

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 12, 1952

FIVE CENTS

THE MISSION OF THE CIO
Speech by James Carey to the New York L.I.D.
... page 6

Brazil Stalinist Party Splits
... page 5

California CP Trial Grinds On
... page 3

The Return of GLK Smith
... page 2

MICHIGAN POLICE-STATE LAW HELD UP BY COURTS

By SAM ADAMS

The infamous Trucks law, passed unanimously in the Michigan State Senate and House, faces a legal test soon when the Stalinist party will argue before a three-judge panel of the federal court in that state to make permanent the present temporary restraining injunction against the law.

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall that this law is based on a bill introduced in the House last January by Rep. Kenneth Trucks, GOP and American Legionnaire druggist of Baldwin, Michigan (pop: 835). He was joined by State Senator James H. Teahen of Ossow, a former FBI investigator. Together they helped push the bill through, making it a state law by votes in the Senate and House of 29-0 and 88-0 respectively.

Entitled the "Michigan Communist Control Law," it calls for the registration of all communists and anyone else the state attorney general may designate as a communist if they fall within the broad provisions of the act. The attorney general has already announced that he would use the federal attorney general's List of Subversive Organizations, itself drawn up in a completely arbitrary and bureaucratic manner, without hearings and with no opportunity given to any organization to examine evidence or to cross examine the official and unofficial stoolpigeons who supplied the FBI with the information which served as the basis for the list.

The Michigan law, its illiteracy and stupidity aside, is perhaps one of the most vicious bills ever passed by any state. It seems as

though it were deliberately designed to prevent anyone from registering since anyone foolish enough to do so, would have to turn himself into a stoolpigeon. Although given a broad interpretation by the state attorney general, the registration blank which people are asked to fill out names only the Communist Party and Communist Front organizations. It calls upon a registrant to give the name and address of the person who recruited him to the CP, the name and address of the financial secretary to whom he paid dues, the names and addresses of all members of his unit, the names and addresses of other units and clubs of the CP, and the names and addresses of all other individuals whom he knows or has known as members of the organization.

By writing "Communist Party" in small letters, and defining as a member even one who does not hold a card in the CP or pay dues to it; by assigning views to any organization and individual which might in the opinion of the Michigan attorney general make one a "communist," such a person and organization might be liable under the provisions of the bill.

THE FIRST VICTIM

The first victim of the law is the Socialist Workers Party whose candidates were ruled off the ballot because the organization was on the attorney general's List of Subversive Organizations. Although not named by the Trucks law, and not covered by its provisions, the Michigan attorney general ruled that it was "a kind of communist party" and therefore could not remain on the

(Continued on page 7)

Where Are the "Friends of Labor" Now?

Steel Union Stymied in Washington Run-Around

By MARY BELL

Negotiation, War Stabilization Board recommendation, employer sit-down, presidential "seizure," court injunction, quickie strike, court reversal, return-to-work, Supreme Court hearings—such, briefly, is the course of the steelworkers' attempts since last November to obtain a wage increase. They have had no increase since December, 1950. The outcome of their case at the present time is quite uncertain. The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the interpretation of the president's executive powers before it adjourns for the summer. Where its decision will place the problem of future negotiations, since ended by the companies, remains to be seen. It also remains to be seen what legislative action will be forthcoming in Congress, which has broken out in a rash of proposals for curbing executive power, making provisions for seizures, etc., etc.

Meanwhile, the steel workers, angry, and disappointed, are back at work. Having exercised their patience to the hilt in the conduct of their negotiations, their patriotism was appealed to when government seizure was re-instituted, and they called off their strike—without a wage increase or change in working conditions.

A radical difference is readily observable between the conduct of the millowners and the steelworkers. The owners ranted and raved at government seizure. They protested against "socialism" and "dictatorship" which are depriving them of their property without due process. The Constitution was

invoked, and the editors and courts have been talking about legal and constitutional issues ever since.

PUSH-BUTTON EASE

The only conclusion one can draw is that the millowners, if they could not get their inflationary price increase, preferred a strike, emergency or no emergency. The reason is obvious. The president has made a clear-cut speech in behalf of the WSB proposals, which were a fair approximation of the steelworkers' demands, and the proposed wage increases would have cut the soaring profits of the industry, if put into effect. The seizure, and the announced intention of the president to put the WSB recommendations into effect, produced the screams about "socialism!" from the steel barons and their editorial echoes.

Now, it may be true that a

"chill of expropriation" was felt by a millowner or two. The seizure was effected with such push-button ease, by the dispatch of a telegram, as a matter of fact. And a few of the more far-thinking labor and liberal elements might ponder over the rights of the steel barons to manage the industry, given their obvious greed for profit, their anxiety for a price increase which would push the inflationary spiral up again, and their lack of concern for the human welfare of the steelworkers.

But the reactionaries, which number first and foremost the highly paid owners of steel, have always raised a hue and cry about "socialism" in connection with any of the welfare provisions of the Democratic administration. The steelowners are now in the forefront of the battle of capital to reap higher profits out of the present war economy, to keep wages down and to hamstring labor. They are also carrying on a political struggle against Truman who has in this instance—being a "year of decision" for Democrats, too—come out in behalf of the steelworkers' demands.

The steelowners would place on the unions the blame for a price increase and the resultant inflation which would spread through the entire economy. Or, they would place the blame for the strike, with the "hampering" of the "emergency," upon labor.

LABOR RESTRICTED

Labor has been restricted as never before in peacetime, nominal peacetime, at least. The wage freeze and the restrictive WSB formulas and provisions have sharply curtailed its ability to obtain wage increases in order to catch up with the ever rising cost of living. Taxes are at wartime heights. Prices now, as always, run ahead of wages. But there is no restoration on profits. The case of the steelworkers' union was so strong that the president could point out that the wage increase could be paid out of increased steel profits.

The seizure technique is nothing. It has been employed by other presidents. It was used during World War I, during World War II, during post-World War II, and is being invoked in a similar manner in the present "emergency."

Seizure in the present instance, coupled as it was with a presidential speech in favor of labor's demands, apparently produced an initially uncritical acceptance of this device in many labor quarters. It is too easily forgotten that in most previous seizures labor was the loser, not the gainer. In the current government "control" of

(Turn to last page)

Fight for Democracy in the TWUA-CIO Comes to a Head

Struggle in the Textile Workers Union

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The internal fight in the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, between the forces led respectively by General President Emil Rieve and Executive Vice President George Baldanzi came to a head at the union's biennial convention in Cleveland during the week of April 20. This was the first major battle in a CIO union, at least in recent years, in which Stalinism was not an issue and in which the Stalinists played no role whatever.

The issue which has divided the textile union for over two years is a fight for union democracy. The reason this issue has taken on such major proportions in this union is that the workers in it face a series of problems which press for a solution. They are of

such a nature that unless they are solved the very existence of the union, and with it the standard of living of over a million workers in the textile industry, is at stake. The union leaders and rank and file members who support Baldanzi are convinced that unless they can get a democratic union, the leaden hand of bureaucracy will stifle their chance to solve these problems.

The most vital problem which faces the union is the rapid, mass migration of the industry into the South. Low taxes, underpaid and unorganized workers, proximity to raw materials, and the willingness of Southern towns to practically give plants to Northern capitalists in that area have been the chief factors in this movement. In addition, the shift of the industry toward synthetics has made it easy

for those concerns which have to build new plants or install new machinery to make their investments in the South.

One effect of this movement on the Northern workers has been the direct loss of jobs. But almost equally devastating has been the pressure by the Northern mills to increase the work-load on the workers to meet Southern competition. The union has not been altogether successful in resisting this pressure.

MUST ORGANIZE SOUTH

The union has been fighting the trend to the South as best it could. But it is clear that in the long run the only answer is the organization of the textile workers in the South. It would take a book to sketch the difficulties placed in the way of the union by

an unholy alliance of mill owners, politicians, courts and police forces in the South. The tactics used against the union have been so flagrantly illegal that they have been investigated and denounced by Congressional committees. This is truly one area of the country where union organizers and leaders don't have to be told that they can rely on themselves and the workers, and can hope for no help from "friends" in government to do the job for them.

The internal fight in the union developed slowly over differences of opinion on tactics and forces to be used in the Southern drive. Baldanzi, who at one time headed the whole CIO's "Operation Dixie" found that President Rieve had, over the years, arrogated so much

(Turn to last page)

S. F. BAY AREA

Stalinists Embarrassed as ISL-SYL Picket GLK Smith

OAKLAND, Calif., April 28—A recent ISL-SYL picket line in front of a Gerald L. K. Smith meeting in Oakland was an excellent reminder of the state of fascist and anti-fascist forces in this area today.

During the post-war period, Smith and his followers tried to drum up support in the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas by a series of large meetings of an open and provocative character. These attempts, coming immediately after a war whose ostensible purpose was to defeat fascism, were met with concerted opposition from a great variety of forces. In both Los Angeles and Oakland militant picket lines surrounded the Smith meetings and made such a show of strength and determination that, at least in the Bay Area, Smith has held only closed meetings in front of carefully selected audiences from 1947 until today.

The 1947 picket lines were initiated and organized to a large extent through the initiative of the Independent Socialist League and included elements of the American Veterans' Committee, liberal and labor groups. In those days the Stalinists were conspicuous by their lack of militancy, by their patriotic slogans and their advocacy of the general concept of "giving Smith any publicity." They attempted, with some success, to transform the militant, anti-fascist character of these demonstrations into baby and innocuous "protests." The effect of these hundreds-strong political demonstrations were, nevertheless, not forgotten by the Smith forces, for from that time on the "No. 1 Fascist of America" trod softly in California and especially in the labor stronghold of the Bay Area.

