

This Is What Is Lacking In N.Y. Labor Politics:



Truman Arms Bill Raises Temperature of Cold War

With the North Atlantic Pact formally ratified, the Truman administration has moved toward implementation of the pact by asking Congress to vote a special \$1,450,000,000 arms bill.

Though the administration bill may run afoul of various shoals at this session of Congress, the substance of the bill is certain to be approved. Republican policy makers are expected to question the bill in its present form, and to propose instead stop-gap arms appropriations until the next session of Congress.

Congressional objections, such as they are, do not contest the principles behind Truman's request. They are based rather on secondary questions such as presidential latitude in discharging the provisions of the bill and the details of some of these provisions. On the basic issues of policy there is fundamental agreement.

Such remnants of isolationism as still appear are unlikely to influence congressional decision one way or the other, as was demonstrated by the reaction to Senator Taft's attack on the A-Pact. However influential Taft may be in molding domestic policy for the Republican Party, it is men like Senators Vandenberg and Dulles who prescribe the outlines of foreign policy.

Temperature of Cold War Raised

Thus Senator Vandenberg stands for stop-gap aid now, pending fuller congressional action at the next session, can be said to have a meaning that Taft's interventions do not. But that meaning, however much it may interrupt the execution of various details, in no wise contradicts the aims of the administration.

The arms bill proposed by Truman in a message that raised the temperature of the cold war at least a notch, provides for arming the countries covered by the North Atlantic Pact, plus certain others like Iran, Korea and the Philippines. U. S. experts in military equipment and personnel will be supplied the nations receiving aid. Disposition of the fund to the various countries will depend on the president's discretion.

Shachtman Lecture in Paris Draws Hundred to 'Confrontation' Forum

PARIS, July 16—Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, was the featured speaker here on July 12 at a meeting held under the auspices of the socialist discussion magazine "Confrontation Internationale," on the subject: "Do socialists have to choose between American democracy and Stalinism?"

Despite the fact that this meeting took place during the midsummer vacation period and in the midst of the heat wave current in Paris, close to 100 people attended.

Following Shachtman's talk a vigorous discussion took place on the nature of Stalinism and perspectives of the independent socialist movement.

This meeting inaugurates a series of discussions to be organized by the editors of the magazine, "Confrontation," which will start immediately following the end of summer, and well-known personalities of the independent socialist movements will participate.

The bi-monthly "Confrontation Internationale," published in French, is a unique endeavor in the international socialist movement. It was initiated by representative individuals from Marxist currents in France, Spain and the United States, with the aim of setting up an organ where they, together with all other interested individuals and movements, could examine and discuss the problems common to them all.

This experiment has been enthusiastically received by various sectors of the international Left. Support and collaboration have been obtained from England, Holland, Italy, Germany, South America, North Africa, and anti-Stalinist refugees from Eastern Europe.

SPECIAL ISSUE PLANNED

Two numbers of "Confrontation" have already been published. The third number, to come off the press on September 15, will be a special trade-union issue of 94 pages.

For the first time in the case of the French labor movement, "Confrontation" has succeeded in obtaining the collaboration of all left-wing currents

An Independent Party Could Unite Labor's Power, But —

Liberal Party's Capitalist Politics Leads to Split Over N.Y. Election

Guerrilla Opposition Against CP Makes News in Rumania and China

From widely scattered parts of the world come reports of active armed opposition to the Stalinist dictatorship. This last week alone, news was published of guerrilla oppositions operating on sufficiently large scales to attract public attention in the official Stalinist press in Estonia, Rumania, Manchuria and North China.

In every one of these cases the opposition seems to be a peasant opposition. This is certainly true in Manchuria and North China. However, it would be erroneous to assume an exclusively peasant character, since all elements who decide on armed struggle are of necessity

forced to the countryside to establish operating bases. Most likely all of these groups are of mixed character and origin.

That they do operate in remote regions is one of the reasons their histories remain obscure. It is impossible to determine how many such different partisan bands there are in the vast Stalinist domains, but from occasional information (such as this week's revelations) we must assume that armed guerrilla movements are not uncommon. For in the brutal regime of totalitarianism every opposition must at its very inception determine its military defense. The nature of these movements is indicative of the harsh brutality of the dictatorship.

ONLY MVD TROOPS USED

A Prague dispatch to the New York Times describes conditions in Rumania as follows: According to reliable information, armed partisan resistance to Rumania's Stalinist government has become so widespread geographically, although small in terms of unit size, that the Bucharest regime has ordered special shock detachments of the state militia to attempt to clean it up.

The last detail here is of note. In almost all cases the regime is fearful of using regular troops because of frequent desertions, and it resorts to special bands of political police. In Russia, in the campaigns against the Ukrainian revolutionary democratic guerrillas, only MVD troops were trusted with the task.

In the case of the Rumanian groups the reports from government sources indicate links with monasteries in the remote forest and mountain regions. The number of killed and wounded on both sides indicates the large scale of these battles. The re-

currency of these partisan bands many times after their official extermination indicates a high degree of popular support and the fact that the oppression is too severe to permit their complete extermination.

In the Baltic states the Stalinist policy has included forced collectivization as part of the process of absorption into the greater Russian empire and cultural Russification.

There are increasing reports of mass deportation from the entire eastern border of Russia and especially from the Baltic states, many

(Continued on page 3)

Runs Liberal Party
—Into Blind Alley



DAVID DUBINSKY

Choice Between Capitalist Tickets Divides Labor Men

By S. PITT

NEW YORK — It is becoming clear that the decision of the Liberal Party to support Newbold Morris for mayor on a combined Liberal-Fusion-Republican ticket is more than a missed opportunity. There are many different ways of missing opportunities. The particular manner chosen by the Liberal Party has already resulted in the worst confusion in its ranks and it may even seriously endanger the future of the party itself.

When the Liberals emerged victorious from the campaign for Roosevelt for congress in the 20th District, the party was on the rise and its morale was high. For the first time it had achieved an integration between itself and the trade unions. In effect, the current alliance with the Republicans turns the party's back on the new strength it had acquired in the Roosevelt, Jr., campaign, renounces any claim to independent aspiration and indeed puts in question its right to be a party of all, rather than merely another political pressure group.

An alliance with the Republicans at a time when the Taft-Hartley

Law remains the legislative axis of all labor politics is, even from the crassest "practical" viewpoint, sheer stupidity or malevolence or ignorance or all three. Its first consequence is to split the New York labor movement wide open over an issue from which it cannot emerge either united or victorious, no matter which side wins.

ANTONINI for O'Dwyer

ANTONINI for O'Dwyer

TARRED WITH T-H

What will the wise and so-practical politicians of the Liberals answer when the pro-O'Dwyer labor leaders accuse them of strengthening the party of Taft-Hartley? The fact is that there is a great deal in such an accusation. If Newbold Morris were to win, only the Republican machine would be in a position to consolidate the victory. In the state as a whole the Republicans would be assured of a greater chance at control in the 1950 elections.

And while the entire labor movement, in its own fashion to be sure, is busy undermining the Republican (Continued on page 2)

NAACP Convention Plans Civil-Rights Struggles

By KATE LEONARD

The 40th annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was held in Los Angeles from July 12 through July 17. Eight hundred delegates from 38 states represented a membership of 500,000, a third of this membership in the South. This was a loss of around 80,000 for this year, and a failure by one-half to reach the figure of 1,000,000 campaigned for in 1947-48.

This failure was openly discussed by board members as "a crisis in association affairs," attributed to a depression among Negroes everywhere. It can also be attributed to the fact, recognized by the NAACP in its report on civil rights in 1948 issued jointly with the American Jewish Congress, that this convention met in the

shadow of "a year of great promise but scant fulfillment."

If keynote there was, he was William H. Hastie, governor of the Virgin Islands and personal advisor to Walter White, national secretary of the association, now on leave. George Streater, reporting the convention for the precise New York Times, commented that Governor Hastie's presence was interpreted as a move to give comfort to association members who contend that many state laws and customs must be changed to bring improved status to Negroes in Southern and border states. He was the highest ranking government official present.

Governor Hastie said that public officials who did not fight discrimination were a greater menace to national security than the radical groups now being tried for disloyalty. He was thus following the NAACP policy of using persuasion and putting pressure where it will tell.

TOP MAN CHANGES

There was speculation on the resignation of Walter White. This is nothing new, although it had been more and more persistently rumored as the convention approached. Roy Wilkins, the acting secretary, represents the same policy and forces as does White. Communist Party elements have used appearance of Wilkins, a weaker man than White, to attempt a move ahead. Concern about Communist Party influence was apparently inflated at the convention. For instance, there was even talk of electing Wilkins permanent secretary to prevent a "coup" by the party-line supporters.

On the last day of the convention (Continued on page 2)

AN EDITORIAL

Cardinal Spellman Does the KKK's Work

The cardinal is becoming positively insufferable. It's the same cardinal who boasted, a while back, that he was proud to be called a strikebreaker, at the time he was busy breaking the strike of gravediggers in a Catholic cemetery. It's the Cardinal Spellman who is the head of the church hierarchy in the United States. It's the cardinal who is on a rampage of denunciation and vilification against anyone (anyone, at least, prominent enough to make the time spent in vilification worth while) who is opposed to financing private religious schools with public money.

It was this Spellman who hurled the cry of "bigot" at the congressman who introduced a bill which did not leave the door open for parochial schools to share in federal aid to education. And now, when Mrs. Roosevelt ventures the opinion that this was the proper thing to do, it is Spellman who, clothed in the vestments of the Lord, has rushed to attack her viciously as "anti-Catholic." And his subaltern, Msgr. Cartwright, preaching in Washington, accuses her of "secret intolerance."

