

Curran Plan for NMU Purge Loses As Convention Defeats Steamroller

By N. R. GADEN

NEW YORK, Sept. 20—Red, white, and blue funting, four feet wide, circles the balcony at the convention of the National Maritime Union. Joe Curran has been able to wrap the hall in a flag but he cannot do quite the same with the union.

What happens next in the NMU hinges on several proposed constitutional changes and these in turn require a two-thirds vote. As the sessions enter their second week, Curran holds a comfortable majority but the decisive two-thirds wriggles out of his grip.

He waited impatiently for five days to present his first resolution, in order first to whip the delegates into the proper frame of mind. All convention committees were solidly packed with Curran supporters except the credentials committee, so that it was a simple matter for the

resolutions committee, undisturbed by the presence of a single opposition representative, to rig up a little stage-play on Monday.

First crack out of the box it resolved to condemn the "lackeys of Soviet foreign policy" for pledging their support to the "Red Army" in the event "of an armed conflict between the Soviet Union and their native country." And it concluded: "We will defend our country against any enemy including the Soviet Union."

The issue is simple, said Curran: Will you defend the soil you live on and your families against Russian invasion? . . . we're damned happy to live in America . . . anyone who says he prefers to live in Russia is a hypocrite.

CURRAN CALLS FOR JA-NEIN

He insisted on a roll call. Every delegate, including aliens and for-

eign-born workers, had to step to the microphone, call off his own name, and state whether he would "defend his country." The complete roll is to be printed and available for all curiosity seekers.

Four hundred eighty-eight delegates voted "yes." That is not surprising. But 56 delegates voted "No" and 53 others abstained. One hundred and nine seamen, men who will work under military discipline if war comes, refused to answer the bugle call and read out their names. This was the courageous act, not of "Russians" or Stalinists, but of honest men who do not think that all questions can be settled by playing an anthem.

Are you a patriotic American or a Russian spy? Curran was eager to divide the convention along that line and speed through his whole program while the delegates were still in a

state of semi-hypnosis. The officials around Curran are men who yesterday were members of the Communist Party and who made the union a plaything of Russian foreign policy. They now make up an officialdom which seeks to expel "Communists" from the union.

They want to revamp the whole constitution to make it easy to throw out all critics; they hope to dispense with the Honest Ballot Association; they want to supervise all elections through hand-picked committees chosen by the top officialdom and not elected in each port by the rank and file. They propose to "Americanize" the union by throwing out aliens to provide jobs for citizens.

This platform drives toward entrenching a bureaucratic machine protecting its domination by the expulsion of critics. Problems of jobs, (Continued on page 4)

British Cut Pound, Bow To U. S. Demand, Place New Burden on Labor

By STEWART PITT

With accompanying headlines reminiscent of the frightened days of the '30s, Sir Stafford Cripps announced this week that the British pound would henceforth be valued at \$2.80 as against the rate of \$4.03 to which it had been legally pegged these last few years. The repercussions are not yet over but in the immediate wake of the announcement 23 nations already have been forced to revalue their currencies. France has declared that the British declaration is "a trade-war rate for competition in international markets" and has appealed to Italy, Belgium and Holland to form a currency union in retaliation.

Almost the very next moment after the Cripps announcement, voices of pessimism became dominant. While the full effects of this measure will not be known for months at the least, there is an every hand questioning as to whether it can actually decrease the gap between the dollar and the pound. Strangely enough, the blackest opinions come from England. Instead of jubilation

over a measure which is intended to increase exports to the United States, there is gloomy foreboding. Among the workers there is uncertainty and confusion.

MORE—
See "What Devaluation Means to British" on page 2

Will devaluation be an open sesame to the American market? It is extremely unlikely. So long as U. S. productivity is overwhelmingly higher than Britain's, the latter can hardly hope to compete successfully. Furthermore, it is doubtful if Congress would substantially reduce the high customs barrier. For just as England resists every attempt of others to enter her imperial market, the U. S. will resist such efforts in the domestic market here.

Reduced sterling value can have meaning for increased exports only if the cost of producing these exports is cut. Obviously if it still costs more to produce, then while the value of each pound will be less, it will cost more pounds to produce the same item. How are these costs to be cut? In the answer to this question is to be found the key to the policy of devaluation.

VOICE OF AMERICA

A mere twelve days before his fateful announcement, Sir Stafford Cripps had announced to the House of Commons for the twelfth time in twenty months that devaluation was out of the question. He had stated emphatically: "No one need fear devaluation of our currency in any circumstances." The day after his return from Washington he announced the new exchange rate.

Something had altered the situation. Whether or not Cripps' assertion that the decision was taken beforehand is literally accurate is unimportant. At best it is ingenious. For as the correspondent of the New York Times put it: "The voice was the voice of Sir Stafford but the words were the words of American economic and financial observers who have been saying for 18 months that

British costs and prices were too high."

Devaluation means a cut in real wages in spite of Cripps' claim that it will not. Britain imports the bulk of her food and most of her wheat must come from dollar areas. Bread is more than ever before the basic food around which the worker's monotonous austerity diets are built. Since more pounds will have to be paid for imports, the price of bread and most other foods is due to rise.

As it is, many unions have been planning to demand wage increases and now the pressure from the ranks will rise as living standards are threatened. Yet if wages go up this means increased costs nullifying the effects of devaluation. Thus devaluation is a device for passing the cost of the crisis on to the workers. For while prices of necessities will rise, every effort will be made to keep wages stagnant. This was made abundantly clear at the recent national congress of the British trade unions where the leadership pushed through its wage-freeze policy before it made known its intention of cutting the pound's value. This is the way in which costs can be cut for the increase of exports.

The Labor government is in the position of bitterly opposing any attempt by the unions to defend themselves in this situation. This constitutes one of the victories of American policy, for the gap in dollars is to be paid by the working class.

The Labor government is in danger of defeat as a result. Its popularity among all classes is certain to fall. Above all, in its attempts to restrict union demands it will under-

(Continued on page 2)

As Opposition Fights Against Communist Party Control Over CIO Electrical Workers—

UE Leaders Carry Split Motion at Convention

CLEVELAND, Sept. 21 (By telephone to LABOR ACTION)—The Stalinist administration of the United Electrical Workers this afternoon presented to the convention a resolution which apparently embodies the CP's formula for their split from the CIO. Cast as a motion against raiding and inveighing against the UAW, James Carey and the national CIO, the motion demands that the CIO give the UE assurances against interference under the threat that, if such assurances are not given, the UE's per-capita tax will be withheld.