The recent ISL-SYL picket line was quite a different matter! In the first place, it was a last minute effort. There was no advance publicity for the Smith meeting although it was held in the Oakland auditorium. The meeting—Smith is still cautious about the possibility of his meetings being raided or broken up—was a closed affair which barred all but ticket holders. (Some SDA youth actually crossed the picket line but were turned away at the door.) The ISL only found out about the meeting on the afternoon of the same day and could therefore only make feeble and limited preparation for it. It was learned that the Stalinists were recruiting people to go down and this was an extra incentive for the ISL-SYL to participate. The Stalinists, of course, kept the entire thing to themselves hoping to be the only group in opposition to Smith.

TWO PICKET LINES

The ISL was able to collect about twenty demonstrators by eight o'clock and, armed with three picket-signs, they joined the Stalinist line, which already contained about thirty-five demonstrators. This unexpected move caught the Stalinists completely by surprise and it took them some minutes to collect their wits after they read the content of the placards: "Down with Totalitarianism on Both Sides of the Iron Curtain," "Against Fascism, Against Stalinism," and "Against G. L. K. Smith—For Socialism and Democracy." Since the Stalinists had come down under the guise of the Independent Progressive Party and the Civil Rights Congress, and since they had included numbers of innocents, fellow-travellers, and the like, it was difficult to find a reason for excluding us from their "peoples' picket line. Some female hack finally found the formula: red baiting! The Stalinists then reformed their line some distance away.

For the next half-hour, therefore, there were two picket lines in front of the Smith meeting, one standing for Stalinism and one for socialism and democracy. The entire affair was completely demoralizing for the Stalinists and constituted somewhat of a victory for the ISL-SYL and, perhaps, increased the understanding of the innocents the Stalinists hooked in. The Stalinists concentrated on singing anti-Jim Crow songs and demanding that Paul Robeson be allowed to use the auditorium for a concert. He had recently been turned down both in San Francisco and Oakland although his managers promised a completely "non-political" performance.

Another interesting aspect of the affair was the character of the Smith meeting. Except for one or two fascist "militants" who screamed "Jew-lovers go back to Russia" at both lines, the general audience was composed of very old men and women, many of whom were too feeble to walk up the stairs without aid. There was a sprinkling of well-dressed bourgeois types and a few shabby-looking workers, mostly men. There were no "toughs" guarding the meeting and the picket-lines, small as they were, were not bothered either by the police or the fascists. Everything was very peaceful.

NO REAL BASE

Since this was the biggest meeting Smith has held since 1947, and since only about 300 persons attended, there is obviously little danger of any immediate open provocation against the labor movement or the Jewish community. Reaction in America is driving from above, by legal and administrative means, and has thus far found it unnecessary to recruit any kind of really dangerous mass fascist movement. One of the reasons why Smith tries to avoid any trouble is that he understands that his "old ladies" just won't do the trick. He is able to play upon their fears and their frustrations, to give them an "explanation" for their failures and insecurity, and thus to milk them of their savings, but he cannot transform them into a militant force against the labor movement.

This "old people" character of Smith's following is a very interesting and instructive fact and

Just out—Summer issue of

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN

In this issue:
 Debate on American Foreign Policy
 Faulkner's Writing and the Southern Myth,
 by Irving Howe
 God, the Devil and Jean-Paul Sartre
 Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?
 plus other articles and student reports

20 cents per copy Order bundles now

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN
 247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

Readers Take the Floor . . . Arthur Schlesinger Jr. Writes —

Dear Mr. Draper:

I read with interest your article on "The Case of the Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom" in the March 24th issue of LABOR ACTION. This is to say that I was not consulted about the issuance of the FRF pamphlets. I assume that their purpose is to promote the kind of discussion to which you have so valuably contributed.

A short time before you sent me this piece, some one sent me a copy of LABOR ACTION of July 9, 1952, with your excellent article "Schlesinger vs. Schlesinger." This is a first-class piece of polemic writing, of a kind of which I should be proud to have done myself. I had not thought through the Jackson-Wyzanski conspiracy theory at the time that I wrote the Post column which provoked your rejoinder. I have now returned to my views in *The Vital Center*.

I would point out that I did write in *The Vital Center*: "The First Amendment does not bestow upon the Communist Party the

constitutional right . . . to be a clandestine network for purposes of espionage or subversion. . . . If such acts become really threatening and the party apparatus can be shown to be involved, the existence of the Communist Party itself may become a source of clear and present danger. Then it could be outlawed." I agree with Justice Douglas when he said in his *Dennis* dissent: "If this were a case where those who claimed protection under the First Amendment were teaching the techniques of sabotage, the assassination of the President, the flogging of documents from public files, the planting of bombs, the art of street warfare, and the like, I would have no doubt." I suspect that the CPUSA has done most of those things, and that the FBI, if it were willing to expose its key agents, could produce the evidence against them. I wish they would. I don't like the idea of convicting people for advocacy and for the holding of ideas.

Sincerely yours,
 Arthur SCHLESINGER, Jr.

LABOR SCOPE

Union Leader Falls into Witch-Hunt Trap

By LES WRIGHT

LOS ANGELES, April 29—A Los Angeles labor leader went on record recently as giving his support, and that of his union presumably, to the anti-Stalinist witchhunt in matters that involve the firing of persons alleged to be "subversive." The case arose following a vitriolic denunciation of Hollywood's film industry by Representative Donald L. Jackson on the grounds of "coddling Communists in movie jobs."

Roy M. Brewer, head of the AFL Film Council in Hollywood, rebuked Jackson sharply for his charge. Brewer's reply denied that either the studios or the film unions "coddled communists." On the contrary, he pointed out, Hollywood unions in recent years have "led in kicking Reds out of union leadership." The unions and the studio employers have cooperated closely to purge the film industry of Stalinists, ever since the first post-war probe of film-land by the House Un-American Activities Committee, at that time led by the sterling American, J. Parnell Thomas, later a jailbird.

The Motion Picture Industry Council censured Jackson's statements concerning the alleged "coddling" of Stalinists. Further, this body, which represents both the studios and film unions, endorsed unanimously Brewer's blast at the California congressman, including that portion which put the AFL Film Council on record as approving a law whereby it would be legal to fire all movie employees who are "Communists." The MPIC moved to send copies of its endorsement to all California representatives and the two senators.

Labor and all other targets of the "un-American" drive for conformity are on the defensive in this period of cold war strategy and cold war psychology and national discipline. Those who take the lead in purging films, plays, schools, and all other repositories of ideas of so-called dangerous men and dangerous thoughts are the same men who, time and time again, prove their anti-labor and pro-monopoly bias. This feature of economic-intellectual interest and identity of interests and statements of our legislative bodies.

There have been indications that some labor leaders recognize many of the implications of the "anti-subversive" campaign as far as labor's rights are concerned. However, these same labor officials wish above all to be considered "patriotic, loyal Americans" with all that such phraseology means today. That is, they want to be known as agents or supporters of the capitalist strug-

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE
 OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

gle with its rival imperialist power, Stalinist Russia. But this also means furthering the militarization of America. And this in turn implies depriving Americans, Stalinists or dissenters in general, who oppose this militarization and its companion features of regimentation, a thought-control, and subversive list criteria for jobs, of their civil liberties.

Brewer's example is one of the worst in the growing list of labor and liberal surrenders to the essentially reactionary and undemocratic character of the over-all witchhunt. The Stalinists are the most prominent victims now, though others are feeling the vicious repercussions. But the labor movement itself is clearly a target. If labor remains on the defensive and answers the witchhunt charges with the same kind of "Red scare" tactics and super-patriotic gestures, it merely enhances the scope and intensity of the reactionary campaign against the remaining areas of democracy.

If democracy is a "luxury" to the capitalist class, which it is ever ready to cast off whenever it becomes a burden along the path to all-out control of society, it is not a luxury for the labor movement. For labor, democracy is indispensable for its struggles and its very existence. It still, in some sections, has to learn the hard lessons on how not to preserve democracy by helping to whittle it down.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date April 30:
- The Fountainhead*, by Ayn Rand. A Signet triple volume, 720 pages, 75 cents.
- The Seven Storey Mountain*, by Thomas Merton. A Signet double volume, 512 pages, 50 cents.
- Finistère*, by Fritz Peters. A Signet book, 224 pages, 25 cents.
- They Don't Dance Much*, by James Ross. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents. Abridged.
- Good is for Angels*, by Christopher Clark. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.
- A Wind Is Rising*, by William Russell. A Signet book, 240 pages, 25 cents.

Prosecution Grinds Away at California Trial

By DAVE BERN

LOS ANGELES, April 24—Howard Charles Litt, the government's eighth witness in the trial of 15 California Stalinist leaders charged with conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the government, took the stand on April 14. Litt, a 30-year-old undercover agent for the FBI, attempted to prove his contention that CP literature "promulgated the idea that all those who oppose Communist aims are fascists." His "proof" was contained in selections from three copies of the *People's World* which he read to the court.

The Los Angeles *Daily News* reported: "From a March 1946 issue of the (CP) newspaper, Litt read a lengthy interview with an 82-year-old Long Beach Communist who was the first to complete a petition urging that a proposal for a Fair Employment Practices Commission be placed on the ballot that year. . . . In the interview the elderly Communist was quoted as saying that, as a shareholder in the South, he had opposed the late Huey Long's program because it was a 'Fascist manifestation' in American life. 'From a 1950 issue of the *People's World* Litt then read an editorial entitled 'The Man to Beat.' The editorial related to Richard Nixon's campaign for election to the Senate. Litt read: 'Behind him (Nixon) will rally all the fascist forces of California.'"