We have discussed in LABOR ACTION the arrogance of the Catholic Church's demand that the government help it to pay for schools which it runs because it wants to give children a sectarian religious education. We have already explained the socialist attitude: we defend to the utmost the right of any religious body to run its own schools, as we would defend the democratic right of any other institution to run its own schools, but a church has no more rights than any other educational or propaganda group in so doing. We are for COMPLETE separation of church and state.

Cardinal Spellman does not have a leg to stand on in making his demand, as indeed Mrs. Roosevelt helped to demonstrate. But the high church bureaucrats are not concerned with logic in this case—not even with the jesuitical variety. They are evidently trying to put their demand across by a combination of political blackmail (denunciation of a public figure by a cardinal has to be considered in terms of votes), by a moral reign of terror, and screaming vituperation, unaccompanied by the slightest attempt to argue the merits of the question.

And let no one be mistaken: these infamous methods are likely to have their desired effect. Already there is talk of a "compromise" in Congress, under the whiplash of the hierarchy. The first news of it refers only to federal grants for child health, but it is to be seen how far it will go.

We are unalterably opposed to any compromise with the Catholic Church which in any way undermines or weakens the indeed inadequate degree of separation of church and state which obtains now.

It has been pointed out by many that Spellman cannot be considered as really speaking for the majority of Catholics in this country, most of whom for that matter send their children to public schools. He is not speaking in the remotest way about any issue involving religious freedom. He is speaking solely and simply in the interests of the church bureaucracy and of the social aspirations of the hierarchy (which is reactionary to the core in this respect).

It is true that the position taken by the church and even more its reprehensible tactics may really be used for anti-Catholic purposes by bigoted forces which, as everyone knows, do exist in the United States in substantial numbers. While all progressives have to distinguish with the utmost sharpness between the Spellmans and Catholic people as a group, this is all the more reason for Catholics themselves to bring their church dictators to heel.

Spellman is doing a bigger job in fostering real anti-Catholic bigotry than is the Ku Klux Klan. And THAT is possibly the very worst aspect of the whole situation.

Bad Weather Hits New York City— Economically Speaking at Any Rate

NEW YORK, July 26—Whatever the proper phrase or the present economic decline is, whether recession or disinflation or whatever else the president's advisers will have, it has already hit hard among many workers. The unadorned fact is that unemployment is on the rise.

This takes many forms. Seasonal unemployment tends to be longer than in recent years. Periodic layoffs are becoming common. Where a plant closes for inventory, a practice recently reintroduced, the tendency is for the plant to remain closed longer. And when strikes take place they tend to last longer because employers are not unwilling to keep their plants closed for periods.

The latest figures on rising New York relief rolls indicates these trends. For the seventh consecutive month the number receiving relief from the Welfare Department has been on the rise. During the month of June 156,000 families were on the rolls in New York City, or about half a million persons.

The newly accepted cases include a much larger proportion of family

cases than in the past," says the Welfare report. Thus a shift has taken place from "unemployables," that is, persons who, because of age or infirmity, are unable to work, to the active working class of producers with families.

VICTIMS OF ECONOMIC BLIGHT

The breakdown on reasons for application for relief are revealing. Sixteen per cent lost their jobs but were ineligible for unemployment insurance; 2 1/2 per cent had exhausted their insurance, that is, were out of work more than 26 weeks in most instances; 12 1/2 per cent had simply exhausted not only insurance but personal savings as well and were completely destitute and without resources.

Thus increasing sections of the working class are already victims of economic blight. The large proportion of those not eligible for unemployment compensation shows that the marginal industries and commercial establishments are the hardest hit. These are also the poorest organized industries.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION
\$1.00 a year

Truman's Plea for Faith in Economic System Ignores Capitalism's Sole Faith: Profits

Condensed from a talk delivered by news commentator Gordon Haskell over radio station KPFA-FM (Berkeley, California). Gordon Haskell is heard by residents of the San Francisco Bay Area over this station every Thursday evening at 7:45-101 on your dial.

By GORDON HASKELL

President Truman's mid-year economic report, submitted in July, boils down in large part to a plea to businessmen to have faith in our economic system. In effect, he proposes that the way to avoid a depression is for all to act just as if the American capitalist economy is bound to keep on expanding; and if this is done, then it WILL keep on expanding.

Something of the same idea was expressed by President Roosevelt toward the beginning of the depression which lasted from 1930 to 1940 when he said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself. In the words of Truman's report, it becomes: "... if in every field of action we do the things that are consistent with a strong and growing economy, we will have a strong and growing economy."

And he calls for "initiative, ingenuity and courage."

Now two things are true about this economy theory of AS IF: (1) it is perfectly true that the economy would keep on expanding IF the businessmen always acted on the assumption that it would always continue to do so; and (2) it is impossible for businessmen, in the nature of this economic system, to act in this way.

JUST IMAGINE

Let's pretend that YOU are one of these energetic, ingenious, and courageous businessmen. To make it more fun, let's say you aren't some small struggling grocer or pants manufacturer, but the president of a giant electrical-appliances concern.

You read the president's report, and you're all for it. So you call in your board of directors and suggest that they act along the lines proposed by the president of the United States.

Your concern is strategically placed in the program. Your plants could use a lot of new machines to bring them up to date. You have a number of new inventions available which you haven't used yet. You don't have any plants in the underdeveloped parts of the country, so you can help there

too. And, as the saying goes, when it comes to conveniences and labor-saving devices for the American home, that's your corporation's first name.

The board of directors calls in your sales head, and that's where the trouble starts.

He informs the assembled gentlemen that for the past six months sales have been falling off drastically. Just two months ago your concern entered the market with a new type of vacuum cleaner which was years ahead of the competition. But sales didn't pick up much. Your dealers are cutting their orders, and have already instituted sales on your products which cut their margins of profit below what they have been for years.

They are sitting tight, using up inventory, and replacing it at about 60 per cent of what they used to buy. They inform your sales manager that even to maintain their present level of orders, you are going to have to cut prices 15 per cent, and to increase sales they will have to be cut from 20 to 25 per cent.

CUT PROFITS? HORRORS!

All right, you say, let's take a smaller profit. Let's cut prices 20 per cent if we can sell much more at that level. The board of directors calls in

their cost accountants to find out what this will do to profits.

They inform the board that even counting on a drop in the cost of materials, such a procedure would result in a considerable drop in net profits. They point out that by curtailing production in your less efficient plants, and by speeding up the work in your most efficient ones, you can make a higher profit by maintaining prices, or dropping them only 5 per cent and producing 60 per cent of your capacity, than by cutting prices drastically and producing 100 per cent.

Further, your experts point out that any new investment in plant is quite unalleviated. If the economy as a whole takes an upturn and sales increase, it might make some sense to buy some new machinery. But until that actually happens, any such investment will cut your profits this year even further.

They advise the board to wait and see what happens before plunging into investments which can't be justified by present conditions.

AW, C'MON! HAVE FAITH!

But, you point out to the board, we must have FAITH. If we cut production and everyone else does the same, there will be a depression. The president says everyone should act as if the economy is going to expand, and then it WILL expand.

We have a few million dollars in a contingency reserve. Why not spend it to buy some machinery and build a new plant in Alabama? That will keep things going for a while. Then, if our competitors and everyone else do the same, things are bound to pick up and we'll be better off in the long run.

In the meantime, let's keep up full production and store the stuff we can't sell. When things pick up, we'll be in a good position to meet the demand.

The chairman of the board of directors looks around the table for comment.

"There seems to be a misunderstanding," says Mr. Morebucks the banker. "This corporation is neither a philanthropic foundation, nor has it been created to balance the economy of the nation. Of course, we all have faith in our free economy of private initiative, than which there is no greater. But it just happens that the interests I represent have bought the stocks and bonds of this corporation in the expectation of receiving a reasonable return on their investment. The line of action you have proposed here this morning would drain the corporation of its reserves, tie up its current funds in unsalable inventories, and generally bring about its ruin."

"We are practical men, not economic theorists, and business is business. I therefore move that production schedules and prices be placed at a level which will bring in the maximum surplus this year, and that we use our contingency fund to maintain the level of dividends we have been paying for the past two years. In ad-

dition, that we institute a program of economy and intensified effort by our employees with a view to cutting our excessive labor costs to a minimum."

NOT IN THE PROFIT SYSTEM

After a brief silence, the board votes unanimously to endorse Mr. Morebucks' motion—and to find a new president who may not be quite as energetic, ingenious and courageous as you are, but who has the advantage of being sane in their eyes.

Now, that's just a little story I've invented. But it comes pretty close to what is actually going on today in every business concern with declining sales.

We live in a profit economy, in which it is every corporation for itself, and may the bankruptcy courts and the creditors take the hindmost. That holds when it comes to increasing prices in a period of scarcity, and it also holds when it comes to cutting production, speeding up the work and resisting wage demands when production catches up with the amount of money people have to buy goods.

The trouble with Truman's whole report is that when he talks about the opportunity business has to provide all the things the American people need, he is not talking in terms which make sense in a system in which the factories and mines and railroads are owned by individuals and are operated for profit.

He is speaking of social needs, not of needs backed up by dollars. And these social needs can become a real economic factor only in an economy in which production and exchange are organized and planned for the purpose of meeting the needs of human beings, not in an economy driven by the profit motive.

That's the Army

The army issued the following warning to military personnel:

"Pending final ratification of the North Atlantic Pact it is improper for military personnel to discuss this matter publicly except under the most unusual circumstances and then only after explicit policy clearance. It is requested that all personnel under your jurisdiction refrain from speeches or writings on the North Atlantic Pact without specific clearance in such instance by this office."

Conscription News comments that the army apparently stays out of politics only when victory is obviously assured. It did not, for example, urge its personnel to keep quiet when universal military training was before Congress. Instead, it issued orders telling military personnel they could speak FOR but not against UIC.

The Pentagon gang is hereby cited for the Order of the Gag and Parrot, with a phonograph-needle cluster.