The debate that ensued was over the question of secession and a split and not primarily about raiding, however. James Carey, leader of the UE opposition, asked President Fitzgerald what he would do, as a vice-president of the CIO, if his union withheld its tax. The latter stated that he would support the union's action. All statements by the Fitzgerald-Mattes-Empak leadership indicated that they would depend upon the per-cap-

ita tax gambit to force the CIO to throw them out, rather than walk out themselves.

A rollcall vote on the motion cut down the administration's majority as compared with yesterday but it was carried—2321 to 1504.

The development was interpreted by most oppositionists to mean that the main task of the anti-Stalinists after the convention would have to be to organize the CIO forces in the union for the impending split.

By approximately the same vote of 3-to-2 which has held through the convention, the present Fitzgerald-Mattes-Empak leadership was rejected to office. There is general expectation that the split, which the Stalinist leadership has obviously decided to consummate, will likely take place around the national CIO convention in October.

By ALBERT GATES

CLEVELAND, Sept. 20—For the first time in the long history of the Stalin-

ist domination of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, a formidably organized opposition came to the 14th convention with the purpose of ousting the incumbent administration.

Still loosely organized, inexperienced, lacking complete clarity in its struggle, and inarticulate when compared to the well-organized and smooth-functioning machine in power, the opposition was fighting from the start of the convention.

Even though it seems apparent that they cannot win now, the events of the past two days show that the Stalinists are not invincible and can be beaten with a decent program, good organization and a will to fight.

The sharp division of the union was evident from the start when it became clear that unlike the normal procedure at other conventions, the old officers retained the chair and determined how the convention should be organized. They packed all

(Continued on page 4)

Stalinists Win in First Test Vote; Minority Tightens for All-Out Fight

By MARY BELL

CLEVELAND, Sept. 20—The first test vote—2376.55 to 1464.21 or 61 per cent against 39 per cent—occurred on the second day of the UE convention, on the collective bargaining resolution. This was less than the Carey leadership had officially counted on in its estimate to the opposition caucus. But it coincided with the guesses of the militant wing of the opposition which had been pressing for a firm, programmatic line against the UE leadership and understood the shortcomings of their own caucus.

The loosely organized, wavering opposition, in the expression of James Carey, ranged "all the way from zero to near-communism." The zero end of the caucus had its way at first. While the Stalinists thrust forward their pro-Russian line with a pseudo-militant policy, the opposition leaders at first reacted with crude expressions of Americanism. Their dull and uninspired fight on the first day of the sessions would convince anyone that "Americanism" is not enough to defeat Stalinism.

A reaction took place after the first day. Those who wanted to hit the Stalinists programatically and principledly appeared to have won out. The transformation was overwhelming on the second day of the convention. The offensive was in the hands of the opposition. The debate was on issues, contracts, pensions, conditions.

CP HACK MUZZLED

The test was dramatically precipitated. James Matles, CP whip and "big wheel" of the UE leadership, who was the reporter on the collective bargaining resolution, had the floor in summary against the vigorous campaign the opposition had waged all day.

Forced to admit the contract gains of Sperry Local 450, an opposition local, he tried to take credit for them. The spirited opposition broke off his speech with boos and jeers. Fitzgerald could not restore order and Matles, his tail between his legs, never completed his summary.

UAW Takes First Step To Organize Unemployed

A highly significant development in the labor movement is taking place. The United Auto Workers, CIO, has started to organize the unemployed.

The UAW is beginning in Muskegon, an important foundry center, where some 24 per cent of the workers are unemployed. The purpose of the new unemployed union will be, according to the Michigan CIO News, to "collectively bargain and obtain for the unemployed their rights at relief offices, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation and other government offices. They will also handle seniority grievances arising out of any rehiring which may occur."

Similar unemployed unions or

leagues will be organized in other distress areas. Though so far Detroit has escaped serious unemployment, it is expected that this is not far off and the UAW will be prepared to do what it can when it arises.

This action on the part of the UAW highlights the problems now being faced by an increasing number of unions. The Stalinists have already been moving into the field of unemployed organization.

If the union movement should continue to ignore the pressing needs of this growing section of our population, it would be grist to the Stalinist mill. The UAW, the most alert and progressive of the large unions, shows how to take the leadership away from the Stalinists.

Steel Workers Face Hard Battle To Win Pensions, Other Demands

By SUSAN GREEN

SEPT. 20—The general optimism for a settlement in steel which prevailed upon the release of the recommendations of the president's fact-finding board has changed to gloom as the United States Steel Corporation blasts the findings of the board and calls them "revolutionary."

The crux of the matter is that Big Steel refuses to finance an insurance and pension plan for the workers and insists that the workers also contribute to the fund. Benjamin Fairless, president of United States Steel, loudly takes issue with the board "on the grounds of costs as well as of principle." He is squealing because all the steel companies together would have to lay out some \$200,000,000 a year—according to his figures—for this purpose, companies which together will have made nearly a billion dollars of profits in 1949.

Unyielding in his "principle" that the companies will not part with any of their profits in the interest of the workers and will pass on to the consumer any increases paid to workers, Fairless contends that such an outlay by the industry would add at least \$3.00 to the price of a ton of steel and "would have the same inflationary effect on prices that the board itself warned against when it rejected the union's request for a fourth-round wage increase."

SAYS WORKERS LIKE TO PAY

In other words, the board's decision in slashing the union's package demand for a 30-cent-an-hour increase to a mere 10-cent increase, and the union's immediate acceptance of this obviously unfavorable recommendation, have emboldened rather than placated the bosses of the steel industry.

As of this writing, Cyrus S. Ching, director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, is trying to pave the way for collective bargaining between the companies and the union so that the one million steel workers of the country will start their strike on September 25. On the

morning of September 20 the situation is that Philip Murray has again affirmed the union's position that further bargaining must be based on an acceptance of the non-contributory principle recommended by the board, while Big Steel's statement to Ching has not yet been made public.

In the nonsensical verbiage liberally distributed by the steel companies is this gem from Charles R. Hook, chairman of Arcoo Steel Company: "As a result of my experience and contacts of many years with a very large number of American workmen, I am convinced that they do not want to be fully relieved by others of the duty of providing for themselves and their families."

And along the same lines spoke Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel, undoubtedly in his best Fourth of July manner: "In a free America no man should be fully relieved by others of the duty of providing for his future and that of his family."

SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE

Philip Murray met this hypocritical palaver head on. "The steel industry," he said, "is coldly preparing to force a strike upon the nation on what it contends is a matter of principle: whether pensions and social insurance should be jointly paid for. Official records filed by these same steel companies with the SEC show that the matter becomes one of principle only where the steel worker is concerned, because officials of the steel industry will receive very substantial pensions entirely paid by industry."