"From the third issue, also 1950, Litt read a news story reporting an address by William Schneiderman (a defendant alleged to be the present national leader of the CP). Schneiderman . . . called on all congressmen to state their position in regard to American aid to Chiang Kai-shek for an assault on the China mainland. Litt, reading from the news story, quoted Schneiderman as saying, 'We know how pro-Fascist Nixon stands on this question.'"

While it is true that the CP frequently sneers all of its enemies as "fascists" (except for those liberals and radicals it hopes to use in a popular-front campaign of some sort), it is likewise evident that Litt's examples did not prove his charge, viz. that "all those who oppose Communist aims are called fascists." The example of Huey Long should have been an embarrassing one for the prosecution—the government which claims to be the world champion of democracy. For outside of certain native Louisianians who benefited from the late Kingfish's regime, there are few who would deny the fascist character of Long's rule.

As for Nixon, it is unquestionably true that, in his race for the Senate seat against Helen Douglas, "behind him stood all the fascist forces of California." But that is not quite the same as say-

ing that Nixon is a fascist, whatever he may actually be. To call him "pro-fascist" is to state a difference in degree which could, under proper circumstances, become a difference in kind.

The following day after Litt's dismissal, the government witness stand was taken by Leonard Patterson, a 46-year-old Negro who was once a New York CP functionary. His testimony, very brief, apparently took the defense by surprise, for they asked a postponement, until the next day, of their cross-examination.

COMPARE NOTES

Patterson claimed he met Loretta Starvuk Stack, a defendant, in Philadelphia in 1934 after she returned from Russia. Stack, reported the *News*, "became a member of the Russian Communist party when she attended the International Lenin school in Moscow where Red army instructors taught her the military tactics of revolution. . . ." Patterson testified that he had also attended the Moscow school in 1931 and, during their 1934 conversation, wished to "compare notes" with Mrs. Stack on their experiences.

Said Patterson, "I asked her if she had studied militarism . . . and if they had Red Army instructors giving lessons in street fighting—upsetting street cars and busses and making barricades and things like that with a disregard for human lives—anything to protect the revolution." The main object of the government, apparently, is to present the CP as a revolutionary party. The witness continued: "She said yes, she studied that and that they even had field problems. She told about how they defended the Comintern building. She said, 'We not only got training with Russian rifles but with those of the United States, England, France and Germany and we were instructed with machine guns, too, and how to use bayonets and the butt of a rifle.'"

Mrs. Stack, said the witness, then a leader in the Philadelphia Young Communist League, claimed she had won ruble prizes for rifle marksmanship, as had Patterson. "I asked her was she

taught that it was the duty of the students (in the Moscow school) to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in their own nations and she said that her class was taught that it could only come about by overthrowing the governments and it was the duty of the students to return to their own countries and overthrow the governments there and to set up the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Patterson said Mrs. Stack told him she was taught that a Negro state should be established in the United States. The witness claimed he replied, that as a Negro, he felt this teaching was wrong—that it was "Jim Crow in the Communist party."

BITTER BATTLE

The witness alleged that even as early as 1933 the Russian Stalinist leadership feared the CP in the U. S. would eventually be outlawed. He said he discussed with Mrs. Stack their instructions on "organization of a four-level underground in America" in the event the CP should become an illegal group. Patterson's testimony provoked a bitter battle between the attorneys. The defense succeeded in getting parts of this testimony stricken from the records. But Asst. U. S. Attorney Ray H. Kinnison was able to re-phrase the testimony by "re-phrasing his questions to conform to technical requirements."

Patterson said he joined the Communist Party in 1930 and "became a full time organizer of the Young Communist League in the East and Middle West after his return from Moscow. His testimony would appear to be the most damaging one thus far in the attempt to prove the "revolutionary" conspiracy of the Stalinist party. However, the questions and answers he claimed took place between him and Stack do not appear very realistic for a trained Stalinist unless he was so naive as to regard the CP as a Sunday School club.

Nor does his claim that the Moscow Stalinists told their foreign students to return home, make a

matter involving various Communist issues." Attorney Wirin attempted to show he was biased against the defendants. Patterson admitted his cab driver's license was revoked in New York in 1948 but restored in 1950. Wirin read from transcripts of Patterson's testimony in other cases and suddenly asked, "Did you ever commit adultery?" The witness replied, "Sure!" before his prosecution sponsors could object. Judge Mathes then restricted Wirin's questions to the issue of whether Patterson had ever faced prosecution for adultery and "wryly observed" that the witness had "displeased no reticence." Wirin implied that Patterson had agreed to testify in return for immunity "from prosecution on an adultery charge and for restoration of his cabbie license." The witness denied these hints by the defense.

"We must work hard here and study Marxism and Leninism thoroughly. You must realize that some of us will be president of the United States very soon (this was in 1938), and some will be congressmen and senators and governors of states." Students, said Rosser, "studied seven days a week, all day long and two hours at night, during the intensive six-months leadership training course."

"This trial is expected to last for some time yet, unless many of the numerous witnesses are not called or their testimony and cross-examination are shortened. The defense is making a strong fight to shatter the whole government case by showing up the irrelevancy of as much testimony as possible, by throwing doubts on the motives of various witnesses and their integrity. These efforts are met by the grim determination of the government attorneys to utilize the "red scare" and the cold war issues to convince the jury that the CP presents a "clear and present danger" to America and that their leaders must be imprisoned, as happened to the 11 Stalinists in New York and 6 others only recently in Baltimore.

GOOD PAL

Patterson resumed testimony on April 18. The 46-year-old taxicab driver from New York under cross-examination said "that he receives a fee of \$25 a day, \$9 per diem for food and lodging and additional travel expense." Not bad pay for his informer services! He contrasted this generous government "handout" with his former pay as a full time organizer in the CP. Another reason why "patriotism" pays! The CP only paid him \$5 to \$15 a week for his work as organizer, and who can live, after all, on zeal and ideals, whether good or bad? "A handout," he complained.

The *News* states: "He has testified, admitted, in deportation proceedings, before boards of education, and official state bodies in

ISL FUND DRIVE

Drive Takes Big Jump Forward; To be Extended 2 Weeks

By ALBERT GATES

Fund Drive Director

One of the finest last minute pushes we have ever seen in a fund drive took place in the past two weeks to put our campaign within striking distance of our \$12,500 goal, with a percentage of 90.7. These two weeks saw contributions reach \$3,473.25.

The General portion of the drive jumped into first place with

\$1308, or 130.8 per cent. Percentage-wise, the leaders remain more or less unchanged, but a number of new areas have made 100 per cent contributions.

Many branches have written in asking that the drive be extended for a couple of weeks since they are certain that with this added time they can collect outstanding monies and meet their quotas. The Fund Drive Committee, in examining the present standings and re-

ports from various areas has complied with the requests and agreed to extend the drive for another two weeks. But now that we have done so, we are counting on all branches and comrades to take advantage of this period to put the drive over the top. The official closing date of the fund drive then is May 15th!

Although the SYL remains in 4th position with 114.2 per cent, its contributions remain the startling surprise of the drive. SYL units have contributed \$1688.25 divided as follows: Chicago, \$655; New York, \$463; Berkeley, \$218; Detroit, \$129; Los Angeles, \$15; New Haven, \$20; Madison, \$20; Northwest, \$37.50; St. Louis, \$55; Buffalo, \$40, and General, \$66.25. If the drive meets its full quota, no

small share of the honors fall upon the shoulders of our excellent young comrades!

New York has been digging hard and is getting closer to its \$4000 goal. No easy mark, this one, but they are really putting on the pressure to get there. Cleveland came through, too, with 103 per cent. So did Buffalo, which made its rather large quota. Newark has 101 per cent.

Other branches getting close to completing their quotas are Pittsburgh, Seattle and Chicago.

The standings below show that with a little concerted effort, we will make the \$12,500. There are branches that have passed the 100 per cent point, but are continuing to raise more money to insure our goal. The next days will tell the whole story. Let's go!

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
TOTAL	\$12,500	11,346.25	90.7
General	1,000	1,308	130.8
Oregon	50	65	130
Streator	25	31	124
Socialist Youth League	1,500	1,713.25	114.2
Oakland	500	516	103.2
Cleveland	200	206	103
Newark	300	304	101
Buffalo	650	650	100
Indiana	50	50	100
Reading	75	75	100
Boston	50	50	100
Pittsburgh	150	141	94
New York	4,000	3,353	83.8
Seattle	300	250	83.3
Chicago	1,800	1,273	70.7
Los Angeles	600	364	60.6
Detroit	750	441	58.6
Philadelphia	300	158	52.6
St. Louis	50	26	52
Baltimore	25	5	20
Akron	75	0	0

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
 114 West 14 Street
 New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1952 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates.)

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!

YOU and SCIENCE

PLANNING: "TOTAL" OR SOCIALIST?

By CARL DARTON

A popular but fallacious argument against socialism is one that runs something like this: Socialism means total planning and total planning crushes scientific research. Modern industrial society cannot exist without a constant flow of new discoveries. Thus socialism would necessitate a return to the dark ages of pre-science. "Free enterprise" is interested in promoting this concept particularly if it is endorsed by some prominent name in the world of science.

Recent issues of scientific and technical periodicals carried full-page advertisements by General Electric on *Planning Unplanned Research*. Its content was taken from a speech given by Irving Langmuir, chief of the GE Research Laboratory. Dr. Langmuir says, in part:

"All of us in this Research Laboratory are interested in freedom. We know from our own experience that in true freedom we can do things that could never be done through planning. That's why we are going to beat out Russia in the long run.

"Stalin believes that everything can be planned. Marx believed that everything could be planned. That's the trouble with all dictators. They think that they can run the world by planning from above. And that is an utter impossibility, basically and fundamentally, because of the existence of divergent phenomena."