YOUTH and Student CORNER

By JULIUS FALK, National Secretary SYL

The Socialist Youth League is sponsoring for the benefit of its comrades and friends a national encampment during the week of September 11 through 18. The encampment is being held in picturesque southern Wisconsin.

Every feature of this encampment contributes to making it one of the most worthwhile educational and recreational projects held by the SYL, and it gives promise of being a stimulating and pleasurable week. Many SYL comrades and friends from all parts of the country will attend and will have an opportunity of meeting new and old friends, exchanging ideas and enjoying a healthy spirit of camaraderie.

The camp itself covers an area of fully 235 acres of woodland, farm area, fields and camp sites. The living quarters are ample and pleasant, with clean private rooms and modern toilet facilities. Choice foods are excellently prepared in old "German style" cooking and are served in cafeteria fashion in a large dining hall.

Among the camp's more attractive features are bowling alleys for use at our convenience, a dance hall with juke box, a cold-water swimming pond, a baseball diamond, indoor and outdoor facilities for holding classes, a rathskeller serving the best Milwaukee brews and the broad expanses in which to enjoy the healthy Wisconsin climate.

EDUCATION, TOO!

There will be a full program of socialist, education and discussion, cultural and social activities of various sorts, as well as an extensive recreational program.

The educational program as it tentatively set up will consist of one or two courses in the basic theories of Marxism, a number of symposiums on important political questions, several lectures and seminars dealing with more specific problems facing the socialist movement and young socialists today. A representative of the National Committee of the Independent Socialist League will be on hand to participate in the educational activities and to talk to individual comrades separately and to give individual instruction where necessary.

A number of well-known socialists, members or friends of the movement, have accepted invitations and will also be present at the camp and will take an active part in the symposiums and the lectures. Members of the SYL will speak and everyone will have an opportunity to engage actively in serious political discussion. Moreover, discussions will be held of SYL activities and student work in various parts of the country.

Complete details of the educational program, the speakers and topics are being prepared and will be sent out as part of a special camp bulletin in about a month's time.

BIG DOINGS SCHEDULED

A thorough recreational and social program is now being worked out. It will include various sports activities such as baseball, touch football, volleyball, swimming, etc.

There will also be some social activity each evening: one night a special show by the Chicago SYL theatrical group, another evening a camp fire with evening roast and folk songs, another evening a showing of Max Eastman's film "Czar to Lenin." As part of the concluding activities of the camp over the weekend of September 17-18, the SYL is jointly sponsoring with the Chicago Independent Socialist League a jamboree which will be held at the camp. At this time there will be a big ball game, picnic, etc.

The great value of this camp for individual friends and members of the SYL and the organization itself hardly needs to be pointed out. It is the first camp ever held by the SYL and its success will furnish an important impetus for and greatly contribute to the success of activities during the forthcoming year.

The SYL suggests to all and sundry that they make this their summer vacation. From those who wish to attend, they request a \$5.00 deposit immediately, to be mailed to: Socialist Youth League, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

The deposit will enable the league to make a down payment on the total expense to the owners of the camp. Cost per person for the entire encampment will be \$20 to \$25 (that includes the deposit).

NATIONAL SYL CAMP SEPTEMBER 11-18

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

I'll be seeing you at the SYL camp in September.

Name Age
Address
City Zone State
\$5.00 deposit enclosed

NAACP Convention

(Continued from page 1)

the Stalinists, who had been demanding the reinstatement of Dr. W. B. DuBois as a functionary and his election to the board of directors, withdrew this demand, substituting for it a motion that the association celebrate the birthdays of the six surviving founders, including Dr. DuBois! That Hastie and other association leaders spoke against such hints was all to the good, and showed that they are more farsighted than some of Wilkins' nervous partisans.

It is to be noted that with this convention is still not a democratic election to the national board of at least four of the seven directors, from candidates agreed to by the convention. This is still not a democratic election—the board has been self-perpetuating up to now—but it is a concession to a widespread feeling that the national office "tried to hog the whole show."

This criticism is in part mistaken: of necessity the national organization has had to move in on local issues within the scope of the NAACP's program, as these quickly become nation-wide in importance and require centralized handling in many instances. The criticism is, however, mainly directed against the long-standing lack of democracy in the internal affairs of the organization, and it also is a repercussion of the lack of a vital branch life for too many branches.

As was widely anticipated, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Acting United Nations Mediator on Palestine, who earlier this year refused a Washington appointment, was awarded the Spingarn medal.

PLAN LEGAL FIGHT

Reports from various sections of the country occupied a large part of the second and third day of the convention. To be commended—not only from the point of view of providing local activity, but also because with the present impasse in Congress, this is one way in which Negroes can move at this time—are proposals for continued activity in the legal field.

British Labor Official Asks Jailing of COs

Even right-wing pink socialists in this country who think the British Labor government is on the high road and best road to socialism, will get a jolt out of this one, involving the recent case of a British conscientious objector.

In this case, the Ministry of Labor's official representative insisted that a CO be jailed, rather than merely fined, on the ground that the judge's softer inclination would set up a dangerous precedent!

The case was that of Norman Stanley Davidson of Romford, who refused to attend a medical examination under the National Service Act. On June 15 Sir Herbert Dunning, the chairman of the court, instead of imposing the usual "qualifying" sentence of three months' imprisonment, unexpectedly decided that the Criminal Justice Act of 1948 laid on him the duty of deciding whether or not prison was the appropriate sentence for a person under 21. In view of the character references handed in for Davidson and his youth, the magistrate decided to impose a fine of ten pounds instead.

Thereupon E. Adey, representing the Ministry of Labor, stated that he considered it essential that COs whose cases had been dismissed by the tribunals should be dealt with by imprisonment and that the judge's action would create a dangerous precedent.

Virginia, for example, is planning to push 96 cases already filed to extend the Supreme Court decision declaring segregation in interstate bus travel to be unconstitutional. The cases will involve train and air travel.

While traditionally test cases are brought where there is a law, in the matter of civil rights for Negroes it has been necessary to bring test cases to establish a law. That this is an asset in the long pull to establish civil rights was demonstrated, if demonstration was required, by the now well-known fact that the real impetus to Negro voting in the South came with the invalidation of the white primary in 1944. The right to travel unsegregated, or the right to vote, will be established in practice. And at the same time it is a venerable axiom that room to stand is useful when wielding a lever.

Speakers urged a nation-wide drive for state anti-bias laws, fair-employment practice laws first of all. The policies of the armed forces were analyzed. One of the current enigmas is the relative advancement of the navy over the army on its integration program. While the convention was in session, the army, only branch of the services which has not advanced a "racial equality" program, again announced that it was not in the social-reform business. The Fahy Committee is to have this finally explained to it on August 1.

The convention's call for a special session of this Congress for passage of civil-rights legislation can be considered good propaganda of the exposure variety, but it unfortunately is little likely to be realized as congressional action before the end of this session.

The NAACP also proposes a Negro and labor conference in Washington as the culmination of a Civil Rights Month. The precondition attached to this excellent recommendation—that this conference be held at the same time as the proposed special session of Congress—can, however, become somebody's "out." Such a convergence upon Washington would require careful preparation and leadership; one still remembers that a previous March on Washington plan in circumstances that augured well was sidetracked, with the NAACP leaders prominent among the sidetrackers.

The problems besetting Operation Dixie came in for attention. Clarence A. Mitchell, the labor secretary again criticized the NLRB. Earlier this year, testifying before the Senate Labor Committee against the Taft-Hartley law, he had charged: "Frequently in organizing drives of the AFL and the CIO in the South, the racial issue has been used to

And Fire When Ready

One of the reasons advanced for the arms-aid program being pushed by Truman was described in the June 17 New York Times as follows:

"... the orders for equipment that would follow passage of the enabling legislation would encourage U. S. producers to retool their plants for the production of military equipment. It is hoped that this would lead to providing the armed services with mass production advantages for their own procurement." The Times added that "it is now felt that the stimulus of the proposed industrial activity might be beneficial to the national economy as a whole."

In other words, profits for munitions manufacturers is still one of the factors for pushing the armament spiral upward. Prod the economic system with a bayonet!

eliminate a liberal union," and he asserted that the Taft-Hartley Law had created an atmosphere of strife which has resulted in serious attacks upon such unions as the United Packinghouse Workers, the Cafeteria Workers in Washington, and the United Steel Workers.

The NLRB, he said, had begun to approve separate unions for Negro workers back in Wagner Act days, and now it does so in every instance. He accused Ford, DuPont and General Motors in Atlanta, Richmond, Charlotte, N. C., and Houston of refusing to upgrade skilled Negro workers.

MORE POLITICAL ACTION

The NAACP, which has historically followed the policy of militant propaganda coupled with resort to the courts, has increasingly found it necessary to enter the political arena. Roy Wilkins announced the continuation of its practice in more recent years of working for the defeat of all public officials hostile to civil rights. (This was first seriously tried in the protest against the proposed appointment of Judge John J. Parker to the Supreme Court in 1928 and upon that occasion was successful.)

In calling for the defeat of all senators and representatives who opposed civil-rights legislation Wilkins named names, including the leadership of both parties in Congress. Of course, "this program is to be effected on a local scale as well."

This corresponds pretty exactly to the stage at which labor finds itself also. George L. P. Weaver of the CIO, speaking at the Race Relations Institute at Fisk University on June 28, outlined the key move in labor's program, to "retire" anti-labor legislators. There is irony in the fact that anyone would call upon Philip Murray to use his influence to put the NAACP in a position to make its political influence felt, as did John Thornton, director of the Mahoning County, Ohio CIO-PAC. Murray, a member of the NAACP's board of directors, does not seem able to suggest anything better than the program outlined.