"A study of the steel companies' own official statements, filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, is truly an exposé of the inconsistent position of the steel industry. It resolves itself to this: For an official of a company to receive a pension paid for solely by the company is a good thing. For the workers to receive the same benefits is a 'loss of his freedom.'"

Murray pointed out that the United

Use Rajk Confession Trial to Smear Tito as Agent of Western Imperialism

By HAL DRAPER

The rather crudely staged trial of Laszlo Rajk in Budapest, aping the performances in Moscow under Vishinsky with the skill of a high school adaptation of a Broadway play, has been held solely for the purpose of "proving" and dramatizing the Cominform's main propaganda line against Tito. But the main thing it proves is that Moscow's fear of the spread of Titoism in East Europe is at a new high level.

It was with this consideration in mind that we pointed out, four weeks ago in LABOR ACTION, that the Rajk trial would be used for the purpose of tying Tito up with the capitalist West. Rajk was arrested June 18 and has been kept on ice since then, with no information vouchsafed on the case against him till this past week. The success scored by the Yugoslavs in gaining economic aid from the U. S., however, has had—without doubt—an impact upon sections of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the other satellites. Moscow's concern at this development and its recent violent denunciations are aimed not only at the Yugoslavs—indeed, perhaps not so much at the Yugoslavs—as at shaken elements in these other satellites.

And the Cominform-Russian counter-propaganda line, ever since the split, has been: Any break with Russia automatically means submission to Western capitalist imperialism. The subtlest variation of this line is: Tito will be forced to become an agent of Wall Street. The crudest variation is: Tito has been an agent of Wall Street all along. The Rajk trial is pretty crude, as we have noted.

BANK ON ANTI-CAPITALISM

The Cominform press and radio have lost no time in putting the trial to the use for which it was intended. The Bulgarian press has seized the occasion to declare that "the meaning of the wide espionage and provocation which Yugoslav agents have been trying to develop in Albania, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria and particularly in Hungary has now become quite clear . . . behind Rajk and Tito stand American imperialists."

This is simply another way of saying: "Don't listen so sympathetically to the blandishing arguments of the Titoist supporters in our own ranks. Maybe you think Titoism is OK, but remember that Titoism means alliance with Wall Street."

The whole propaganda force of the Rajk trial depends upon understanding one thing which is systematically glossed over in the West but which independent socialists have stressed. It is that much as anti-Russian workers in the satellites hate and fear Moscow, by and large they have no

use for the alternative power bloc in the world led by U. S. capitalism. Indeed, Moscow's propaganda depends upon convincing them that the only alternative to going back to the old discredited system is submission to Stalinism, and that no third road is possible—neither Tito's nor that of independent socialist revolutionary struggle.

Therefore the Stalinist press considers that the main way of discrediting Titoism is to tar its name with Churchill, Dulles et al. Rajk and Tito become men "who have long been the paid agents of foreign intelligence services." Says Pravda of September 17: "The guiding center of the conspiracy is beyond the ocean, in the United States. The conductor of all plans and tasks of this center is the Yugoslav fascist clique of Tito. Ruling American and British circles gave the central role to the bourgeois nationalists of the Tito clique."

PURGES AHEAD

The Western press consistently tries to convey the impression that the people behind the Iron Curtain, groaning under the Stalinist dictatorships, look with longing eyes to the West. If this were indeed so, the line of the Rajk trial and of Cominform propaganda could only be considered a piece of gigantic stupidity, playing into the hands of Washington and London. Why should the Cominformers be so eager to proclaim to these people that the West has won over a whole country from "popular democracy," thus encouraging them in their hopes? But the Rajk trial is a smear trial; any connection with world capitalism is a smear and not a bouquet—even in Eastern Europe, even among disaffected elements.

A period of purges is to be expected in Stalinland, we pointed out four weeks ago. The purge of Rajk dates back to last June but the present eight defendants have recently been increased to 32 as the net widened following the current Belgrade-Moscow flareup. An interesting remark in Pravda of September 18 may point to Poland as the next arena for a pro-Cominform cleanup. (Pravda said that Poland was next on Tito's infiltration list after Hungary.)

Or Czechoslovakia, where there have as yet been no prominent figures purged in spite of constant complaints of "opportunism" in the swollen CP, may be in line. The N. Y. Times' roving European correspondent, Sulzberger, has been hinting broadly (without any details, unfortunately) that Albania's No. 1, General Hodza, is on the skids. The recent purge of Kostov in Bulgaria may or may not be enough for that country for the nonce.

But purges there will be. These are

the symptoms of the constant crises of Stalinism, which presents a façade of apparently monolithic solidity only to those who are easily impressed with the efficacy of the knout and whip.

HOW STUPID CAN GPU BE?

Debunking the Rajk trial as a staged farce is the simplest aspect of the event. Laszlo Rajk, the chief defendant, was formerly deputy chief of the interior (the government designation in all the satellites for the GPU bloodhound) from 1946 to April 1949, he was behind no one in ruthlessly purging any elements sympathetic to the West or antagonistic to the Russian power. From April to last June he was foreign minister, before he took the nose-dive. This is the Stalinist hatchman who confessed to being a police informer since 1933 and an agent of American and British intelligence.

Rajk's own account of how he entered the latter's service is as stupid a concoction as the choicer imbecilities in any of the Moscow Trials. An American lieutenant colonel, Kovach, according to his tale, learned that he was or had been a police informer and threatened to expose him unless he took orders. If he was already a police informer (well-known grade of rat), it is hard to see why he had to be threatened with exposure to bend him to the will of the OSS (which, by the way, was abolished in 1945).

But the richest element is the fact that a colonel in a newly arrived U. S. military mission was able to unmask him, while the Stalinist apparatus trusted him so highly that he was raised to the highest posts of the government. ("The Communists always believed me to be one of the best comrades," he said.)

At the same time, he not only claimed to have been a police informer in Hungary but also an anti-Stalinist spy in the Spanish Civil War, an agent of the French in a French prison camp and an agent of the Gestapo during the German occupation of Hungary.

SPANISH WAR VETS AND TITO

The reference to the Spanish Civil War seems to be a growing motif in East European purges. Up to now a common characteristic shared by many purges has been the fact that, instead of being imported cold from the Hotel Metropole on the gun carriages of the Russian army of occupation after the war, they were in many cases Stalinists who had fought against the Hitler occupation in their

own countries. This was true not only of Tito but also of Kostov in Bulgaria, for example. This is also true of Rajk, significantly enough.