How can a competent scientist be so muddleheaded about politics? How can one so misrepresent and misinterpret socialism that it is identified with Stalinism and dictatorship? It would appear that Langmuir has become obsessed with some basic relationships in organizing scientific research and has foolishly rushed in to apply these to every phase of social life.

Neither socialists nor scientists could find much to criticize in some of Langmuir's remarks:

"You can't plan to make discoveries. But you can plan work that will probably lead to discoveries. . . ."

"You don't know all of the things that are going to happen: too many of them are unexpected. But it is these unexpected things that are going to be the most profitable—the most useful things you do. . . ."

"If you can't predict ideas, you can't plan things in a laboratory. But you can organize a laboratory so as to increase the probabilities that useful things will happen there."

From this limited arena, Dr. Langmuir projects his global view: "The moment you see that the world isn't a kind of place where complete planning is possible, then you believe in democracy, you believe in freedom and initiative—in all the kinds of things that can be planned only in very general ways, not in detail."

He does not realize that socialists are certainly not advocates of complete planning in the sense that it covers every phase of life, private and public, and is imposed by authority above. They too propose planning only in a general way—only in so far as and in the interest of increasing the material and general welfare of the entire population.

Dr. Langmuir should also know that socialists would subscribe to his concluding remarks: "I think most of us here have the ideas of freedom and the importance of thinking things out in our own way. Human virtues such as curiosity, initiative, interest in things, and just doing things for the fun of it, add up to me as just one of the things you realize in this laboratory. And if only it could be done on a world-wide scale, we would be much better off than we are now."

Socialists believe in planning but they also advocate workers' control of industry. Scientists are fully aware that basic research particularly and all science in general can be carried on only in an atmosphere of freedom both on the job and in society. Scientists are most likely to plan their work in a manner which would give maximum impetus to basic research. They know that planning can be a virtue, not a liability. The critical aspects of planning are: for whom, by whom, and to what end. Let the Socialist slogans for planning in science be: for everyone, by scientists, to further the welfare of all and to promote "curiosity, initiative, and interest in things."

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

MUFFLED MIKES, By Diane Shieler.—The Progressive, May 1952.

This article is a review of what has happened to Jean Muir and a host of other radio and TV personalities since *Red Channels* published the names of 151 actors, producers, directors, singers, dancers, commentators and network executives in 1950, charging that there was information that they had some connection with Stalinist front organizations.

The general facts about *Red Channels* and its editors and sponsors are well known. The Jean Muir case became quite a scandal at the time she was barred from TV, and was the occasion for pious comment by a large number of editors and others across the country. But the general impression now prevails that the radio and TV industry has since come to its senses, and no longer pays any heed to *Red Channels* or the campaigns whipped up by similar outfits.

Miss Shieler's article shows that this is far from the case. General Foods, the sponsor in the Muir case, some time ago announced a "new policy": it would not be against the hiring of "controversial persons" on its programs. It now

simply makes absolutely sure that it never hires any such people. And the whole industry follows suit.

"Muffled Mikes" refers to the study made by Merle Miller for the American Civil Liberties Union of the whole problem of blacklisting in radio and television which has recently been published in book form under the title "The Judges and the Judged." From this book Miss Shieler quotes an unidentified executive of Columbia Broadcasting Company as follows:

"An undertaking that eventually may cost the industry \$0, maybe a hundred million dollars and God knows how many ulcers and grey hairs and broken hearts and shattered careers and suicides. Plus a lot of public respect—and good shows. The trouble with people who've never joined anything and therefore are 'safe' for us to use is that they usually aren't very good writers or actors or producers, or, hell, human beings.

"But we're relying on mediocrities now, and the three boys on the flying trapeze are responsible. My God, it's straight out of Kafka, isn't it? These three gents have the whole dam industry stymied—three guys, count them."

WORLD POLITICS

What Policy for the Marxists in Latin America?

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Chile.—The recent resolutions of the Fourth International on Latin American problems are based on the policy of the Latin American sections and in the first place on those of the Bolivian POR and the Argentinian organization. They support the conception that the Latin American revolution is, in its first stage, a bourgeois-democratic revolution which must solve the anachronistic problems of the Latin American countries, and specially those on the Pacific Coast. This means that their task is to overcome their backward colonial economic structures and to win their national emancipation from the imperialist yoke. In this way they are to finish the work of the democratic revolution begun by Bolivar. Agrarian reform is part of this also, specially in Bolivia and Peru with the liquidation of the great unproductive estates and the emancipation of the Indian peasants from medieval serfdom.

Our "Fourthists" consider the petty bourgeoisie of Latin America to be the prime movers of this transformation, particularly as they are organized in the Argentinian Peronist movement, in Vargas' trahalshism ("laborism") in Brazil, the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR) in Bolivia, Ibañez' "socialism" in Chile, and so on.

The Fourth International in Argentina gives "critical support" to Peron's movement, and the Bolivian POR (Trotskyists) is backing the MNR with the hope that in this way the Latin American social revolution can begin. The native Trotskyists believe that the Peronist concessions to the workers, such as his anti-imperialist demagoguery, have a really "progressive" character, and can push the masses into revolutionary motion. They seek to apply to Latin America the theory of the two stages of social revolution. The first stage is that of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and the second one, the socialist revolution. In the first stage the petty bourgeoisie and their government will be in power. In this case this means the native nationalist movements, possibly in coalition with the "Trotskyist" party. The resolution of the Fourth International clearly foresees the possibility of such a coalition between the petty bourgeois parties and the "proletarian party," especially for Bolivia between the MNR and POR.

After this transitional stage, the petty-bourgeois government

will be overthrown by the masses, and there will be a socialist revolution under the leadership of the "proletariat," that is the "Trotskyist" party.

This theory is based on the misinterpreted experience of the Russian revolution. In fact, it is a semi-Stalinist misrepresentation of the social revolution as occurring in two stages. The first is the "popular" stage as in China and the satellite countries under "popular democracy." The second is the pure socialist revolution under the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in its Stalinist edition, of course. This childish, reactionary and idealist misconception of the social revolution is the base for the program and "strategy" of the Latin American "Fourthists." It is also the reason for their mistakes and theoretical errors.

Marxists are well acquainted with the different conceptions of the future Russian revolution held by Lenin and his followers on the one hand, and Trotsky and Rosa Luxemburg on the other. Both the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks believed that the Russian revolution had to be and would be a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The difference between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks lay in their diverse strategic conceptions and in their different approaches to the question of state power. The Mensheviks supported the idea that the liberal bourgeoisie must lead their revolution; that is, that the revolutionary government would have to be a liberal-bourgeois government. Lenin and the Bolsheviks, on the other hand, considered the bourgeoisie incapable of achieving its own revolution, and therefore foresaw a form of revolutionary government which they called the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry."

But the content of this government and of the revolution were to be limited to the tasks of bourgeois democracy, and of preparing the future socialist revolution. The peasantry would win in the bourgeois democratic revolution, and thereby completely exhaust its revolutionary potential as a peasantry. The proletariat would win in a bourgeois democratic revolution, and thereby would begin to unfold its true socialist revolutionary potential. The peasant movement is the movement of another class. It struggles not against the foundations of capitalism, but only in order to purge it of all the remnants of feudalism. This was Lenin's idea in 1906. The

social content of the revolution, and the social program of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" was limited to a capitalist society, even if a very radical one.

The third position on this question was held by Rosa Luxemburg, Parvus and Trotsky and it was opposed to the two other conceptions. They held that if the revolutionary proletariat was to lead this revolution and to form its government, the result would be a workers', or socialist government, and therefore the program and content of the revolution could not be limited to the full realization of bourgeois democracy.

The revolutionary government would be the dictatorship of the proletariat, backed by the peasantry, and not the "democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry." The bourgeois-democratic revolution would pass beyond its own limits and would be transformed into the socialist, proletarian revolution. Or as Trotsky put it much better in his book *Stalin*, "The perspective of the permanent revolution may be summarized in the following way: the complete victory of the democratic revolution in Russia is conceivable only in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, leaning on the peasantry. The dictatorship of the proletariat, which would inevitably place on the order of the day not only democratic but socialist tasks as well, would at the same time give a powerful impetus to the international socialist revolution. Only the victory of the proletariat in the West could protect Russia from bourgeois restoration and assure it the possibility of rounding out the establishment of socialism."

The program of the permanent revolution was vindicated as against that of the "democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry," and Lenin was the first to acknowledge this. He wrote in the April Theses: that the state power in Russia has passed to the hands of the new class; the class of capitalists and landlords. Therefore the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia is completed. In this way Lenin acknowledged not only the "democratic dictatorship" as obsolete, but also the coming of the socialist revolution. This is the program of the one, indivisible and indissoluble social revolution of our time. That is the program of the permanent revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

Brazil Stalinist Party Split Over China-Type Plan for "Revolution"

By MADEIRA

RIO DE JANEIRO, April 1952.—The first serious crisis since 1937 has just taken place in the Stalinist Party of Brazil (PCB). In 1937, most of the S. Paulo section and other elements through the country resisted the Comintern orders to support Vargas' candidate in the campaign that just preceded Vargas' "coup d'état" by which his fascist dictatorship was established. The leader of the 1937 split in the PCB later on became a prominent figure among Brazilian official "Trotskyists" and a stubborn defender of the workers' nature of Russia and Stalinist parties as against the Marxist group of "Vanguardia Socialista."

The present crisis is also led by one of the top Stalinist leaders in the state of S. Paulo, the former deputy José Maria Crispim. He has been expelled from the Stalinist party by a unanimous decision of the executive committee together with Leonardo Roitman (a well-known Stalinist militant in the port of Santos), Frederico Bonimani and a few others.