The political-action discussion at the convention looked to November 7, 1950, when we elect the 82nd Congress, under the impress of the fact that Taft-Hartley is still law, and that no major federal civil-rights bill has been enacted. The association's 40th convention met under little more auspicious circumstances than did the 39th, which also "rewarded its friends and punished its enemies."

The NAACP and Negroes generally supported the Democratic Party in 1948, in a demonstration of bloc voting decisive enough to satisfy any politician. They saw nowhere else to go. The situation was complicated by the fact that the presidential election was used in the South to gain a beachhead for the right to vote. The Republicans could not even bid for the Negroes' vote. And to most Negroes, the idea of a protest vote looked like a luxury.

AT LABOR'S LEVEL

However, the "blame" belongs not to them but to labor's leaders. Reward your friends and punish your enemies—1948 style or 1949 style—has brought little effective result, but a leadership of labor in the political sense is sadly lacking, and there is not yet a labor party.

In this context labor does not advance and class differentiation on the political front among the Negro population cannot proceed. One thing this means is that labor elements in the NAACP cannot force to the fore. The work of the association will continue to have a limited effectiveness as long as this is true.

Liberal Party Split

(Continued from page 1)

pro-Taft-Hartley party the Liberals will be just as busy giving it labor support.

Luigi Antonini, head of Local 89 of the ILGWU, largest local in the International, and second only to Dubinsky as a power in the union, has announced he will not go along but intends to support O'Dwyer. And he threw this accusation at the head of Dubinsky, who fathered the Republican collaboration policy: "The Liberal Party has become the party of Messrs. Taft and Hartley."

Nor is Antonini alone. He hinted at what is rapidly becoming common knowledge: that many local union leaders will not go along with support of Newbold Morris, even those who are in the Liberal Party. For example, he charged that all was not well in the Hatters Union leadership, even though its Alex Rose is a vice-chairman of the party.

The chief effect to date of the decision to support Morris has been to split the New York labor movement wide open on the issue of supporting Democrats or Republicans. Both AFL and CIO have launched denunciations at the Liberals and this is only the beginning.

The bulk of the non-Stalinist CIO unions will support O'Dwyer, as will most AFL unions. Even Quill will probably support him. Since the Liberal Party claims to speak for labor it will have a difficult time indeed in verifying any such claim. The pro-O'Dwyer union leaders, in order to defend their political position, may plan to isolate the Liberal Party from the labor movement in the future.

There are indications that such plans are already afoot, to isolate the Liberal Party from the rest of the labor movement so that it will become (even more than hitherto) merely the top combination of Dubinsky and Alex Rose, just as the ALP has come to represent politi-

cally no one but the top Stalinist leaders of Stalinist-controlled unions.

HOW ATTACK O'DWYER?

Having accepted the principle of alliance with a capitalist party, what will be the basis of the Liberal attack on O'Dwyer? That he is a Tammany man? The season for that vegetable is indeed over. O'Dwyer is not a Jimmy Walker. If anything, he has been fighting Tammany.

This week he finally squeezed out Rogers, Tammany head, as Manhattan Democratic Party chief and installed his own henchman, De Sapio. He has even forced Rogers to withdraw from opposition in the primaries. In fact he is very busy building his own New York County machine as an alternative to Tammany's.

Will the Liberals charge that he is anti-labor, which he is? To be sure, that has been evidenced by his transit policy; by his maneuver of dealing with pay-raise demands in city departments (sanitation workers are still on a 48 week at miserable pay and a worse pension, which they must pay themselves); by his cruel policy toward relief recipients; by his reactionary housing policies of his Commissioner Moses and by his fare increases.

Then O'Dwyer will reply that no matter how evil his labor policy has been, at least he openly denounced Taft-Hartley and would not become a partner of the party that symbolizes it in the eyes of labor. And the rest of the labor leadership will back him up.

It is not yet certain who will be the Democratic candidate for U. S. senator from New York in the elections this year. However, the Liberals nationally have been a tail to the Democratic kite.

If, as seems likely at this moment, Herbert Lehman is the Democratic candidate, unless the Liberals suddenly and inexplicably alter their national course, they will also en-

dorse Lehman. They will then be in the position of fighting the Democrats in New York City, where this party receives normally its necessary overwhelming majorities by which to overcome the customary upstate Republican majorities. At the same time they will support Lehman for the Senate. Such an unenviable position could only have been dreamed up by the party's worst opponents.

Whoever is the cook of this devil's brew is a master of confusion indeed. For in Brooklyn it appears the Liberals will support the Republican nominee for borough president, in Queens a Democrat is to be the lucky man, and in Manhattan they will run their own candidate.

OIL AND WATER

Can the Liberals propose a serious municipal-reform program—schools, housing for low and middle-income families, increased recreation facilities, completion of municipalization of transport and reorganization of the city debt structure—all desperately needed?

Without the last two points on the above list, for example, it is impossible to have transit peace, because it is the burden of debt and the annual interest on it that gives the bankers a stranglehold on transportation, even though the city is technical owner. And it was that great reformer LaGuardia, running with the same kind of coalition as is behind Morris, who created this financial monstrosity.

There can be no programmatic agreement between these three parties, because their aims differ. The Fusionists are for good and cheap government, while the Republicans are simply for cheap government. If the Liberals are to make any popular appeal at all, they must be able to propose changes and improvements that cost money. Nor can there possibly be agreement on labor policy

between the party of the bankers and the party of the ILGWU.

What will the program of the Liberals be? Whatever they propose will be negated by their allies.

The question arises: Whatever led David Dubinsky—for it was he who forced through this policy—into such a swamp? How is it that the Liberal Party deserted its real of tail-ending the Democrats? No real explanation has been publicly given as yet.

A STRANGE INDEPENDENCE!

It seems probable, strangely enough, that the present Liberal policy was conceived as a measure of independence. After the successful FDR Jr. campaign it was felt the time had come to give the party some reason for existence, which it had certainly lost in all the years of simply adding votes to the Democratic column. Many members of the Liberal Party were anxious to take a step on their own. Many more have left the party as useless since it was not even in business for itself.

And so, it seems, in the eyes of Dubinsky and his brain trust, some measure of an independent role was necessary to save the organization from wasting away in dry rot. And this is certainly true. But since its inception the Liberal Party has been little more than a pressure group in and around the Democratic Party. When the idea of independent action arose, it meant independence FROM THE DEMOCRATS—STRAIGHT INTO THE ARMS OF THE REPUBLICANS!

It would be hard indeed to illustrate better the ruinous results of capitalist politics as it has been practised by the Liberals and labor leaders, in their firm effort to avoid the only course that in the long run can unite labor in political action: the concentration of all working-class strength on candidates and policies independent of both capitalist parties.

An Interview with a UPA Detachment Commander—

Russian Underground Fighters Tell Of Continuing Resistance in Ukraine

MUNICH, Bavaria, June 25—On June 23, a new group of fighters of the underground Ukrainian Insurrectionary Army (UPA), composed of about twenty men, crossed the Czechoslovak frontier. This group, like its predecessors who arrived in Western Germany and Austria in 1947 and 1948, went to the West by order of the underground revolutionary center, permanently based in the Russian Ukraine.

Below is the report of an interview between this correspondent and the commander of this group.

QUESTION: When did you arrive in Bavaria and how long were you on the road?

ANSWER: We crossed the Czech-Bavarian frontier on the night of June 22-23. We have been traveling since spring of this year. We crossed Poland near *** and ***, and we crossed the Czech-Polish border near ***. The Polish peasants were eager to help us, and thus we did not have many run-ins with the local police. We crossed Poland near the towns of ***, ***, ***, and ***. The Czech population also helped us as much as possible. We had only rare meetings with the local police.

QUESTION: In what region were you active in the spring of this year?

ANSWER: The area of operations from which we have come was Podlyasha, on the Polish-Ukrainian border, along the Curzon Line. During the past winter our group went on raids through Poland. In the spring our commander split up the group and ordered us to make a raid to the west.

POLITICAL RAIDS

QUESTION: Does the fact that you have left the region of the Curzon Line signify that armed resistance in this area has diminished?

ANSWER: As far as we know, the basic forces of the insurrection have moved from the Curzon Line into the Soviet Ukraine. Only small groups remain in these areas, since the whole Ukrainian population has been deported from this area after the cession of the area to Poland according to the treaty of 1945.

QUESTION: What is the condition today of the underground revolutionary movement in the Ukraine itself, in the USSR?

ANSWER: The Ukrainian liberation movement within the borders of the USSR consists of an armed underground and small units of the UPA. The units are constantly on raids whose main aim is political propaganda work. Sometimes it is necessary to undertake such actions as the liquidation of important NKVDists (secret police), in defense of the non-military population. Special underground groups which engage in political work among the Ukrainian

For the fullest description and discussion of the Ukrainian underground movement behind the Russian borders, see *The New Internationalist* for April 1949. The asterisks in the answer to the first question replace names of towns given in the dispatch as received by LABOR ACTION.—Ed.

workers function in the cities and industrial centers especially, among the working masses.

In the spring of this year the Moscow government threw into the field against the UPA new forces composed exclusively of NKVD troops, since Moscow hesitates to send ordinary soldiers on such missions. This action of the government led to a regrouping of our forces in the western forest regions of the Ukraine, but the government's attempted purge failed.

LEGENDARY FIGHTERS

QUESTION: What are the perspectives of the Ukrainian underground in the USSR?

ANSWER: The fighters of the revolutionary underground are men who have decided to struggle at the risk of their lives for the liberation of the people. The revolutionary activity of the UPA has destroyed the belief in the USSR that the NKVD is all-powerful and has demonstrated the possibility of struggle with the Kremlin apparatus of terror. The heroism and fearlessness of the UPA are legendary throughout the USSR.