But the indictment drawn up against Rajk also makes a point of smearing not only the Yugoslav Titoist leaders in general but particularly those who participated in the Spanish war. The plot between Rajk and the Yugoslavs was hatched, according to the tale, in the French concentration camps where Spanish war veterans were held, and here it was that Rajk met the Yugoslavs Bebler, Goshnyak and others.

The Yugoslavs deny that their men so named were even in a concentration camp with Rajk, but M. S. Handler (in the Times for September 15) points up an exceedingly interesting aspect of the Yugoslav rebuttal on this matter:

"The [Yugoslav] resolution disclosed facts that had generally been ignored—namely, that the Spanish war veterans constituted the original cadres for the partisan army that was formed by Yugoslavia in the last war and that many of the most eminent positions of power in present-day Yugoslavia are occupied by these men.

"This assumed great significance in view of the fact that the principal victims in recent purges in Eastern European countries also were veterans of the international brigades in Spain and that elimination of these men from power in Eastern Europe has created the impression that the Soviet government wishes to remove anyone who has been exposed to Western society."

The Titoists, of course, furthermore have denounced the entire Rajk proceedings as a tissue of "lies and forgery." The twin resemblance between this trial and the Moscow Trial frame-ups naturally has not affected their denunciations. In fact, as former GPU experts themselves (as many of the Titoist leaders are, including 'Tito himself), it would not be at all surprising if we saw a confession trial in Belgrade before long. They have had two prominent actors ready at hand ever since the split: the two Yugoslav leaders who were purged and jailed before the split, Zujovic and Hebrang.

As far as we know, these two gentlemen are still in the land of the living and are not doing Tito any good in the cooler. This would be a trial of real substantive agents—both were without doubt the Cominform's aces in the hole within the Tito regime—but it would still be interesting to read their prepared scripts.

Urban League Convention Continues Tepid Resistance Against Jim Crow

By KATE LEONARD

The National Urban League, a social service agency for work among Negroes, held its annual conference in Denver from September 4 to 9. The action taken at this conference reflects the changing role of the League, a role which has developed within the limitations imposed upon the organization by its leadership. Its financial backing preponderantly comes from large corporations and its policy is determined by a board of directors which includes businessmen interested in the improvement of living conditions for Negroes for philanthropic reasons or because they are convinced that it is to the interest of industry to liberalize employment policies as they affect Negroes.

Traditionally the function of the Urban League has been to improve employment opportunities for Negroes, to work for better housing and recreational facilities. It did not enter the protest or the defense field which was left to the NAACP. In recent years the Urban League has broadened its field somewhat and changed some of its practices, especially in the matter of attempting to secure jobs for Negroes.

Founded in 1910, this organization was originally called the National League on Urban Conditions Among Negroes. It first showed significant growth following the great World War I migration of Southern Negroes to Northern cities. While never completely uniform, its policies in the earlier days stemmed from the fact that large industrial concerns regarded it as a useful agency for procuring labor and as a conservative, stabilizing force in the colored community. It is well known that at this period of its history it was hostile to organized labor (not only to unions which practiced Jim Crow). It served as a strike-breaking agency.

CHANGE IN POLICY

With the change in the Negro's relation to industry this policy could not be maintained and the League

Ford Hails Strike

"Henry Ford 2nd, president of the Ford Motor Company, received word today that an oil well in which he holds an interest had struck it rich."

—N. Y. Times, Aug. 19.

And just as if it had to be mentioned, the item adds: "The well is not a wildcat operation."

"Wildcats" are outlawed by Ford's contract with the auto union.

British Cut Pound - -

(Continued from page 1)

mine its position in the working class, which, without an alternative in the situation, may become politically cynical and apathetic.

SQUEEZE ON BRITISH

Nor would a merely quiescent working class which accepted a cut in real wages solve the immediate matter. That would simply maintain the status quo. The problem is not simply to cut costs and prices but to increase sales, which in turn requires increased production. This sales increase must be substantial enough to compensate for the 30 per cent loss on each item resulting from devaluation. That is, in order to earn as many dollars as before, 30 per cent more goods must be sold.

But the object is to earn many MORE dollars than previously. For this the first requirement is a large increase in production. It must be remembered that the British working class is already fully employed, so that no increase is possible by hiring more workers. The only possibility lies in increasing the productivity of the present labor force. In other words, the workers must work harder.

Where will the incentive for such intensiveness come from? On their thin diets the workers' energies are already low. All observers note the listlessness of the people after ten exhausting years.

Yet there have been times when men have responded heroically to desperate need. From profound inner depths they have called upon long-submerged resources to perform the impossible. Invariably this has occurred when a people has been stirred by a new ideal or hope which has wrenched it out of the daily paths. Revolution is such a time.

The Labor government's need is desperate. Yet the unions assembled at their annual convention the week before the Cripps announcement were kept in the dark on the government's intentions. No program was presented other than the proposal to keep wages in line. Even the general council of the British Trade Union Council was not informed of its government's decision. The result has been confusion even in the top leadership.

At the time of writing the TUC has not taken any decision. It has not rushed to give blanket and im-

mediate endorsement to the party leadership. There is considerable dissension among ranks and leaders. Whatever decision is finally taken, it is doubtful if it will be satisfactory to all groups. Several unions were chafing at the wage freeze even before the recent convention because of the slow but steady rise in prices over the past year. The railwaymen, for example, have been planning a slowdown strike for months to force a wage increase. None of these people upon whom the labor party depends for its very existence were consulted or informed about devaluation. The labor leadership thereby expressed its lack of confidence in the workers.

LESSON IN ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

This attitude is contained in every economic policy of the party. The leadership has opposed all proposals for increased workers' control or participation in industry. When coal was nationalized, the unions were given advisory representation on the national coal board, while the old management remained in actual control. Nowhere has democracy been introduced into the economy. The workers remain hired and exploited hands without voice or power. Since they are alien to management they have not had cause to concern themselves with its problems.

Here is a lesson on the economic significance of democracy. Workers' control of production has consequences for production itself. It is an important incentive possible in an economic democracy.

In this sense devaluation represents an important choice of alternatives by the Labor Party leadership. It represents the decision to bow to the program of subordination to the U. S. rather than an extension of nationalization in a socialist and democratic program for the whole people as part of an orientation toward an independent Western Europe. That is the meaning of the statement by Cripps on Tuesday: "We realize that conditions have changed in the matter of capital investment and that we must study the problems of incentive and suitable environment to capital investment."