Crispim is a former worker and sergeant in the Brazilian army. He seems to have some prestige in some S. Paulo industries where he was elected deputy in 1945 to the Constituent Assembly and the Federal Congress. In 1947 he lost his seat in the Congress together with the rest of Stalinist representatives and a senator, by an act of Dutra's government. As is the case with all Brazilian Stalinist bureaucrats, Crispim has never had any Marxist cultural background and his mind is completely distorted by the bureaucratic ideology of Stalinism.

REBELS DOCUMENT

The only public document known from the "rebels" is a letter from Roitman to a lawyer who defended him in a trial at Santos. Some passages of that letter have been printed in the Rio newspaper "O Globo" of March 11. Roitman says: "The question has a long background as comrade Crispim's thesis reveals; it is therefore much wider and deeper than a simple personal question. It involves deep ideological and political differences which are reflected in the lack of a uniform and sound tactic for the whole party as well as in the dissolution of the party in the industries and the liquidation of the workers cadres which ensure the permanent connection of the party with the working class (my emphasis)—Madeira."

After claiming his allegiance to "Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism" he asserts: "I have already warned

my most intimate comrades that the situation in the party leads us fatally to the following dilemma: dissolution (with the consequent fascist terror in the country) or a fourth national party congress which will achieve a self-critical change of policies and a thorough reorganization so as to safeguard the unity of the democratic, anti-imperialist, workers' movement." He states he can't stand any longer the "blind obedience to orders from individuals who very often are conscious agents of the class-enemy in our ranks," and accuses the "troika" Arruda Camara-Joao Amazonas-Mauricio Grabois, which controls the party (Prestes seems to be hidden near the Brazilian border in Bolivia or Uruguay), to be a group of men "with hideous purposes," responsible "for the present crisis in the party." Roitman ends by saying that the Stalinist organization "will be greatly strengthened by discussion, approval and effective application of comrade J. M. Crispim's proposals."

No one, outside the top Stalinist circles has seen Crispim's thesis to which Roitman refers. Crispim's group is chiefly concerned with the calling of a party congress and the overthrowing of the "troika". Although expelled from the party, they say the PCB is still "their" party, and prevent their own activities from being known outside Stalinist circles.

STALINIST LINE IN BRAZIL

The split in the Brazilian CP is an important event because what is really at stake is the bureaucratic line for large, backward countries like Brazil. The scheme based on the Stalinist method in China of bringing the revolution "from the land to the towns" appeals very strongly to Brazilian Stalinists because of the more explosive situation in some agrarian areas of Brazil, the great distances from the advanced centers and the very nature of peasant movements which are more easily controlled by a totalitarian leadership and to which they provide a solid base when it reaches the big towns and meets the working class. So, instead of trying to strengthen its influence in the working class of the big cities, the Brazilian CP aims chiefly at taking power—or, at least, at starting a great trouble in the U. S. rear—by organizing and leading an agrarian revolution in the backward regions of Brazil.

Prestes himself writes in the May-June issue of the Stalinist magazine "Problemas" (pg. 8): "Without drawing any analogy between the historical formation

of Brazil and that of China, nor forgetting the specific features of the formation process of our party, the Chinese example calls our attention to the task we are now fulfilling which has basically a similar nature."

As a matter of fact, despite Stalinist emphasis on "the leading role of the proletariat in the Brazilian revolution," the CP is not at all concerned in taking profit from the great disillusionment among the workers who voted for Vargas. The chief open activity of the CP in the big towns is the peace campaign to which they subordinate everything they are doing. The Stalinist press is concentrating on two tasks closely related to the purpose of leading an agrarian revolution in the Chinese style: infiltration in the land and in the army. Since the end of 1950 many cases of Stalinist infiltration in the army and air force have been revealed—the imprisonment of former captain Agliberto de Azevedo (the leader of the 1935 Stalinist uprising in the air force center of Campo dos Afonsos, near Rio) when he carried out political work among the troops stationed in Recife; the cases of Stalinist cells working in the air bases of Belém and Porto Alegre; the recent arrest of 30 officers and sergeants in Rio; and—above all—the military club case.

There has always been a petty-bourgeois nationalist trend among the officers of the Brazilian army. This nationalist trend is now in opposition to U. S. imperialism and some elements in it are highly susceptible to Stalinist slogans of a national, anti-imperialist revolution and the building of a Brazilian national state "rich, powerful, independent." The Stalinist uprising in 1935 at Rio, Recife, and Natal, had a purely military nature. Yet, in spite of all their nationalism, Brazilian Stalinists very faithfully follow the changes of international Stalinist policies and even, in 1935, sacrificed their own movement for the sole benefit of Russian foreign policy in a bloody and desperate military "putsch."

The military achievements of the Chinese Stalinists in their civil war appeals also strongly to Prestes' own experience as the leader of Brazilian "Great March" through 25,000 kilometers in the interior of Brazil (1924-1927), during the petty bourgeois military uprisings of 1922-1930. (Prestes himself is a former captain of the army.)

The "Sinking way," i.e. the military-agrarian line, could not help creating serious contradiction in the PCB. After all, Brazil is not China, there has never been any political movement

among the Brazilian peasantry, the density of population in Brazil and the strength of the PCB has always come from the working class in the big centers. In Brazil if the Stalinists minimize the role of the working-class—even for their own totalitarian purposes—they commit political suicide.

Crispim's group is in opposition to the lack of a consistent Stalinist action among the workers as they break with Vargas and as the cost of living rises higher than ever. They also strongly oppose the subordination of all party activities to the peace campaign. In their opinion, the soul of Stalinist propaganda must be the economic demands and not foreign political slogans. Yet, they do not, as far as we know from their public statements, point to the "Chinese" line as the fundamental difference, let alone state that such a line flows from the very nature of Stalinist bureaucracy.

It is improbable that Crispim will be able to develop a strong dissident wing in the party. Since it has been outlawed, the PCB has lost its mass following and the party apparatus is submissive to the bone to Prestes and the "troika." Yet, the fact that Crispim keeps saying that the PCB is "his party" in spite of his expulsion from it, and his insistence on calling a congress shows that he must still have some influence in the machine. For he is not such an innocent as not to know how a Stalinist congress is called and held.

Very likely, Crispim will tend to a "Titoist" nationalist position, on account of his lack of Marxist background and the fact that the subordination of the party activities to the peace campaign appears to him just as a foreign interference.

Some days ago a manifesto appeared in Rio signed by Crispim, launching a Brazilian Revolutionary Party and attacking, in a violent, ultra-nationalist language, Prestes, the "troika" and the Cominform, which is described as "a political foreign organ integrated by elements with principles completely different from ours" (printed in Rio newspaper "Tribuna da Imprensa," March 25). A few days later Crispim sent a statement to an S. Paulo newspaper saying that this manifesto is a forgery, that he has not created any party and that for him, the PCB is still his party. In the writer's opinion, this manifesto was forged by the Stalinist leadership itself so as to make Crispim appear before the CPB adherents as a vulgar bourgeois Nationalist.

nor by the Stalinist bureaucracy, because the revolution is a spontaneous process, led and realized only by the revolutionary proletariat, and only under its dictatorship.

The Latin American "Trotskyists" (more nationalists than Marxists or proletarian revolutionaries) have assimilated very poorly the teachings of Trotsky. Therefore they must learn the reasons for their own mistakes and errors empirically, by their own defeats. And the Latin American proletariat will have to learn its lessons in its own flesh with them.

What does this historical experience signify for Latin America and for the whole world? It indicates that the coming revolution in America, Asia and Europe, delayed artificially by the Stalinist counter-revolution and the capitalist monopolies, must be and will be a socialist revolution under the leadership of the working class. It will be an indivisible and indissoluble social revolution. Even if Latin America is a retarded continent which still has to solve the problems of the democratic revolution, it cannot go through a separate "first" bourgeois democratic stage of its revolution under the leadership of the petty bourgeoisie, or under a coalition of the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie. Such a coalition could only form a reactionary government, one which would only hinder and restrain the revolutionary process. It indicates that neither Peron, nor the MNR, nor a coalition between them and the "proletarian parties" of their respective countries can realize the tasks of the bourgeois demo-

cratic revolution, or could be the bearers of progressive social transformations worthy of the "critical support" of revolutionary movements.

The concessions of such regimes to the workers, their social demagogy, are only means of hindering the social revolution and the emancipation of the working class. Therefore every collaboration with or "critical support" to them is treason to the independent class policy of the proletariat and suicide for the revolutionary party.

This does not mean that it is excluded that Peronism or the MNR could realize some social reforms or bourgeois agrarian reforms, or even the bourgeois nationalization of some industries or mines. Even if such reforms are not at all probable, they cannot be completely excluded. But such reforms can serve only as patchwork on the structure of capitalism, and not for the revolutionary emancipation of the working class.

This emancipation cannot be realized by the petty bourgeoisie,

tionaries) have assimilated very poorly the teachings of Trotsky. Therefore they must learn the reasons for their own mistakes and errors empirically, by their own defeats. And the Latin American proletariat will have to learn its lessons in its own flesh with them.

The Latin American "Trotskyists" (more nationalists than Marxists or proletarian revolutionaries) have assimilated very poorly the teachings of Trotsky. Therefore they must learn the reasons for their own mistakes and errors empirically, by their own defeats. And the Latin American proletariat will have to learn its lessons in its own flesh with them.

In English — At Last
The Famed 'Vol. 4' of 'Capital'
KARL MARX'S
"History of Economic Theories"
—From the Physiocrats to A. Smith
The Langland Press 337 pages \$5.00
Order from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

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 Vol.

Get it EVERY week!
A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year
LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 16, No. 19 May 12, 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, 1879.
Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH
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.