The political ideas and social program of the UPA have found wide support and recognition among the toiling masses and oppressed peoples of the USSR. We know that these ideas are attracting workers on an ever-increasing scale, and also the collective farmers and soldiers of the Soviet armies. The best indication of this is their attitude toward us. Our friends recognize that if they should perish, their sacrifices would not have been in vain, for the ideas of the revolution cannot die. This is the source of our strength.

UNDERGROUND IN SATELLITES

QUESTION: Has the collectivization of the agricultural economy of the western provinces of the Ukraine and Galicia been completed?

ANSWER: The Moscow press has been writing a great deal about collectivization in Galicia and the radio has also carried a great deal on this subject, but in actuality matters are in bad shape with collectivization. The peasantry understands very well that the kolkhoz is the best method the Kremlin has for the exploitation of their labor. Since the village is the source of the most res-

olute resistance to collectivization and since the Kremlin has not yet succeeded in breaking this resistance, the Stalinists began in 1948 to take the best land and machinery from the Ukrainian peasants and to give it to collective farmers brought in from Central Russia. There are already many such Russian settlements in Galicia.

QUESTION: Is there an underground movement in Poland and Czechoslovakia?

ANSWER: Almost everywhere we passed in Poland, from conversations with the local population we were able to ascertain that underground organizations are at work. Strong activity of armed Polish underground forces is in evidence north of the river Bug, in the provinces of Bialystok and Warsaw. In Czechoslovakia there is also an underground. In the mountains of Slovakia there are strong partisan units. Economic conditions in

Poland and Czechoslovakia are almost the same, as are the moods of the population. The government is conducting collectivization at a slow pace.

If the reader wishes to know what these Ukrainian partisans look like, they are all young men from 20 to 28 years of age, workers, peasants and in some cases students. They are dressed in military uniforms of the Soviet and Polish armies; their clothing has been worn out during the raids. They carry light arms of Russian make.

They appear to be extremely tired, since they have had to travel by night. But their spirit and morale are high, since these people know what they are fighting for. These are the simple soldiers of the revolution who are fighting to replace the deathlike Stalinist dictatorship with a classless society.

British Trotskyists Dissolve RCP, Enter Labor Party as Left Wing

The British Trotskyists, official section of the Fourth International, have decided to dissolve their organization (called the Revolutionary Communist Party) and to enter the Labor Party as individual members. The decision is announced in a folder published as a special July number of the Socialist Appeal, the RCP organ up to now.

The action was taken, explains the statement, at a special national conference of the party in London on June 4, 5 and 6. It is motivated particularly in the following passage:

"While the Labor government has introduced a series of economic and political reforms, we do not believe that these reforms have gone far enough, or that they have basically undermined the capitalist structure of the country. The experience of two years of nationalizations has brought to the forefront the problem of workers' control and management of the nationalized industries; of further nationalization and inroads into capitalist enterprise—key questions for a future socialist development of the country.

"There is dissatisfaction among wide sections of the working class with the policy of the Labor government. They reflect this, however, not by seeking for a new or more revolutionary organization, but by striving to exert pressure through their established mass political organization—the Labor Party. They see no alternative in small left-wing groupings outside that party. The perspective for socialists must therefore be to join the ranks of the politically

conscious workers inside the Labor Party and try to orientate its policy along truly socialist lines."

After outlining their views—still including, unfortunately, the conception that Stalinist Russia should be defended in war, because "the economic base of Russia is historically progressive"—the statement concludes:

"We would prefer to have the right to enter the Labor Party as an organized body, affiliated in the same manner as the Fabian Society and other organizations. But this is not possible owing to the 1946 decision of the Labor Party regarding organizations seeking affiliation. We have therefore dissolved our organization and will fight as individual members, within the framework of the constitution of the Labor Party, for the policy outlined above. By dissolving the Revolutionary Communist Party and entering the Labor Party as individual members we consider we will best play our part in aiding the British workers to reach their socialist goal. We appeal to all friends and sympathizers to take this step together with us. Our members are confident that by such a step they ensure their fullest participation in the development of the British working class and that in the common struggle for socialism together with other members of the Labor Party, the correctness of our ideas can be demonstrated.

J. HASTON

"On behalf of the Committee of Dissolution."

WORLD POLITICS

Discussion: Toward a Socialist Program on Britain's Economic Squeeze

The headlines have been giving enough prominence to the latest of the many British economic "crises" that have been so prevalent since the end of the war. A speech by Winston Churchill and an answer by Clement Attlee have announced that the current economic situation is to be the basis of the campaign already beginning for next year's general election.

American publicists tend to agree with Churchill's declaration that the present state is a product of the Labor Party's "socialism," with some adding the special provincial twist of a Robert McCormack that you can't "expect much better from the British dryway." The more sagacious official American government reports are much more sober, but these do not get top billing in the press.

Despite Churchill's loose pronouncements, the British "recovery" from the war, in terms of production figures, is about as good as could be expected from any capitalist nation under similar conditions, and probably better than any other country so closely involved in the war and with an equivalent industrial structure. The present difficulties, like all the others since the war, are the product of the long-time development of capitalist Britain.

FROM CREDITOR TO DEBTOR

As should be well known to any interested person by now, much of British national wealth was based upon its exports of coal and finished products, but another equally important base was the large amount of "invisible exports," primarily government and private investments and loans abroad.

Satisfied with the returns from the latter, British capital was lax about modernizing much of its industry. But these investments and loans are now largely gone, and Britain is now very largely a debtor country; it even owes money to India, formerly one of its own largest debtors.

Living in this new world, the design of the Labor Party government was to increase production and exports to such an extent that these "invisible" exports would compensate for the loss of the "visible," either of which is necessary to a nation that lives so largely on imports. What made the task so difficult at the outset was the all-pervasive peculiarity of the post-war capitalist world—the fact that necessary imports must largely come from the United States and the few other places, like Canada, which are included in its "dollar area." In the inflationary trend of the post-war years, the British purchases in the U. S. had to be made at increasingly higher prices. As a result, the original American loan to Britain was more quickly dissipated than anticipated, and this became one of the prime justifications for the Marshall Plan.

A further quirk was that British goods are mostly in direct competition with those of the United States, both in this country and in the rest of the world. This was somewhat mitigated by the existence of a sellers' market in which almost anything could find a producer. But the world has apparently reverted to a buyers' market setup; the advancing American recession has cut down purchases of British goods in this country; and the slight reduction in prices here has further pushed American goods below those of Britain in purchase price. For most of this year, British exports have thus steadily declined in the dollar areas, irregularly declined elsewhere.

TOWARD A PROGRAM

To maintain as low as possible an "unfavorable" balance of imports over exports, particularly in relation to the dollar area, the amount of the former has been cut several times, further reducing the living standards (which still remain the highest of any major European state). Latest proposals of the government call for another such reduction in consumer imports.

The "dollar" crisis is of immediate interest to the entire population. Britain has tried to overcome it partially by "unilateral" trade agreements with various countries, including Argentina among the Western states, and Yugoslavia as well as Russia itself from behind the Iron Curtain. These attempts have been few, often limited and blocked by protests from the United States and other Western European countries.

The possibility of some immediate answer for the British worker has been given, from what can be observed in this country, by various elements on the left, most prominently in the publication of the Independent Labor Party, the Socialist Leader, and in that of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the Socialist Appeal. But we have not seen any systematic presentation of a program that could have significant immediate meaning

for British workers. From a full ocean away, we would like to take the risk of making suggestions for such a possible platform.

It is, of course, first of all, necessary to point out that the British economy remains overwhelmingly non-nationalized. The further nationalization of industry and finance, beyond that advocated by the Labor Party, and under full workers' control, should, of course, be primary. This would give a workers' government a far better control over the economic life than it can now possibly have. But the question will still arise: How can this importing country so narrow the gap between imports and exports that living standards tend to be raised rather than lowered?

DEBT CAN BE LOWERED

A reduction of some of the government debt would obviously reduce over-all national costs and permit easier sales in the world market. This must in no manner come by lowering the income of the workers, either by lowering wages or, as proposed by the Conservatives, by cutting social services, which are among the really substantial gains of the Labor Party government.

There are two other important places for reducing costs. One is the abolition, or at least the reduction, of the tremendous first mortgage held by the former owners of the nationalized industries, in the form of their bonds based upon inflated valuations.

Second, though not necessarily secondary in importance, is the reduction of the vast amount spent upon maintenance of the military establishment both at home and abroad. This implies an end to the continuation of imperialist policies by the Labor government, including the German and Austrian occupations, a breakthrough from the American orbit, the assumption of leadership in the formation of an independent democratic Western union—something the Labor Party has ironically allowed Churchill to take over.

Basic to any improvement is the increase of industrial efficiency. This has been attempted, but in strictly narrow bureaucratic fashion, by managers of nationalized industries and private owners. To make a serious try at a significant increase in individual productivity requires the participation of and contributions from the majority of the population, giving their ideas, effort, loyalty and devoted interest. This will come only with a complete transformation in all of economic life—a change in the direction of democratic control by the workers themselves.

Several surveys reveal that workers in nationalized industries do not feel that the plants or mines or railroads are actually "theirs." They will have that attitude, and will give their all, only when they ARE actually "theirs"—when they determine operation and control distribution. It is encouraging to note that various non-Stalinist organizations and spokesmen of the left are making this tenet the cornerstone of their policy.

NO POLITICAL DISTORTION OF TRADE POLICY

Another approach to a solution of the current plight in Britain has already been indicated in practice to a slight extent—a movement toward trade with those parts of the world with which Britain has a complementary rather than a competitive relation, as it has with the U. S. British labor should support all such tendencies, regardless of the regime of the other country or the extent to which the trade is "unilateral" (something necessary to a planned economy in the present world situation). Any U. S. proposal to prevent such trade should be violently opposed by the working class of both Britain and the U. S.