Cripps has thus announced that devaluation is to be interpreted as more complete reliance on capitalism and empire.

shifted to a more conciliatory policy toward organized labor. At this period it appealed to trade union officials to let down the racial barriers in much the same way that it solicited the big industrialists to provide jobs for Negroes.

In more recent years it has cooperated more actively with organized labor. Today by and large it maintains a pro-union attitude when operating in any organized field, has established projects to do educational work in connection with unions and has assisted in organizing to a limited degree.

This reorientation has been caused by the greater integration of Negroes in the union movement, and by the more complete organization of the unskilled worker, especially after the coming of the CIO. It is to be noted that the 1948 convention of the Urban League only by a narrow margin condemned the Taft-Hartley law.

Officials had advised a course of watching and waiting. It was argued that "the next Congress might bring a better law or a worse one, and that if the Negro has survived all his disappointments in legislation down to the present day, he might be favorably disappointed in this one." It was pointed out that the closed shop which has barred Negroes in several trades and industries, might be opened by the workings of the Taft-Hartley law. This viewpoint of the officialdom fortunately did not avail, probably because labor's attitude on the Taft-Hartley law was well known and because the law has helped eliminate Southern unions with a liberal racial policy.

SET UP UNION COUNCIL

At the recent convention plans for setting up a trade union advisory council to work in cooperation with the National Urban League officials were announced. This is a forward step.

Announced also at the convention was an elaborate plan made by agreement between the United States Employment Service and the National Urban League to expand job opportunities. This boils down to a program of educating companies who hire through the USES on the advantages of hiring Negroes. At this time the USES does not have administrative control over its local state offices but their representative at the conference stated that the local units follow federal policy on major matters. Lester Granger, executive secretary of the League, summed up the plan as follows: "The USES men have the entree and we have the arguments."

One of the significant things report-

ed is the expansion of the League in Southern states. Six new league offices have been set up in the South in the last five years. Nelson C. Jackson, director of the Southern field division, explained that so far the League has had to concentrate on health, housing and welfare services there, but it plans to give more attention to industrial relations, which fits in with increased industrialization. He was of the opinion that the League's recent experience in the South is a symptom of a new psychological atmosphere in the South. There seems to be a widespread sentiment, "If we don't do it ourselves, we're going to be forced to, so let's get our house in order."

The Atlanta League cooperated in the amassing of the data to be used in the court fight to force the Atlanta Board of Education to equalize educational facilities for Negro schools.

STAND ON PEEKSKILL

In its closing session the convention passed a neatly-mouthed resolution dealing with the recent Peekskill affair. That this resolution was introduced in character with the philosophy of the leaders of the League, but that 250 delegates passed it unthinkingly is cause for sober thought and regret.

This resolution has not been printed in full but enough is there to see that it is straight "Sambo."

It says: "We condemn those elements in our society which are seeking to foment disunity and discord among our people and specifically those totalitarian forces of whatever persuasion which are exploiting the issue of race for their own selfish ends."

There is no objection to calling Paul Robeson what he is, the representative of a totalitarian force exploiting the issue of race for its own selfish ends, but this does not end the matter. There is apparently not a word about why and how Robeson was given this opportunity to exploit the Peekskill scandal.

The resolution goes on to pledge the League to continue fighting for the legitimate aspirations of the Negro people in the United States. Indeed, We would be interested to hear what the League regards the "illegitimate" aspirations of the Negro people in the United States.

The 250 delegates who voted for this disgraceful resolution had better wake up and quickly learn that unless they react to injustice, no matter against whom it is perpetrated, they have no chance to prove that "our democracy is not a static or retrogressive thing but a living, vital force to be made stronger by its extension to every one of its citizens."

Split in Ranks of Mapam Threatened By Its Pro-Stalinist Orientation

By ED FINDLEY

The progressive isolation of the Mapam (United Workers Party) of Israel—resulting from its fanatic pro-Stalinist orientation—is endangering the precarious unity of that party. Reports in the Israeli press of intense intra-party struggles and factional jockeying for control become more and more frequent. The opinion is widely held that the Mapam's recent bid for entry into Ben-Gurion's coalition government stems from a slowly growing realization on the part of the dominant elements in the Mapam leadership that its role as an opposition party, in de-facto alliance with the small Stalinist party of Israel, can only lead to catastrophic isolation from the masses and to the splitting of the Mapam.

The weakened bargaining power of the Mapam makes its early entry into the government coalition improbable. Neither the Mapam nor Ben-Gurion and his party appear to be in a mood to moderate their demands. Ben-Gurion's government has shown itself capable of ruling without the aid of the Mapam—much to the astonishment of the Mapam's leaders, who failed to see that the strategic advantages of their pivotal position in the labor movement of Israel could be nullified by their disastrous pro-Stalinist policy.

SECTION FOR COMINFORM

According to Haaretz, a general Zionist Hebrew daily close to the Progressive Party, the current intra-Mapam party struggle revolves about problems thrown up by the Stalinist orientation. A section of the Mapam leadership proposed that the Mapam join the Cominform and participate directly in its political activities. Fortunately, the motion for direct affiliation with international Stalinism was defeated by a majority of the top committee. In this connection, Haaretz reports that Meir Yaari, Mapam representative to the Stalinist Paris Conference for World Peace this summer, was promised a personal interview with Joseph Stalin if he would come out for joining the Cominform.

Another issue that agitates the Mapam is what attitude to take toward the "people's democracies" which close their doors to or place insuperable obstacles in the way of Jewish emigration. For many Mapam members, who are more Zionist than pro-Stalinist, this is a painful and embarrassing question.

A somewhat less controversial question with which the Mapam leadership wrestles is the attitude toward the CP of Israel. The extra Stalinist wing of Mapam calls for closer ties, blocs and even organic unity with the CP of Israel, inasmuch as there exist virtually no important political differences between the two organizations. In this connection, the expulsion of 27 Stalinists (former Mapam members) from the Hashomer Hatzair Kibbutz (commune) "Zikim" came in for a great deal of criticism.

However, here the ingrained hatred for the local Stalinist breed on the part of most Mapamers—even those very friendly to world Stalinism—is an obstacle that the Stalinist wing of Mapam will have difficulty overcoming. Even the former Hebrew Communist Party, led by Alexander Preminger, Knesset (Parliament) deputy, which voted to join the Mapam (Haaretz, August 14) has accounts to settle with the official Communist Party leadership. The decision of the Mapam (Haaretz, August 14) to accept the members of the Hebrew Communist Party (as individuals) tends to strengthen the Stalinist wing in Mapam.

The relative strength of the various contending forces and the names of their spokesmen are not known, due to the fact that the fight thus far has been limited to the secluded confines of the Central Committee. It is inconceivable that it should remain there.