James Carey's Speech to the League for Industrial Democracy

The Mission of the CIO in America

LABOR ACTION reprints below excerpts from a speech made by James B. Carey, secretary treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in New York on Saturday, April 26. The occasion of this speech was the forty-seventh annual luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy on which occasion Carey accepted an LID citation to Philip Murray "for a half century of constructive achievements in the cause of labor." The general subject of the conference was: "Needed: A Moral Awakening in America."

Although LABOR ACTION does not necessarily agree with all the statements and sentiments expressed in the speech, we feel that it is outstanding as a general statement of the role which the CIO has played, and even more, of the role it can play in American society.—Ed.

The theme of your conference, "Wanted: A Moral Reawakening in America," is particularly pertinent to the CIO.

If ever there was a "moral reawakening" in modern industrial America, it came with the birth and early development of the CIO. Unexcitable historians have termed it "another American revolution" and a "vast, unprecedented stirring of the masses."

But there was much more involved in the birth and early development of the CIO than the phenomenal organization of millions of men and women into trade unions. What happened across the length and breadth of our country was truly a "moral reawakening." There was a reawakening of the conscience of America; there was an enormous resurgence of the realization that men are, indeed, their "brother's keeper."

An Affirmation and a Revolt

In the birth and development of the CIO there was both an affirmation and a revolt. There was an affirmation of forgotten values on which our nation was founded—that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

There was affirmation of the American conviction that this richest of all nations could and should provide its citizens with the opportunity for adequate food and shelter, with proper medical care, education and security in old age. There was, moreover, an upsurge of planned effort to translate these affirmations into realities. There was a renewed realization that broad political activity was a necessity for the effective functioning of democracy. There was a fresh recognition that the legislative process—and local, state and national governments—were not the private property of a privileged and wealthy minority. Across the face of our nation crept a mounting determination that the meek should not be disinherited from the earth.

The revolt—in a large sense—was a part of our affirmations. It was a revolt against an uncontrolled economic system that could callously throw 15,000,000 men and women out of work. It was a revolt against mass poverty and hunger, against Hoovervilles and breadlines. It was a disgusted and angry rejection of a philosophy of greed and inhumanity that decreed the most appalling human and economic waste the world has ever known.

All these events—revolts and affirmations—represented, beyond any conceivable quibble, moral and ethical upsurges in our society. Nor can any of us who lived through that period forget the element of spiritual crusade that entered into the CIO's amazing drive and achievements.

Blood, Sweat and Tears

There was self-sacrifice and individual heroism far beyond the call of ordinary idealism. There was blood, sweat and tears in unprecedented quantities—all dedicated to the accomplishment of a more equitable world and a more meaningful human fraternity.

It is to this "moral awakening" and to this

tradition of selflessness and sacrifice for the common weal that President Philip Murray would say the League for Industrial Democracy is paying tribute today.

Philip Murray would insist that the League for Industrial Democracy's Citation is really for the workers who laid down their lives in the Memorial Day massacre at Republic Steel in Chicago. He would declare that the Citation was for the men and women who were terrorized and beaten in Harlem, Kentucky, and Alabama. He would say that the Citation was for the workers who were murdered in textile towns, in maritime strikes, in organizing drives in rubber. He would assert that the Citation was for the intrepid men who startled the world with sit-down strikes in the auto industry, proclaiming a new principle that men have a property right in their jobs. Philip Murray would tell you that the Citation was for the CIO organizers who were left crippled by company thugs, and for the widows and children of CIO leaders who fell in the performance of their duties. He would claim that the Citation was for the countless anonymous men and women who sparked the great organizational drives, who walked a myriad picket lines in freezing cold, who toiled obscurely into the night-writing and grinding out leaflets, pamphlets and posters.

These people and their work were—and still are—the flesh and blood of the moral and ethical crusade that has been the CIO.

It is not alone we of the CIO who owe an unpayable debt to these labor pioneers. To the extent that we enjoy today a greater freedom from want and a greater freedom from fear, all sections of our American society are beneficiaries of the soil broken and plowed by the CIO and brought to fruition by the nation's working men and women.

We take almost for granted today the legislation prohibiting economic slavery and starvation wages. We seldom reflect on the origin of laws that protect women and children in employment. Rarely do we recall the fierce fountain-heads of unemployment compensation or of a social security system that has ended the degradation of human beings in their declining years after a lifetime of toil for American capitalism.

Assaults on the Status Quo

Similarly do we take for granted the preservation of our precious Constitutional liberties—our freedom of speech, press and assembly. But all these political and economic inheritances were brought to birth in struggle, perpetuated in conflict, and expanded only by never-ending assaults on the status quo.

But the debts we owe to the past we pay to the future. Our debt to the CIO leaders of the past, to the countless anonymous Jimmy Higginsons and their unsung achievements is the obligation to carry into the future that same zeal, that same fiery idealism and sense of moral responsibility.

We cannot change the world without them. We cannot bring peace, freedom and plenty without the destruction of inertia and apathy. We cannot escape injustice and the brutal exploitation of man by man without again closing ranks and again marching shoulder-to-shoulder as we did in the CIO.

For it is fruitless today to complain about political depravity and governmental corruption and submissively wait for some miracle to erase them. If modern society and capitalism has im-

posed anything upon us today it is the near-futility of the individual acting alone. Whether we like it or not, it is true. We are individuals only to the extent that we group ourselves together to fight the suppression of our individualities. We are human beings only to the degree that we combine to resist attempts to de-humanize us, to take from us our manhood.

What good today are our individual voices or our individual anger against the entrenched greed of the gigantic steel industry? What we confront in the steel dispute in 1952 is a world away from any dispute between an employer and his workers 50 or 100 years ago.

The steel barons of our day are determined to victimize not only their own employees, but all American consumers and wage earners. In their complete abandonment of moral and ethical sensibility, they would undermine the living standards of millions of Americans and even jeopardize the national defense program itself.

The steel industry stands revealed today as a beast striped of moral values. In its contempt for social responsibility, in its rejection of all concerns save those of profit-taking, the steel industry has proclaimed itself as irresponsible as that other threat to human dignity and economic decency—international Communism!

We can protect ourselves neither against rapacious industry nor Communism by individual indignation. Neither Congressional investigations nor the perverse variety of anti-Communism advanced by big business can give us our national salvation.

Common Goals of All Working Men

Our country needs, and our world needs, collective indignation that takes on strength and crusading power only by the cohesion of brotherhood inspired by the common economic, political and social goals that all working men and women share.

Our country needs, and our world needs, a great renewal of the fraternal spirit and dedicated idealism that has produced the CIO. These are not and should not be empty aspirations, for the goals that the CIO set for itself in the beginning and the goals that it still seeks are based on the broadest social values. The millions of members of the CIO have never been permitted to forget that they are "Citizens First and Then CIO Members." Our programs and our objectives, therefore, have insistently been those that would benefit, not just union members, but the mass of the American people . . . and the mass of peoples in other sections of our globe. By its very nature the CIO could not live or survive if it contained the contempt that both Communism and reactionary capitalism hold from those outside of their hierarchical circles.

These are times in which all men live from day to day. They eat and work and play—and join together—on the banks of a raging torrent that at any moment can sweep them and all their handiwork into oblivion.

The dykes must be mended, new walls thrown up, or all of us are doomed—including those who undermine the dykes or breach the walls. Human flesh is fragile enough but joined by common ideals and dedicated effort it can erect a wall that no force can penetrate, no torrent can wash away.

World's Workers Are Brothers

We are brothers with the workers of Europe, of Asia, of Africa, of all the world. We must act like brothers before it is too late.

The CIO, its president Philip Murray and its members will dedicate themselves anew to the task of international brotherhood. We will not just close ranks; we will quicken our marching step and enlist into our democratic army new allies, new friends and new fighters for freedom and human dignity.

It is for that determination—and for the tradition of the American labor movement that gave it life and substance—that you have awarded this Citation to Philip Murray of the CIO.

Humbly, I accept it on his behalf—and on behalf of the millions of men and women whose strength is his strength and whose aspirations are his aspirations.

S.F. BAY AREA NOTES

Strike Wave Mounts as Bosses Block Demands

By JACK WALKER

OAKLAND, April 21—Over 50,000 workers have been idled at one time or another in the recent and still continuing strike wave which swept the northern California area in the last few weeks. The blow by blow description appearing on page 1 of the *San Francisco Chronicle* in a "Bay Area Strike Box Score" feature included the following industries and numbers: Greyhound bus drivers, 500 (est.); carpenters, 12,000 plus 30,000 additional construction workers respecting their pickets; Western Electric, 500 plus 5,000 telephone operators and workers respecting their picket lines; pile drivers, 1500; Western Union, 1,300; and lastly auto salesmen, 350 plus 1400 other employees respecting their pickets.

To date, telephone, auto salesmen, Western Electric, and about 3,000 carpenters are back at work while 30,000 laborers are just about to begin their strike.

The basic issues involved in the different industries were wage boosts, the 40-hour work week, and fringe benefits. The unusual element in the situation is not the demands but the determined resistance put up by organized business. The carpenters are a sample of that resistance for they have usually gotten what they asked for or some figure close to that without having to ever hit the bricks. This seemed only natural in an AFL state and with a most influential AFL union. As it is,

apart from settling with some independents, the carpenters have been forced out by the Associated General Contractors since March 31. The issue here was a 15 cent hour pay boost versus a whole contract re-opener sought by the association.

Other instances of "toughness" included the use of University of California sorority girls as scab telephone operators by the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company (with some success in Oakland and Berkeley) at higher wages received only by operators with six years' seniority, and the siege-like stand of Greyhound since March 2 in its refusal to grant the five-day week to California and Nevada drivers.