And the inane conflicts among the Western European countries should be immediately terminated for some type of common economic planning, which could reach fruition in the establishment of the aforementioned independent Western Union. The political and military values of such a union have been emphasized; equally important are the obvious economic advantages.

To achieve the above requires the development of a political force that would be heard and followed by large numbers in Britain and the other countries involved. For us in the United States, our job remains the same—the creation of a socialist movement that would assist, with every means available, in the creation and success of a powerful group based upon like-thinking people in Britain and within its Labor Party. The last thing we can afford to forget is that the building of a socialist America would make the trials and struggles of our brothers in other countries a thing of the past.

William BARTON

WITH THE



Independent Socialist League

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

- AKRON**
Write to Box 221.
- BALTIMORE**
Write to national office of ISL.
- BUFFALO**
639 Main St., 2nd floor.
SYL meets Friday evenings.
- CHICAGO**
333 West North Ave., Room 3.
Tel.: MICHigan 9003.
SYL: same address.
- CLEVELAND**
Write to Box 1190, Station B.
- DETROIT**
9016 12th St.
- LOS ANGELES**
3314 So. Grand, Tel.: Richmond 7-3230 (if no answer, phone AX 2-9067).
- NEWARK**
248 Market St.
- NEW YORK CITY**
City Center: 114 West 14th St., third floor. Tel.: WAtkins 4-4222, CItelsea 2-9681.
Open daily 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.
Manhattan Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.
Industrial Branch: Thursday, 8:15 p.m. at City Center.
Brooklyn - Brownsville Branch: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m. at De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin).
Queens Branch: Write to ISL at City Center, 114 West 14th Street.

- NEW YORK CITY—SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE**
For all information, write: Socialist Youth League, 114 West 14th St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.
Manhattan Unit: Open forum every Friday, 8:30 p.m. at City Center, 114 West 14th St.
Bronx Unit: Open forum every other Sunday, 8:30 p.m., at 1330 Wilkins Ave.
Brooklyn Unit: Open forum every Thursday, 8:30 p.m., at 1758 East 5th St., Brooklyn.
- PHILADELPHIA**
1139 West Girard Ave., 3rd floor. Meetings Monday at 8 p.m. Open House, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.
- PITTSBURGH**
Write to national office of ISL.
- READING**
Write to P. O. Box 1671.
- SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA**
Write to Labor Action Hall, 466 Tenth St., Room 212, Oakland 7, Cal.
- SEATTLE**
Write to Labor Action, Box 358, 905 3rd Ave.
- ST. LOUIS**
Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.
- WEST VIRGINIA**
Write to national office of ISL.
- YOUNGSTOWN**
Write to J. P. Walters, Box 605.

PRESS MANAGER'S



PRESS ACTION

By JOE ROAN

PRESS ACTION AT THE UAW CONVENTION: Our comrades of the Chicago branch of the ISL did a noble job in covering the UAW convention at Milwaukee with LABOR ACTION and other literature. . . . 2,000 copies of the July 4 issue were distributed. . . . 500 copies of the July 11 issue, sent by special delivery, arrived in time to make a second distribution.

Bob F. of Chicago writes as follows: "It was well received and read by all in the convention. In my opinion it served to make clear the infernal union situation to many." . . . Proof accompanies the letter in the form of a large batch of subscriptions gathered from convention delegates. Besides the subs, a number of copies of NEXT—A LABOR PARTY by Jack Ranger were sold. Orphans to all deserving. . . .

Bob also promises a large payment on literature from Chicago very soon. . . . Send it in, Bob, send it in.

By the way, the pamphlet NEXT—A LABOR PARTY! by Jack Ranger, is still available from this address: Labor Action Book Service, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. . . . 25 cents postpaid, for a single copy, 20 cents each in bundles of 10 to 50; 18 cents each for more than 50.

Recently we have received a steady flow of requests from the labor and international reporters of many newspapers for subs to LABOR ACTION. We try to fill all such requests. Side-light: among the casualties on that plane that crashed recently in India carrying American correspondents from a tour of Indonesia, were two reporters who had been receiving the paper.

In the past week subs have been received from, among other places, Alaska and Argentina. Our friends down South America way heard about us in the pages of the Socialist Leader of England.

And from far away India, a socialist writes that our press is an important part of the library in his socialist youth center. He asks that we print more on the Stalinist movements in the East and on Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution in its present day application. . . . Well, Editor?

Among those present with payments this week were Los Angeles and Newark, now restored to this department's good graces . . . and subs from all over.

Next—A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 Cents for Single Copies Independent Socialist League
20 Cents ea., bundles of 10-50 4 Court Square
18 Cents ea., bundles over 50 Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Guerrilla Opposition —

(Continued from page 1)

parts of which are now settled by Russian peasants who have been transplanted into these old communities, very often also forcibly. Even the cities are being Russified. Thus it is reported that Konigsburg, in former East Prussia, has become a Russian city.

These facts provide the drives to opposition. They are matters of life and death, for to be forcibly deported

to the far wastes of Asiatic Russia is for these people tantamount to extinction. It is not surprising that partisan groups are active here.

RED SPEARS TAKE FIELD

The news from China is more obscure. There the regime is too new for a clear judgment on the causes of opposition. Thus it may be that in isolated instances Kuomintang elements may take the field.

Or, as is hinted, in North China provinces such as Shantung, the Red Spears, a secret society that goes back 500 years in the history of peasant uprisings, has gone into opposition. The Red Spears have had a checkered career, at times being the organizer of the peasants versus the tyrants of state and landlords; at other times it has been the rallying

center of the gentry against the peasants. There is no information available on its present role.

However, continued inflation, recent floods which usually bring famine in their wake, may be factors. Also Stalinist taxation is on the rise in the securely conquered areas in Manchuria and North China. This taxation is not yet of the level of the Kuomintang's but is rising steadily as the CP begins its economic program, particularly industrialization. Peasants who but yesterday fought the government for better conditions are not likely to permit the new regime to exercise its oppression easily. Thus one of the bands is supposed to have raised the slogan: Crush the Kuomintang and Down with the Communists.

In Spanish

5. Manis: Jalones de Derrota: Promesa de Victoria (España 1930-40), 424 pp.....\$3.50

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

Subscribers — Attention!

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

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

13-31

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

RENEW NOW

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

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

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

Vol. 13, No. 31 August 1, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper
Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett
Business Manager: Joseph Roan

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

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Presenting the Case of the Workers Party before the Board of Regents in Albany —

Independent Socialism and 'Subversive' Lists

Speech by Hal Draper At Feinberg Law Hearing

I do not want to spend any time now on our condemnation of the Feinberg Law, especially in view of the fact that so many excellent arguments have already been made on that score by the preceding speakers. I realize that the law has been passed by the state legislature which has—unfortunately—foisted upon this committee the task of implementing it. I want rather to discuss the question which is directly before this committee hearing: whether or not the Workers Party was "subversive" as defined in the act.

However, I cannot resist making one comment in passing on the law itself before taking this up. One—not the only one and not even the most important one, perhaps, but one of the reasons for our condemnation of the Feinberg Law and similar laws is precisely the fact that it makes it possible for supporters and defenders of the most brutal and despotic tyranny on earth, Russia, to come before this committee and elsewhere and pose as defenders of democracy, as Mrs. Gates of the Communist Party did a while ago.

It is such laws and such practices by government agencies in the U. S. which make it easy for the Communist Party to dupe followers and sympathizers, hypocritically and demagogically (and with excellent arguments too), while at the same time they laud the Russian prison-state. For our part, as democratic socialists, we do not condone such police measures when they are practised by the Russian government, and we cannot condone them when practised by the American government.

But, as I said, I want to discuss the Workers Party's relationship to the Feinberg Law. And on this point I come before you as the representative of an organization which is, in one respect, in a somewhat different position from that of the other groups here. You have already been told that the attorney general's "subversive" list was drawn up without any hearings or presentation of evidence. Well, we have had a hearing of a sort, at least.

It occurred, to be sure, somewhat accidentally and without any thanks to the attorney general's office. It was a hearing by a president's loyalty review board; and it resulted in a decision which cleared the Workers Party and in effect reversed the opinion of the attorney general. As far as I know, we are the only organization in whose case the listing of the attorney general was thus in effect overruled.

(I should make one thing clear before going ahead, though I think the committee already understands it. You invited the Workers Party to this hearing. Well, last April, at the last convention of the Workers Party, it was decided to dissolve the Workers Party as a political party and establish in its stead a league for the popularization of the ideas of socialism; the Independent Socialist League was adopted as the name. The Workers Party therefore no longer exists, but the last thing we wanted was any suspicion that this action was taken in order in any way to circumvent or "get around" the attorney general's listing. We even sent a letter to the attorney general's office informing him of the change and stating that the ISL would continue all efforts to remove the name of the Workers Party from the list. That is also why I am here this afternoon.)

Board Cleared WP

The case I mentioned just before came up in the Department of Commerce. The man involved was charged with being a supporter of the Workers Party. He not only admitted this charge but stated that he had personally helped the Workers Party in its activities; that he had contributed money to it; that he had helped to distribute its literature. There was therefore no purely personal issue involved.

The hearing on his case was transformed into a hearing on the character and ideas of the Workers Party. The president's loyalty review board, a national board of the Department of Commerce, headed by Oliver C. Short, permitted him to call witnesses to testify. Max Shachtman, the national chairman of the Workers Party (now national chairman of the ISL), was called before the board and cross-examined thoroughly and at length by counsel and by the members of the board on the beliefs and activities and organization of the Workers Party. Professor C. Wright Mills was called before the board to testify on the subject.

This, you see, while far from perfect, was something of a real hearing, unlike the drumhead procedure of the attorney general.

And this, the first thing resembling a real hearing on the attorney general's listing, resulted in the clearing of the Workers Party of the charge of "subversiveness." The man involved was reinstated in his job, solely as the result of the board's conclusion on the nature of the Workers Party. The attorney general's opinion was, as I've said, in effect reversed.