One thing appears certain. On the outcome of these inner party struggles depends Mapam's survival as an independent political party in Israel.

What Devaluation Means to British

By HENRY JUDD

The devaluation of the British pound sterling announced by Sir Stafford Cripps is bound to have a serious effect on the British people. Let us try to see how devaluation will work.

Last week the pound was worth \$4.03—that is, it cost that much to buy one British pound. On the European black market and in New York, it was worth only \$2.90 or thereabouts. Now its official rate is only \$2.80, a 30 per cent drop.

Question: Who was anxious to devalue the pound, and why?

Answer: American government representatives and economists were anxious for this devaluation. They said that England must export more goods, to help close up the gap between its exports and imports. But they claimed this could not be done because English prices were too high. Devaluation makes it possible for foreign lands to purchase British goods for fewer dollars—that is, British prices will go down and thereby (presumably) exports will go up. A British car which sold for 1,000 pounds (\$4,000) before devaluation will still be priced at 1,000 pounds, but this will actually mean only \$2,800 now. The argument that devaluation will stimulate export sales in the dollar market by lowering prices is the principal weapon of the pro-devaluationists—needless to say, the Americans.

Question: But are there other effects of a not so beneficial nature? What will happen in England itself?

Answer: Devaluation in and of itself will not have any automatic effect. It will, however, set into motion a whole series of factors which can have serious effects upon the British people. These factors (which Cripps and the Americans naturally do not emphasize) may be listed as follows:

(1) British imports will automatically become more expensive, since it will cost more pounds to buy American goods—which are, naturally, priced in dollars. The effect on imports will be the exact opposite of the effect on exports, and tend to largely cancel out the gains mentioned above. Britain will be forced to cut its imports (now more expensive), and this in turn would lower British living standards.

BOOSTS COST OF LIVING

(2) It is assumed that dollar prices will tend to drop (as they have for the past year), and therefore the cost of imports will drop. But will it be equivalent to the 30 per cent devaluation of the pound? There is no reason to believe this. Dollars gained by export trade will increase, it is true, but this gain will quickly be drained away to the higher cost for imports. The "imbalance" will remain substantially the same. And suppose that export trade does not increase as much as expected? The net result will be that Britain will be worse off than before. Who will guarantee this increase in exports, particularly since America refuses to lower tariff barriers and other nations retain theirs?

(3) Devaluation will seriously disturb the home market in England. Devaluation without an increase in production at home will make matters worse since exports can not be increased without a productivity increase. Domestic prices rise (it is estimated they will increase at least 5 to 10 per cent). Why? Because the cost of food, raw materials and other imports will increase—as explained above—and this will naturally add to production costs. As usual, the cost increase will be passed along to the consumer.

(4) But won't wages increase? If they do, this will start the famous price-wage spiral and automatically defeat the whole aim of the devaluation! That is, it will send British prices up again, whereas the whole alleged purpose of devaluation is to lower British prices. Therefore, the devaluation measure will find the British government seeking to freeze current wages and thus defeat this inflationary trend. Prices will be going up, wages will remain stationary and the result will be: lower and more austere British living standards.

The only possible conclusion is that devaluation is an effort on the part of American capitalism to make the British masses pay a large share of the price, required to keep British economy alive. It is thus reactionary in all respects, and must be fought off by the entire British labor movement. Devaluation means the British people pay.

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
by
Leon Trotsky
\$3.50

Order Your Copy From
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

Max Shachtman Reviews the Howe-Widick Book — —

A Socialist Portrait of Reuther and the UAW

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Books about the American labor movement generally fall into one of three categories.

There are, first, those that are written with a pathological hatred of the labor movement as the prime cause of social disturbance and economic disorder. To their authors, the labor unions are nothing more than the vices to be found within them, by which they usually mean those aspects of unionism which simply appear or reflect the viciousness of capitalist society itself. They are as a rule interesting not because of what they reveal about the trade unions but of the police mentality they reveal in the authors' approach to a social question. The library of any labor relations office of a modern corporation has an ample stock of this literature on its shelves.

Then there are those written by court biographers who have already been employed by a union officialdom or who hope to be. The union and its achievements, above all in the realm of respectability and what is called public responsibility, are rhapsodically described, often with grotesque errors that disclose the quick ignorance of the author and always with the heavy-handed suggestion that the union owes its progress and present grandeur all but entirely to the quick-wittedness, compassion for fellow-man, honesty and statesmanship of its well-paid leader, whose right-hand man carefully coached the author or censored his manuscript. Examples of this kind of work can be found on the modest library shelf of more than one union president.

Finally there are academic studies of all kinds. Many of them are exceedingly valuable for their documentary material and the thoughts which the occasionally penetrating observations of the author stimulate in the reader. But they usually suffer from the position and outlook of the author, which are much more of a handicap than is generally supposed. They are most often written from the far outside, like a man describing a battle through a low-power telescope. And just as often the author, confusing the necessity of objectivity with the impossibility of impartiality, is preoccupied with focusing the reader's eye on his—the author's—own detachment, on the extreme pains he takes to add a cancelling-out "on-the-other-hand" to every "on-the-one-hand." The result is like a flat diagram of an anti-heap

instead of a three-dimensional portrayal of the living, fighting, human social movement that every labor union represents. Or, to the extent that such authors approach the problems of organized labor as a social movement, their criterion is altogether misleading. When they ask, "How does it, or how can it, discharge its social responsibilities?" (this is the theme of 90 per cent of these academic studies), the term is meant as responsibilities to and within a society with whose foundations and structure the very nature of the trade-union movement compels it to come into incessant conflict.

A WELCOME BOOK

Worthwhile exceptions from these categories of books are rare. The most welcome, timely and valuable exception in years is the new book, *The UAW and Walter Reuther*, by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick (Random House, \$3.00).

This is not a book written by malicious opponents of the labor movement or by frozen-fingered "impartial" investigators who write about its problems the way a hermit talks about the problems of life. It is not written by maudlin or condescending "friends" of labor, either. Both authors have been active militants of the working-class socialist movement all their conscious lives, and one of them, Widick, is not only a reputable militant in the Detroit Chrysler Local of the UAW today, but knows the CIO, as a member of it, from the first days of its birth in such storm centers as Akron and Flint.

To them the UAW is not something on a glass slide under a microscope, or the target of a narrow and narrow-minded factional polemic. Their treatment of it shows that a thorough socialist understanding of an organization like the UAW has only stimulated their sympathetic objectivity and their ardor in championing it; and that the sympathy and ardor they feel has only sharpened their ability to analyze it with a critical independence of opinion.