Probably the most amusing part of the strike wave was the 17-day walkout of the auto salesmen seeking higher sales commissions. Concentrated in the East Bay area, the pliers of this semi-Rotarian occupation were successful in reaching a compromise settlement primarily because of the fine support given them by the "blue collar" workers in the garage and servicing departments when they refused to enter picketed showrooms.

Although the calling off of a national steel strike may have dampened the independence and militancy of the union movement as a whole, such local "rounds" of wage increases as that in the Bay Area and northern California foreshadow the inevitable re-growth of militancy required just to hold on to past positions.

Is There Any Difference Between A Selection and an Endorsement?

Speaking before a meeting of the Wayne County (Detroit) Federation of Labor, director James McDevitt of Labor's League for Political Education told the assembled unionists that they should use the same degree of caution in selecting their congressmen senators as they do in selecting their collective bargaining representatives.

"They are now one and the same thing," McDevitt said, "because, while they do not actually sit at the collective bargaining table, they have by law regulated your right to bargain."

We agree heartily with Brother McDevitt, and only wish that he meant what he says. The truth of the matter is that the LLPE offers the unionists no way in which they can select their government representatives, but only a method whereby they can endorse selections made for them by others. If the union movement were to adopt the same method in selecting its collective bargaining representatives, it would wait around till the employers drew up a list of candidates for it, and then "endorse" the one who seemed least likely to misrepresent the union at the bargaining table.

Is this an exaggeration? Here is what Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon said recently about the way in which political candidates are selected today: "The American people need to wake up to the fact that our democracy can be no stronger than the extent to

which the people are guaranteed an exercise of freedom of choice in selecting their representatives. "Now, where do these men come from in the Congress? The great majority come from 'smoke filled rooms.' They are the choices of courthouse gangs, of corrupt political machines, of professional politicians who select them in the first place as their party's candidates. And then all they give the voters in the general election in the fall is a choice between and among the evils that the party machines have selected as candidates."

How can the unions exercise caution in their selections when the selections are made by political parties, and they do not have a party of their own which can do the selecting? If the congressmen and senators and presidents and the judges appointed by them regulate collective bargaining by law, by seizures, and by injunctions, and affect the lives of the workers in a thousand other ways, how can the workers leave the selection of candidates for these offices to the kind of men and cliques described by Morse, and then hope to get their "own" political representatives out of the process by endorsing one of the selectees?

That is a question we would like to see answered by Brother McDevitt, and the other labor leaders who accept the policies of PAC and LLPE as the last possible word in labor political organization.

Rosa Luxemburg

REFORM OR REVOLUTION

This historic pamphlet, long out of print in this country, is now available in an edition published in India

Price 50 Cents

Order from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

Fight Michigan Law

(Continued from page 1)
ballot even though it obtained its place by carrying out all the provisions of the state's electoral law.

Apparently unaware that there is no capital punishment in the state, the author of the law included a death sentence provision for sabotage which was stricken when his bill was voted on. Nevertheless, the section on sabotage is so broad in its intent, that the entire labor movement of Michigan is endangered by it.

For the moment, the law is stayed—until the federal court makes an adjudication on constitutional grounds. That is the basis of the Stalinist challenge. The state's lawyers agree that a constitutional issue is involved.

The SWP is preparing to make its own test of the law on the ground that it violates the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of United States which states: "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law." The SWP is asking for a restraining injunction to prevent state officials from arresting anyone for failure to register under the Trucks Law and wants an order to compel the secretary of state of Michigan to certify the SWP for the ballot.

Shortly before the bill was passed, state elections director Edward W. Frey declared one of the aims of the bill is to see to it that "no organization inclined toward socialism is given a place on the ballot." Who could not be outlawed by the reactionary group-nothings who dominate the Michigan GOP? As a matter of fact, a proposal by members of the legislature to include the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Legion in the bill was rejected. The reactionary legislators do not conceal their real aims.

The most disheartening thing about the whole situation in Michigan is that CIO members of the legislature voted for the bill after criticizing it as unconstitutional! Governor Williams, "labor's governor," signed the bill without any great pangs of conscience. Three UAW members,

two of them international representatives, likewise members of the legislature, were also found voting for the measure.

WHERE ARE UNIONS?

In general, the organized labor movement of Michigan, and above all, the UAW, with its international headquarters located in Detroit, have distinguished themselves not at all in this situation. They have said less about this "police state" measure than about a hundred other less important things. During this writer's stay in Detroit, not one public utterance against the law was issued by the CIO or AFL.

The silence of the labor movement over a bill whose sabotage sections can wreak havoc with the trade union movement is the dreariest part of the whole picture. This silence, and the generally feeble nature of the comments made by labor leaders is either an unjustified disinterest in the new law or a surrender to the reactionary pressures of the

state officialdom, the un-American Committee hearings in Detroit, and the atmosphere of McCarthyism which is fairly strong in the middle West.

Whatever the reason, the position of the labor movement is self-defeating, for the emergence of such reactionary legislation under the guise of fighting Stalinism, has a logic of its own, as experience has, or should have, taught us. Starting as a measure against Stalinism, the bill's essentially anti-democratic and reactionary character, must spill over to cover other segments of the workers' labor and political movement.

That is why a genuine front of labor is needed to strike back against the reactionaries and to force the repeal of the measure, or to organize a legal fight to challenge it on constitutional grounds. If the bill is allowed to stand, it will be as a bayonet pointed at the whole labor movement and not merely the smaller and weaker political organizations of labor.

U. S. Invests Heavily

Because of stock flotations in connection with the development of Canadian oil, mining and lumber, public investment attention has been centered on our neighbor to the north but, in reality, Latin America has attracted a larger share of American capital.

Since World War II, a revival of private U. S. investment in the countries to the south has been marked, reaching an alltime high of \$5,064,000,000 or 37 per cent of total foreign investments by year-end 1950 as against \$3,850,000,000 or 28 per cent in Canada.

By the end of last year, it is estimated that investments in South America had reached \$5,300,000,000 or almost 40 per cent of the overall total.

Direct investments in branch plants or subsidiary companies make up four-fifths of the risk money; the remainder consists of American ownership of Latin American stocks and bonds.

In a digest of these investments by Chase National Bank, it is shown that by averaging a yearly

increase of \$400,000,000 during the postwar period, the flow south of non-governmental capital from the United States has stimulated all phases of the Latin American economy. This figure is about four times the amount furnished by U. S. government grants and credits.

It is noteworthy that, just as has been the case in Canada, the biggest growth has been in petroleum. . . .

In discussing Latin American trade trends, the Chase review points out that exports from Latin America to the U. S. roller-coasted during 1951—first up, then down, then up again. They finally reached a new overall high of \$3,300,000,000, 16 per cent above 1950 and far above any earlier year. Meanwhile, Latin American imports from the U. S. during 1951 totaled \$3,600,000,000, a 34 per cent increase over 1950.

—Los Angeles Daily News, Apr. 2, by Financial Editor

UPWA District Convention For New Party—In 1954

A recent convention of District Two of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, passed a resolution calling on the CIO "and all its affiliates, together with all interested groups of organized workers, farmers and liberals, to explore the feasibility of establishing a liberal party to take part in the 1954 congressional elections." District two of the UPWA covers Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana and northwestern Wisconsin.

According to the April issue of *The Packinghouse Worker*, official paper of the union, a partial text of the resolution reads as follows:

"CIO and other liberal organizations should give serious consideration and explore the feasibility of establishing a liberal party to take part in the 1954 congressional elections, such party to be based primarily on:

"1. A domestic policy which places freedom, welfare and well being of the common man ahead of the freedom, welfare and well being of crooks, tax cheats, tax chiselers, machine politicians and big business.

"2. A foreign policy that carries the same theme to the rest of the world by recognizing that hunger is the real enemy of man and that genuine peace can only be ob-

tained by eliminating the terrible and unreasonable exploitation responsible for that hunger.

"3. A political policy which can eliminate the dictatorships of the world, whether communist or fascist, by offering the workers and peasants of the world a decent return for their labors as well as full democratic freedom and self-government."

For the immediate future, the convention voted to back CIO-PAC drive to get a maximum vote in the 1952 elections, though

not committing itself on what candidates this vote is to be for. The gathering described PAC as "a powerful, independent force not seeking to capture any political group and rejecting with all its power any attempt by any group to capture it."

As is customary in this union, the convention also adopted a powerful civil rights platform, and provided for a vigorous civil rights program inside the union as well as in the community at large.

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

Steel Workers Stymied — —

(Continued from page 1)

the railways, the government's recommendations are not to labor's liking and the unions are seeking relief by injunction. It is also forgotten that the real purpose of the seizure order, in this instance linked with a sympathetic treatment of labor's demands, was to prevent a strike on the part of the steelworkers.

The seizure weapon has thus become the means of preventing the exercise of labor's most effective weapon against capital—the right to strike.

This is a major reason why the steelworkers are angry, baffled and back at work without their wage increase. The favorable WSB recommendations did not stem from sympathy with labor. They were motivated by the previous militancy of the steelworkers, their walkout on the WSB and their readiness to exercise their right to strike. What will happen now that they have surrendered that right, no one can guarantee.

RIGHT TO STRIKE

This surrender of the right to strike illustrates the contrast between big business and labor in the steel case. Steel refused to bargain, refused to disgorge some of its profits, refused to maintain price control, refused to bargain collectively. Labor's sole economic weapon from time immemorial against such behavior on the part of industrialists has been its right to strike. The effect of government intervention has been to cause it to give up that weapon. As a consequence, no real collective bargaining can be carried on.