Now, it would seem evident that your committee should take this occurrence as a very important consideration. Naturally, we do not suggest that you should take the word of the president's loyalty review board any more than you should take the word of the attorney general. But certainly the status of the Workers Party, with respect to "subversive" listing is now, to say the least, anomalous.

It has been impugned by one government agency—without a hearing and without any presentation of evidence. It has been cleared by another government agency—after a hearing and presentation of evidence.

We are anxious for such a hearing in this case, for the most thorough examination of the organization. But this hearing today—is it to be of such a nature, that is, at least as much of a hearing as was vouchsafed by the president's loyalty review board?

Can the FBI Be Trusted?

You have already heard a number of criticisms of the strange procedure of the attorney general. Permit me to say a few words about this also, especially in contrast to what I have told you about the Department of Commerce board.

We were invited here by the Board of Regents, because the Workers Party was listed by the attorney general, to submit a written statement and to make an "oral argument." Excellent! We are to be heard. But on what?

The charge that the Workers Party is "subversive"? Well, we have denied that—in detail, as I shall do shortly also.

No evidence of any sort has ever been presented to us to back up this general charge, as you know. And so I am forced to wonder: On what basis, on what possible basis, can your committee come to the conclusion, after this hearing, that the Workers Party is subversive?

Because the FBI says so? But, gentlemen, consider the following:

On July 14, the Board of Regents of New York State held a hearing in Albany for the purpose of determining a list of "subversive organizations" in accordance with the Feinberg Law, passed by the state legislature to bar from the schools any teacher belonging to such an organization. (See last week's LABOR ACTION for the story on the hearing.) Five organizations—the Workers Party, the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the IWW and the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party—were invited to attend, present written statements and make an "oral argument" on why they are not subversive.

The presentation of the case for the Workers Party, which since April has been replaced by the Independent Socialist League, was made by Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION and acting national chairman of the ISL in the absence of Max Shachtman. His oral argument before the board is given here in full. As noted last week, no oral testimony was recorded at the hearing. The text as given here was drawn up by Comrade Draper on the basis of the detailed notes used when delivering his speech in Albany.—Ed.

(1) The Feinberg Law says that it is the Board of Regents that is to make up your subversive list, not the FBI. If your conscience permits you to put the Workers Party on the list because of the FBI's say-so, then no hearing is necessary at all, not even this hearing.

(2) Can the board—or any other citizens—trust the FBI's say-so? In asking this question, I am not even referring to the fact which Fred Thompson of the IWW mentioned before: Attorney General Tom Clark's characterization of himself as the biggest fool in the United States. Tom Clark is not the FBI, to be sure.

But first of all I should like to call your attention to something which appears only in today's newspaper [the New York Times]. William Hastie, the governor of the Virgin Islands, who is in the most responsible governmental post achieved by a Negro in this country—no irresponsible personage, you see—is quoted as stating that the FBI has put groups on the subversive list because they are interracial! That is Governor Hastie saying that, not I, not some radical!

Are you sure you can trust the FBI's say-so? (3) But let's say Governor Hastie is wrong. Let us even say that the FBI is a politically and socially unprejudiced body. Let's say that, at any rate. Well then—

Is the FBI to be considered infallible in its judgments—never mistaken, that its say-so can be taken? Are men to be deprived of their livelihood and career, as the Feinberg Law requires, because an FBI clerk makes a notation on a filecard? with no check?

Ask yourselves simply this: Is the FBI nearer infallibility on cases of "subversion" than it is on criminal charges? Remember, please, that the FBI is also supposed to deal with catching criminals. In the case of criminal charges, it has to present EVIDENCE, not its say-so, to be democratically judged by others.

Let's say that in even 90 per cent of its cases, it succeeds in making its charge stick, with evidence. In 10 per cent—or 20 per cent, or whatever it is—of the cases, its charges are thrown out, after it is compelled to submit its evidence. So it is not infallible. Why should its say-so be taken by anyone in the case of subversive charges, with not a scintilla of evidence submitted for public judgment?

But let us say that the board does not take the FBI's say-so. It has the FBI submit evidence to it. This evidence is whispered in its ears—I say that because we haven't heard it.

What is the worth of this evidence? I don't know. More important, I do not see how the board can know—unless it does what elementary democracy demands, unless it submits it for possible refutation and disproof, confronts the accused with it and hears the other side. For example:

Let's See the Evidence!

In response to an inquiry made before, you Chairman Moot, stated that no fascist organization was invited to this hearing because the attorney general did not present any such names to you as being subversive under the terms of the Feinberg Law; you added that you would be willing to have anyone submit such names of groups to you and would be willing to consider evidence as to their fascist character.

Well, I can name for you a fascist organization operating in this state: Gerald L. K. Smith's outfit, the Christian Crusaders of America or whatever it's called nowadays. I can present evidence also, if I wished. I've written a pamphlet demonstrating the fascist and anti-Semitic character of Gerald L. K. Smith and his movement. I can, for example, present evidence showing that Gerald Smith organized gangs of hoodlums to break up union meetings.

Suppose I did so, what would you do with this evidence? Would you confront Smith with it at a hearing, my say-so? You can't deal one way with FBI "evidence" and another way with other evidence. Is a democratic socialist organization like ours, secretly accused by the FBI, to be deprived of the right to be confronted with the case, while a fascist organization, ignored by the attorney general, is given the right to confront its accusations and accusers?

This procedure of the attorney general is very strange indeed, and it would be even stranger if the Board of Regents were to adopt such procedure as its own. Thompson made an analogy before, but it wasn't precisely accurate. The case is rather something like this:

Suppose you, Mr. Moot, are accused of murder. I accuse you, and tell you: "Clear yourself."
You ask: "Whom am I supposed to have murdered?"
—"Sorry, I can't reveal that detail."
—"Well, then, when am I supposed to have committed this murder?"
—"That's a secret. Come, come, what's your alibi?"
—"With what weapon did I—er—commit this murder?"
—"I must inform you that there is no provision in the law requiring us to furnish you with this information."
(That is a literal quotation from a letter which we actually received from the attorney general's office, a copy of which has been submitted to the board.)
But you're still puzzled: "What possible motive . . . ?"
—"That's classified data." Enough of this; please prove that you didn't commit this murder!"
You might even finally be driven to asking: "How do I know that there even WAS a murder?" . . .

In this procedure of the attorney general, you have already been told, a man (or organization) is guilty until proved innocent. More than that: in this procedure, we are not only guilty until we prove ourselves innocent—we don't even know of what exactly we're supposed to prove ourselves innocent!

In contrast, I've told you of the procedure of the president's loyalty review board—which was far from perfect, as I said, but at least that board did not accept

the opinion of the Department of Justice as anything more than the opinion of one source, to be checked and weighed—and finally thrown out—by it. It reached the only possible conclusion on the basis of some evidence.

Every liberal, indeed every man who really has democracy at heart, cannot but be revolted at the procedure of purges and an Index Expurgatorius of organizations on the basis of secret-police evidence and card-filing.

Lastly on this point: the procedure of the attorney general is a one-way street! You are put on the list, for good or bad reasons. How, if you feel strongly that this is a grave injustice, do you go about trying to get delisted? How do you get off this list? Do you know? Does anyone know? We have asked; see the correspondence we have submitted.

Once on this list, there is simply no way of getting off! None. No channel exists for challenging such listing. No channel exists for rectifying any mistake or injustice by this far-from-infallible FBI!

Against Totalitarianism

And so, since there is no evidence, and no specific charges against the Workers Party, in response to your invitation to make an "oral argument" I can only make some shots in the dark, more or less.

To be sure, there are at least two such points which I can discuss which certainly bear on the question. Whether what I shall say will be considered adequate by you, I have no way of knowing. This was possible in the case of the Department of Commerce hearing because the board members there asked questions to decide their doubts; they cross-examined; they brought up their doubts. In the procedure you are following here, there is no such possibility. And so I cannot know whether what I shall say will really be directed to what you have in mind or not.

But unless the pretty universal understanding is sadly mistaken, the occasion for such legislation as the Feinberg Law is not any sudden threat today from American radicalism. I am sure everyone is aware that in the eyes of its sponsors and supporters its justification is something else: the existence in this country as in others of a substantial force (the Communist Party) which acts as the political agent of a foreign reactionary power (Russia), which is engaged in a cold war with the United States.

Now, like a very, very large number of liberals who are not even socialists, we do not believe that such purge and witch-hunt methods can combat an ideology and movement like the Communist Party's. We are opposed in principle to the idea that the only way to combat the totalitarians is to adopt the methods of totalitarianism. And so we are likewise opposed to the procedure and type of legislation embodied in the Feinberg Law.

But the Feinberg Law was passed by the state legislature and not by the Board of Regents. I know that. But contrariwise, it is not the state legislature which is considering putting the Workers Party on a subversive list; it is this board. And it is this board, therefore, which has this grave responsibility and the opportunity to remove a grave injustice.

For the attitude of the Workers Party was, and the attitude of the present ISL is, one of irreconcilable hostility to the Communist Party and the Russian regime, which I have already called the most barbaric, despotic, tyrannical regime on earth today or, perhaps, that has ever existed.

In his testimony before the president's loyalty review board, our national chairman Max Shachtman made a flat statement, which I repeat to you: that it is inconceivable that any member of our organization would in any way aid Russia or its agents—any more than it is conceivable that any would help the National Association of Manufacturers.

We are socialists. We educate toward the replacement of the capitalist system of private profit by a democratic socialist society based on production for use. As democratic socialists, we are unalterably opposed, not only to capitalism, but to any form of what is sometimes called "state-ism"—I refer to the idea that the state should be raised to a position of absolute mastery over dehumanized human beings who are the de-personalized tools of an all-powerful bureaucracy.