These lines do not propose to serve as a "review" of the Howe-Widick book if that means giving a synopsis or summary of its contents. It cannot really be done and it would not be desirable if it could be. No "review" can serve as a substitute for reading the book itself. Its economical but active style brings to warm life the great and significant movement which is the UAW and the men, the nameless and the promi-

nent, who compose it; it brings to life both the exciting struggles that the UAW has conducted and the conflicts that have taken place in its midst; it brings to life the simple and complex problems it has faced before and faces today.

The praise it has already received in the public press is more than merited. If the official UAW press has not yet commented on it, as it must, we want to believe that the delay is accidental and not due to any embarrassment in dealing with a book which shows no embarrassment in dealing with the UAW. In any case, every reader of the book will agree that it is impossible for anyone in or around the labor movement, including the best-informed members and leaders of the UAW itself, henceforth to speak or think intelligently about the UAW, which is at once so typical and so untypical of the American labor movement, unless he has read this work which is to date the most important history, defense, criticism and balance-sheet of the organization.

The authors do not draw up a final balance-sheet which would, as it were, close the books on the UAW or on its leadership. They emphasize that the balance-sheet is tentative, provisional. In this they are incontrovertibly right.

LABOR VANGUARD

The course, let alone the future, of the UAW is far from determined or fixed. "We are the vanguard in America," said Walter Reuther two years ago, "we are the architects of the future." So far as the second part of this proud declaration is concerned, it still remains to be verified. The first part is unquestionably true. In the history of the American labor movement—if we speak of the labor unions as distinct from the labor political movement—the position of vanguard has shifted from one group of workers to another. It was once the distinction of cigarmakers and brewery workers, then in turn of the railwaymen's, of the metal miners', of the needle-trades workers' unions. In almost all cases in the past, the vanguard unions were avowedly and emphatically socialist, their leaderships openly associated with the socialist political movement, their opposition to Gompersism open and even defiant.

Not one of these old unions or those that have succeeded them is today even formally committed to the aim and principles of socialism.

Neither is the UAW. Yet it occupies, in the labor movement as in the United States today, the position of the vanguard union, the left wing of organized labor, its most advanced and powerful sector. It should go without saying that in many respects the American union movement of today is far superior to that which existed before the First World War: take only the fact that today it has in its ranks millions of workers in the basic, mass-production industries who were never organized on such a scale before, and the correspondingly tremendous economic and political weight they exert. In other respects, however, the labor movement of today, even the CIO, even the UAW in the CIO, is still far, far behind the progressive unions of the first two decades of the century, notably with respect to the all-important question of independent political action.

WHAT KIND OF VANGUARD?

The comparison should serve as an indication of how far the American labor movement has still to move and as a warning against any smugness about an organization like the UAW. It SHOULD be regarded and treated as the vanguard—but only in the United States and only in the American labor movement as it is today.

The UAW and its present leadership as the vanguard, the left wing, of the labor movement? Decidedly "No!" in comparison with leaders and unions of the past, like Haywood and St. John of the Western Federation of Miners and the IWW or Debs of the American Railway Union or even the early leaders and unions of the Eastern needle trades, but just as decidedly "Yes!" in comparison with all the Greens of the AFL and the Railroad Brotherhoods, Dubinsky of Ladies Garment, Murray of Steel, Lewis of UMW and certainly of the popularly misnamed "left" represented by anti-labor totalitarian Stalinism. For those who still have doubts about this, Howe and Widick supply conclusive documentation and argument.

As to how far the UAW will go as "architects of the future," and what future they will lead in constructing, that depends in different ways upon the militants in the ranks and upon the present leadership under Reuther. No one in years has drawn so clearly-etched, so faithful and objective, so rounded a portrait of an American labor leader as the authors draw of Reuther, who quite appropriately occupies a substantial part of the book. We can speak of a broad left wing of progressive current in the American labor movement, in view of the still very limited size and influence of a socialist left wing and above all in contrast to the still broader conservative and pure-and-simple trade-unionist wing of the movement. Of this broad left wing, Reuther is the most prominent leader and spokesman.

Our authors call Reuther an "unfinished personality," and they indicate the sense in which they employ the term. It might be just as well to speak of an immature labor leader who passively reflects the immaturity of the left wing and even lags behind the ranks and more often than not, in spite of what he may think of his views being "too far advanced" for them.

If we check back on all the plans and proposals and programs presented so spectacularly by Reuther in the past ten years—the book refers to all of them—what really stands out is their inconclusiveness, the rapidity with which they found a dust-gathering place on the shelves. The criticism of Reuther is not that he does not carry out a socialist labor policy with socialist methods; that could be expected from a Debs but not from Reuther. What Reuther has failed to persist in, to carry out with vigor and consistency, is the policy or program he HIMSELF has sponsored.

REUTHER'S WEAKNESS

In no important case was this due to lack of support, even enthusiastic

support, that could be mobilized in the ranks of this mighty organization (and even outside of it). In virtually every case, however, to carry out the policy required a bold drive to independent political action and in every case Reuther has shrunk back from it.

To cite only a few instances, that was the case with Reuther's own "equality of sacrifice" program during the war, with Reuther's own "GM Program" after the war, with his own denunciation of Truman as "hopelessly inadequate" which he followed by a humiliating endorsement of Truman, with his own pledge to work for a "new political alignment" in the United States.

In some AFL official whose ideas of politics does not go very far beyond getting a traffic ticket fixed by the local Democratic boss, everything is understandable. In Reuther and his associates in the leadership who also know better, it is inexcusable.

Reuther does not suffer, as some conservative critics contend, from audacity and too much political or social ambition; he suffers from political timidity. He represents directly about a million workers who today acknowledge him as their leader unchanged by any other claimant; he enjoys authority and prestige, outside his own organization, on a national and even international scale. Loaded for bear, he goes duck-hunting.

In England, to take only one of the countries of Europe, labor leaders who are his inferior in many respects are content with nothing less than occupying the commanding political positions in the nation, positions to which they laid open claim for years before winning them. Reuther is content with losing in Washington what is won on the picket line, as they like to say in the UAW, and then voting to return to Washington the "hopelessly inadequate" candidate of a political party which could barely get to first base without the support of the organized millions who follow leaders like Reuther in the labor movement.

WHAT IS "UNFINISHED"

What is for the present "unfinished" about Reuther—to use the authors' term again—is not that he has not appeared as a labor leader of the caliber and quality of a Debs, but simply that he has not been able to decide to break with capitalist politics even to the extent of the reformist labor leaders of almost every other modern country in the world. And anything less than the declaration of political independence of the working class, which the UAW is in the indicated position to initiate—not to impose on the rest of the labor movement but to initiate—all talk about "architects of the future" will remain in the realm of convention rhetoric.

