition of a large section of the Labor MPs to the Japanese peace treaty. There can be little doubt that the Labor Party is groping for a specifically Labor, as distinct from "National," foreign policy.

COLONIAL POLICY

The replacement of Malcolm

MacDonald, high commissioner in Malaya, by General Templar, bodes no good for the people of Malaya. Only a few weeks ago John Strachey placed on the record Labor's rather belated recognition of the necessity for accelerating the liquidation of imperialism in Malaya, despite the opposition of the tin mine owners and rubber plantation owners.

In the Laborite Daily Herald, Strachey stated that he hoped that the Labor Party would cooperate with Dato Onn's independence for Malaya Party in the task of eliminating white imperialism.

It may well be that the Labor Party will fight the next general election on issues which have a vital relevance to the Malayan, Sudanese and Nigerian peoples, as well as on domestic and foreign-policy issues.

HOME POLICY

The national committee of the Cooperative Party has issued a statement entitled "The People's Industry," which calls for the nationalization of Engineering, Cement, Chemicals, Shipbuilding and Building Materials. Moreover, it points out the necessity for the extension of social ownership and public control in new forms such as have been developed by the cooperative movement.

Moreover, Strachey has stated that the first measure the Labor government will effect, when it is returned to power, is the transformation of the 12,000 companies into public utilities. The scheme he has in mind has been elaborated by Austen Albu in "The Anatomy of Private Industry." By the process of inserting a "social clause" into the deeds of every company, and giving employees the right to appoint one-third of the directors with the state having the right to appoint another third, Strachey and Albu hope to establish a new form of mixed public and private enterprise.

In the field of education, the threat of cuts in the expansion of

school building has provoked an immediate reaction from former home secretary Chuter. He is now organizing a nation-wide campaign to resist the Tory attack unwillingly led by Miss Florence Horsburgh.

In the London County Council the Labor Party is pressing hard for comprehensive schools which will do away with the distinction between Secondary Grammar, Technical and Modern Schools. Transport House [Labor Party headquarters] has published a pamphlet on this subject entitled "A Policy for Secondary Education," which will serve to guide the Labor Party during the forthcoming council elections.

It is not without significance that the not-unimportant Liberal sector of opinion is shifting back toward the Labor Party. A recent editorial in the *News Chronicle* on the Education cuts seems to have heralded the beginning of a leftward swing in Liberal opinion.

PARTY ORGANIZATION

The appointment of a 25-year-old National Youth Officer for the Labor Party's League of Youth seems to run counter to the decision of the national executive committee to scramble together the second annual conference of the Labor League of Youth with a holiday at a camp at Filey. The vigorous opposition of the LLY to the latter bureaucratic decision may be responsible for this remarkable departure from the party's previous policy of appointing middle-aged party organizers to the position of National Youth Officer.

All in all, we have the beginnings of significant changes in the outlook of the Labor Party. The Bevan group is by no means the only channel for the left-wing current. The Cooperative Party, the National Council of Labor Colleges and even the much abused Fabian Society are all contributing to the over-all picture of Labor's new program.