This conception, this state of affairs, is as abhorrent to us—at least as abhorrent to us—as the capitalist private-profit system! In one form it is represented in Russia today. For us what exists in Russia is not "some kind of socialism," not even a bad kind; there is nothing resembling socialism in Russia today.

The Russian regime and the Communist Party are the mortal enemies of every ideal and aim and principle and good that we hold dear.

Some of you may perhaps believe that any kind of socialism, even democratic socialism, inevitably leads to totalitarianism. I've heard that said. I don't believe so. But need I argue this? I, for example, would tell you that the continuation of capitalism leads to totalitarianism in the long run. Well, who is right? That will be shown in the long run, and shown most effectively by the free clash of conflicting ideas. But it will NOT be thus shown by, on one side declaring the other illegal.

Let me make this clear. I believe that the continuation of capitalism inevitably leads to totalitarianism in the modern world. But even if we had the power today—please stretch your imagination that far—we would be unalterably opposed to declaring supporters of capitalism illegal because of such an opinion. Such a policy could not lead to a free socialist world.

Socialism and Democracy

The ideas I am expressing with some brevity are not a set of ideas dusted off simply for presentation to this board. We can prove without the slightest difficulty that the Workers Party was founded and organized around such ideas. (We have indeed been denounced for them by certain other self-styled socialists!)

The Workers Party was first formed in 1940 because the members who formed it, then members of another organization, refused to go along with the idea of the majority of that organization that Russia deserved any defense in the war as some kind of "workers' state," albeit a bad one. [A board member here asked what organization that was.] That was the Socialist Workers Party. We rejected any support to the Russian government.

Around that and related ideas the Workers Party was formed. And since then, up through our last convention, there has been a development of our concepts of socialism and democracy—the concept that socialism and democracy are inseparable!

And if, however much you disagree with our socialist opinions, you will try to understand our views (and, after all, it is our views that you are called on to label), then I think you will be forced to agree that it is precisely because we hold the ideas I have sketched that it is so senseless, so contrary to all we stand for, to accuse us of "advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence," by conspiratorial methods, etc.

We not only believe, but argue constantly with others,

that a socialist government which takes power otherwise than with the will of the majority cannot bring about socialism even with the best of intentions!

We insist with the greatest vigor that no "benevolent despotism" can lead to socialism. No benevolent despotism—and that means: not even our own. It can benefit capitalism, and has. It did in the case of feudalism and chattel slavery, many a time. But there is one kind of society that cannot be built that way, and that is socialism.

Why do we believe that? I repeat that you should try to understand our views, since you are called upon to judge them. We believe that because socialism is different from all other social systems in a very basic respect. Socialism means, if it means anything, that for the first time in the history of man, the mass of people are freed of class rule over them, that they take the stage of history on their own behalf and in their own interests. The working people become the dominant class, and they are the mass of people, the overwhelming majority.

And this freedom from class oppression cannot take place unless they themselves act. It cannot happen if a utopia—even a well-intentioned utopia, let alone a totalitarian dictatorship—is thrust down their jaws with a mailed fist.

'Force and Violence'?

How does this bear upon "advocacy of overthrow," etc.?

Unless one is simply mad, it makes no sense to base a movement upon the advocacy of such ideas and yet to advocate overthrow of government by a conspiratorial minority or something of the sort, presumably with armed bands using force-and violence to make up for the lack of support by the democratic majority!

As long as we do not enjoy the support of a majority—and the socialist movement unfortunately does not yet in this country—and as long as the opportunity exists to reach the ears of and convince such a majority by persuasion and conviction, we will continue to use every channel of persuasion and conviction open to us to gain that majority without which the achievement of socialism is hopeless. To do otherwise would be contrary to our socialist principles.

In Russia today, I might say, I would certainly be "subversive"—yes, subversive in the sense defined in the Feinberg Law. Under that regime, which is detested by the great majority of its people, where any criticism of the regime of any kind is met with jail and slavery and repression, there is not the slightest channel open to real socialists except secret and conspiratorial action, leading to organization for a forceful overthrow of the totalitarian government. There is no other recourse.

Today in the United States, other channels do exist, the channels which permit us to try to persuade a majority to replace the capitalist system with a socialist society. WILL IT ALWAYS REMAIN SO? No one here is going to guarantee that, nor would it even be relevant to try to do so. If, say, a KKK government, a fascist government, were to be installed in Washington, I hope that not only we but many others, you included, will be for "force and violence" to get rid of such a government, that is, a government which does not permit expression of the will of the people.

Can this "happen here"? I've expressed my view of the trend of capitalism, which is indeed borne out by current events. You may think, as I said, that this opinion of capitalism's direction is unwarranted, and that will be seen in the long run. But all that is relevant to your inquiry is our firm and deeply founded opinion: that for socialists to try to take power by force and violence even though a majority is against them, would not only be wrong—it would be a great blow precisely to the prospects of the socialism we advocate.

Last point: There may be a certain question still in your mind; at least, there often is in such cases. You may be asking yourselves: These views which I am presenting here—are they strictly for external consumption only, and do we speak otherwise and contradict these views in our "private" classes and lectures and among ourselves? Do we tell one thing to our members and another to loyalty boards?

Now, naturally I can only repudiate any such idea, but then anyone can do that. I want to explain briefly why such a practice is indeed impossible for us.

We Want a Real Hearing

In the first place, I want to call your attention to the fact that ours is the only socialist organization I know of which deliberately has no so-called "internal bulletin" of political discussion which is distributed only to members and withheld from the public. We have differences of opinion and political disputes in our ranks—and, incidentally, we think that's a good thing in general and not a bad thing—but we have done away completely with the practice common even in the socialist movement of confining discussion of such questions to private "internal" bulletins. Our classes and meetings are open; even our bulletins of internal discussion are open to public sale. It is very easy for you to check on the truth of this statement: the FBI ought to be able to tell that at least!

Secondly, I would like you to understand that any policy of having one line for public consumption and another for private education would create a furor first of all in our own ranks.

Our movement indeed is composed largely precisely of people who have been attracted to our ideas and practices just because they are revolted and fed up with the doubledealing and hypocrisy of organizations like the Communist Party! Our ability to exist as an independent socialist group is based on the fact that we represent a concept of socialism which has nothing in common with Stalinism, which rejects both Stalinism and capitalism, and the doubledealing and chicanery which in our opinion is inseparable from both. The Communist Party can make a different kind of appeal. We cannot, and we exist because we cannot.

These are some of our ideas, and we vigorously urge an examination of them, a thorough examination, a thorough hearing, a real hearing, and this hearing cannot be called that on the basis of the procedure laid down. We will be more than anxious to cooperate fully in such a real hearing.

A LABOR ACTION subscription is only \$1.00 a year— SUBSCRIBE NOW!

SPARKS in the NEWS

Call for Button-Pusher

Secretary Krug has recently informed us that ten million people could live well in Alaska. And he's worried that if the U. S. doesn't put them there, the UN will, and the United States will lose a fine base for "launching weapons in a push-button war."

Sign of the times: they used to call for colonists in order to BUILD UP countries. . . .

Ye-See?

A lot of congressmen have been worried that the terms of the A-Pact mean that the power to declare war is virtually out of the hands of Congress now. Some of them wanted a clarification on this point. The report of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee clarified it for them. It emerged with the answer that the president has no more power now than he had before, and Chairman Connally said that ought to settle the matter.

This reminds Devere Allen of Worldover Press of the sergeant who asked his men: "If the zero hour comes, will ye fight or will ye run?" The men chorused as one: "We will."—"I knew ye would!" beamed the sergeant.

War Criminal

Trygve Lie has the answer to the hope of the world. He says that "no war of importance will ever be started while the General Assembly [of the UN] is in session."

If only the General Assembly could be persuaded to stay in session permanently, the danger of war would be eliminated. But just imagine what would happen after a while if some warmongering aggressor got a motion through for a five-minute recess for tea.

Sensitive Scabs

Grace McWhorter, an ILGWU organizer in Roanoke, Va., was arrested in June while heading a picket line at the Roanoke Garment Company. She was leading singing on the line and one of the tunes used the word "scab." The cops hauled her in, charged her with "abusive language" and the Old Dominion judge socked her with three months in jail and a \$250 fine. Yes she.

For the life of us, we can't see why a scab should think he's being abused when he's called a scab. You never heard a rat protest against being called a rat, did you?

Truth Is Stranger

Theodore Yntema, a vice-president of the Ford Motor Company, says that corporation profits last year were largely "fictitious" due to book-keeping practices.

Fiction or no, the item proves that Yntema can make up a good story.

Land of Bilk and Money

Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, likes it. We mean it likes the idea that a slump is in the offing.

Under the headline (page the Un-American Committee) of "Moscow Likes Slump Here, and So Do We," the June 20 issue of this magnates' mag says:

"The cycle [boom and bust] seems to be the basic principle of nature. Planets have their orbits and years their seasons. Night follows day. Trees and animals grow, mature, decay and die. . . . Recessions and depressions are unpleasant. No one likes to see stock prices going down, businesses cutting dividends and losing money, or, worst of all, working people losing jobs. But there are times when recessions are needed. A healthy man can lose the power to walk if he stays in bed long enough. Layoffs are painful, but they do induce those who are still on the job to work harder; and they also tend to bring the working force of the nation down to where it includes only those who really want jobs. It weeds out the temporary and the casual workers, and those who are normally experimenting with jobs."

We advise our readers to try to rein in their impatience while waiting for the promised blessing.

Good Will

An Ohio chemical factory, after ending a long strike of its workers with an injunction, tried to establish friendly relations by holding an employee contest to pick a good name for its new fertilizer. Each worker dropped in a slip with his preferred name—and all slips read "Taft-Hartley."—Industrial Worker.