This is what labor did during the last war. Industry profited during the war while wages were frozen and strikes prohibited. Labor is in effect again being asked to give up the right to strike. It can maintain its own in the struggle against profiteering **ONLY IF IT RETAINS THE RIGHT TO STRIKE.**

The surrender of the right to strike is the product of the support by the labor movement of the Democratic Party, and its consequent belief that it has a "friend in the White House." But the wage freeze, the ineffective price and rent controls and the lack of controls on profiteering are in part the products of a Democratic administration and not only a reactionary Congress. The steel strike was in effect called off by the "friend in the White House." Reliance upon the Democratic Party not only breeds illusions about friendly politicians but admiration and faith in the extreme exercise of presidential authority. Even were the president to negotiate today an increase in wages for the steelworkers, tomorrow he would—as has been done before—

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.

Marxism in the United States

By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents Order from

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

seize another industry to break a strike.

The danger of placing trust in government by seizure, or negotiation by seizure is, however, recognized by many beside the steel barons and those who have recently become so concerned about constitutional issues. Today's rigid interpreters of the Constitution number many of those who used hired gunmen, police, tear gas and bombs against the labor movement only yesterday.

But if the large-scale organizing days of the labor movement in the economic sphere, except for the South, are over, its days of political organization have scarcely begun. As its struggles move from the economic sphere into

that of politics, it is most handicapped. It cannot rely upon a capricious president, who is baiting the trap of labor's support in 1952 to the Democrats.

The president in turn will rest upon the decision of the Supreme Court which, while permitting the seizure to stand until it makes a ruling, at the same time denied the workers any change in wage rates or conditions of employment. For the moment, the strike is averted. The court, all of whose members are appointees of two labor-supported presidents, is an unpredictable body whose tendency is quite plainly on the reactionary side in matters of property rights, "free enterprise," etc. Congress, having passed the Taft-Hartley Law, is likely to pass

further anti-labor measures.

The steel situation is a striking example of how an economic struggle of the workers becomes enmeshed in the politics of our class society. It emphasizes the political character of labor's economic struggles, especially when government is a government of business, and when Congress has an anti-labor ideology which results in anti-labor legislation.

ECONOMICS & POLITICS

Labor cannot fight on the economic front without also fighting on the political front, whether it likes it or not, whether it wants to or not. As long as it continues to act "politically" as the ally of one of the two capitalist parties, or as an "impartial" supporter of its

so-called friends in both parties, labor can expect nothing but "be-trayals" and "stabs-in-the-back." The steel workers would never have gotten such a run-around as they have now if we had a government of labor instead of a government of big business in Washington.

Both economic independence, including the right to strike, and political independence—the formation of labor's own political party—are necessary for genuine progress on all fronts for the organized labor movement. An independent labor party would speak and act not only in the name of the labor movement or the workers in general, but for all the people of the United States.

Struggle in Textile Union — —

(Continued from page 1)

power to himself in running the union, that it was impossible for any other officer to influence the union's leading committees on questions of policy or personnel.

The device through which Rieve had accumulated this power is relatively simple. The union constitution makes the Executive Council of the union the supreme governing body between conventions, and further provides that members of the EC be elected by the convention. However, most EC members receive their salaries as state, area, regional or industry directors, and all these jobs are appointive. Thus the president can cut off the union salary of any EC member who meets with his displeasure, and he has not failed to exercise this power in the past.

It is not possible in this article to tell the whole story of the factional fight which has raged in the TWUA since Rieve's attempt to oust Baldanzi at the previous convention in Boston. The Baldanzi forces organized a "Pre-Convention Committee for a Democratic TWUA." Every resource of the International was used to undermine and combat the locals, joint boards and regions in which the opposition had strength. In preparation for the convention locals were jerry-mandered to give the administration more votes. International subsidies were cut off from subordinate units which were not willing to toe the line.

SURPRISING STRENGTH

In the face of this ruthlessly organized campaign, the opposition was able to muster surprising strength. They had the New Jersey and Pennsylvania organizations overwhelmingly with them. They controlled over 80 per cent of the Southern delegations, including all the important chains and key textile areas in which the union has been able to establish organizations. But they had not been able to crack the New England area, which though most threatened by the movement to the South of the industry still contains the bulk of the union membership.

The Baldanzi forces came to the convention prepared to battle out not only the issues of union democracy, but the vital problems which face the union. Although it is clear that they overestimated their strength, they felt sure of about 700 of the roughly 2,000 delegates, and hoped to pick up additional strength on the basis of the debates at the convention and the extensive proofs of machine control and corrupt practices which they had brought with them.

However, they were never given the opportunity to present their position on the floor. The first fights developed over the reports of the committees on law and credentials. All convention committees are appointed by Rieve. The law committee (usually known as a rules committee) proposed that all committee re-

ports be voted up or down as a whole by the convention. The clear intention of this was to prevent any debate on individual or delegation challenges on the report of the credentials committee. The only debate permitted at the convention was on this kind of procedural issue. On a standing vote on the report of the law committee the administration won by about three or four to one.

THREATS OF REPRISALS

The effect of this vote was to show the relationship of forces before any of the issues could be brought to the convention. It tended to consolidate the position of the administration by showing up the relative weakness of the opposition. Many delegates who before the convention had been favorable to the opposition now pulled in their horns and went along with the majority. A constant barrage of threats of reprisals against those who dared to challenge the Rieve machine had their effect.

President Rieve's report to the convention was a running attack on the opposition, with the latter given no chance to question or reply. The whole convention was organized in such a way that no time for discussion on any of the issues was available to the delegates. The opposition had to resort to desperate measures to try to get the floor and present their position. When Baldanzi was nominated, he attempted to get the microphone for an acceptance speech. But the power was shut off. Rieve pushed him away from the mike, and the ushers were ordered to remove him from the platform. Another delegate attempted to present some of the issues in his nominating speech for an opposition candidate for secretary-treasurer. He too was dragged away from the mike.

Unable to get the floor for a presentation of their position, the Baldanzi forces held open caucus meetings every evening which were attended by from 700 to 800 delegates and visitors. But the Rieve machine saw to it that numerous parties were held in their rooms and suites every night at which the delegates were plied with food and liquor, thus keeping them away from the caucus. Needless to say, Rieve ignored Baldanzi's challenge to debate the issues either in front of the convention or at a separate meeting.

It is interesting to note that the Baldanzi forces received two hundred more votes on the only secret ballot of the convention (the election of officers) than they were ever able to get in the standing votes on procedural or other questions. Although many majority delegates were disgusted by the behavior of their own leadership (to the extent that toward the end of the convention a number of delegations were abstaining on various issues), the Rieve machine was able to elect a whole slate of officers which excluded all members of the opposition from holding elected office

in the International. They also passed a constitutional provision which prohibits the International or any subordinate body from spending money directly or indirectly for internal political purposes. The clear intent of this is to make it possible for Rieve to proceed against any of the locals, joint boards or other sub-divisions which might wish to continue the fight in the union.

The daily press has been full of rumors that the Baldanzi forces intend to leave the TWUA. It is estimated that they might be able to pull out as many as 100,000 of the 350-400,000 members of the union.

The problem which they face is an extremely difficult one. There can be little question but that many people in the opposition feel that if they stay in the TWUA they will be gradually demoralized and cut to ribbons. For two years they have organized themselves as best they could, and they had hoped to win at this convention. This feeling can best be expressed in the phrase: "what more can we do than we have done?"

But what are the prospects if they pull out of the TWUA and form a new union? One of their charges has been that Rieve has prevented collaboration between the drive of his union in the South and the general CIO drive. If they leave the CIO, the chances of collaboration will be even less. The contracts held by their locals are legally the property of the International, as are the funds and properties of all subordinate bodies. The courts have a long record of ruling in favor of parent bodies in other instances where individual locals or groups of locals have attempted to leave unions. And in the South most of the locals have to wage such a constant battle for survival that they need continuing subsidies from the International to hold together.

THE CIO LEADERS

The leaders of the opposition to Rieve have felt so sure of the justice of their cause that they hoped that Philip Murray or other CIO leaders would intervene to ensure some degree of democracy in their union. These hopes were shattered when Murray, Potofsky and Heywood spoke at the convention and not only carefully avoided any mention of the internal struggle in the union, but

quickly fled the scene so that no one could involve them, even by implication, in the fight. It is clear that the last thing these CIO leaders want to encourage, regardless of the merits of the case, is a rank and file rebellion in any union. Even in unions where rank and file movements against Stalinist leaderships once existed, Murray was always very careful to give them no open (and very little secret) encouragement.

The opposition in the TWUA is faced with an exceptionally difficult decision. It appears probable that if they remain in the union they will not be able to continue the kind of open fight that they have carried on for the past two years. If they decide to remain, they will have to bide their time in the hope that the administration's inability to cope with the problems which beset the union will eventually arouse even larger sections of the membership against it. This is a long-range perspective, and one which must accept the idea that many of the members and even leaders of the present opposition will be forced to make their peace with the administration in the meantime, or be ousted from the union.

But the chances of a secession movement are far from bright. The employers have already taken full advantage of the faction fight in the union, especially in the South where it has tended to paralyze organization efforts. If the union were split, they would no doubt move to do their utmost to destroy it. This danger alone would find all likelihood tend to reduce the forces which would be willing to follow a secession movement.

Added to this is the general reactionary wave in the country which has created an atmosphere none too favorable for large-scale union organizing activity. The real hope of a secession movement would be its ability to expand in the South. It would have to start with some solid, even though small base in the North, and expect the existing Southern locals to join it either immediately or in the near future. But with the courts favoring the International, without cooperation from the CIO, with anti-union sentiment high and the employers well organized against it, only a miracle could result in speedy expansion of a new, independent textile union in the South.

JUST OUT —

**BOUND VOLUME of
LABOR ACTION
for 1950
WITH FULL INDEX FOR YEAR
\$3.00**

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City