The exceptional collection of militants who give the UAW its real distinction have succeeded more than once in prodding reluctant leaders along the right road and in raising new leaders out of their ranks to supplement or even replace inadequate leaders. Reuther's own rise to leadership is evidence of this. It is these militants who are indeed the vanguard. The book of Howe and Widick is rightly dedicated to them. It is an invaluable and indispensable contribution to their own rededication to the fulfillment of the tasks of the future and of today.

ORDER
"The UAW and
Walter Reuther"
by
Irving Howe and B. J. Widick
from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Sq., Long Island City, N. Y.

More Reviews Praise Book on UAW, Chrysler Local Paper Boosts It

Additional reviews of "The UAW and Walter Reuther" (Random House, \$3.00), by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick, appearing in places as diverse as the New Yorker and Citadel, the paper of Local 7, UAW, were published last week. All of them are extremely favorable.

Described by the New Yorker as "a compact and exceptionally well-presented" history of the UAW, the book's treatment of Walter Reuther is also discussed in detail in a column by W. K. Kelsey in the Detroit News. The New Yorker says Reuther is "sympathetically treated, but the authors see danger in the success he has had in purging the union of dissident elements, on the ground that he has wiped out intelligent opposition and is on the way toward making the union a rock-bound bureaucracy." In his widely-read column Kelsey gives a detailed summary of the book's analysis of Reuther and discusses the possibility of the formation of a Labor Party in the U. S. He believes that "Walter Reuther is far more dangerous to vested interests than any other labor organization."

In the Citadel, organ of Local 7, UAW, which comprises thousands of Chrysler workers, the book is summarized with sympathetic detail. The review opens: "The Local 7 Citadel takes great pride and pleasure in announcing that one of our chief stewards [Widick] is the author of a book about our union." The reviewer says that "Every thinking member of our union, and of the entire labor movement, will want to read it for himself." It concludes by saying: "It is a provocative and stimulating book."

In the Toledo Blade there appears a review which takes issue with the book's "harsh" treatment of industrialists but which finds that the book's treatment of the problems of the union is accurate. A review summarizing the book has also appeared in the Birmingham News.

Kerensky: At It Again

HATCHES NEW SCHEME FOR RE-ESTABLISHING EMPIRE

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The international tension between the United States and Stalin's Russia provokes reactions from various political groups in Stalin-occupied Europe. The "Committee of Liberty for Russia," headed by the same Kerensky who was overthrown by the revolution of October 1917, organized a meeting not so long ago at Carnegie Hall in New York in which various delegates from Eastern Europe participated, principally the members of the "Peasant International" over which Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former prime minister of Poland, presides.

The agreement between Kerensky's committee and Mikolajczyk's Peasant International is based on the recognition by Kerensky of independence for the Balts (Lithuanians, Estonians, Finns, Latvians), for the Balkan peoples, and for Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, the "delegates" of these countries have recognized the Ukrainians and White Russians as integral peoples of Russia, and for this reason, members of Kerensky's future Russian Republic.

Kerensky Hatches New Version of Russian Empire

The resolution adopted by this alliance defines the future pattern of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe in the following fashion: "Since aggressive communism expands its dictatorship even more in Europe and Asia, and in an open fashion divides the world into the nations who still enjoy liberty and independence, and the others who live under the yoke of the communist minorities... we resolve in the name of the nations subjugated by communism to collaborate together for the liberation of our countries, seeking to solve all the differences that could divide us, by our own efforts, abstaining from raising any divisive questions, be they political or national, until the moment of liberation from the yoke of the common communist enemy..."

The press of the Polish Right has commented sharply on Mikolajczyk's arbitrary action, in giving the Russians a free hand on the Ukrainian and White Russian question, thereby renouncing the Polish territories outside of the present Russian-Polish frontier. Besides, according to this press, Kerensky widens and expands the frontiers of the Russian empire to the Western frontier of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. That is, he goes far beyond the limits of the Stalinist domain, since the recognition by Kerensky of a joint federation composed of the Russians, Balts, Balkan peoples, Poles and Czechs, signifies nothing else than the maintenance of Russian influence over these peoples.

By virtue of such a political program of a Eurasian federation of the Central European peoples linked with Russia, the right of self-determination so magnanimously recognized by Kerensky and his Russian Committee remains rather platonic. Besides, the "representatives" of the Central European peoples have agreed not to raise differences between Kerensky's "Russian Democrats" and themselves. When the Polish press brought the danger to the attention of the representatives of Ukrainian nationalism, the latter did not assign it any importance, dismissing the role played by Dr. Dobrianski as the representative of the UPA. The Ukrainians are divided into the nationalist camp of Bandera-Melnyk, the Democratic camp of UNDO (Dr. Lewycky), the radicals (populists) and Socialists (Kotovyeh), the part played by the UPA (Ukrainian partisans) being unacknowledged.

It is unrealistic to say that this agreement was probably inspired by some American politicians who want to hand Central Eastern Europe over to "Russian democracy" (Kerensky's restoration)?

Socialists Want to Crack "Prison of Nations"

Polish policy, the Rightists as well as the PPS, opposes the concepts of a "democratic" Russian empire, the program of the inter-seas federation (between the Baltic, Black, and Adriatic seas) which would also include Byelorussia and the Ukraine.

The Ukrainians present different versions of a program calling for a "Great Ukraine" as the leading member of the bloc of nations oppressed by Stalin, but this must be left for another article.

From the point of view of revolutionary Marxists, the right of self-determination also includes the right of the Ukrainians and Byelo-Russians to separate from the Stalinist empire and from Greater Russia.

The separation of the Ukraine and White Russia from Russia is the fundamental key to anti-Stalinist revolutionary policy in Central Eastern Europe. It provides the basis on which to destroy the "prison of nations," into which Stalin transformed Russia.

On the other hand, the liberation of the peoples of Europe requires the radical and sweeping destruction of the two principal imperialisms of the European continent, the German and Russian. Since the German empire was destroyed in the course of the Second World War, there remains the task of completely and finally destroying Russian imperialism. Only when these two imperialisms have been destroyed for good will the European peoples have the perspective of national and social liberty. Then the moment will arrive to form the Socialist United States of Europe. Clearly, there is one further condition, the destruction of American imperialism, which is now preparing to intervene in Europe through such intermediaries as Kerensky, Adenauer, or a Schumacher.

The peoples of Eastern Europe fear Russian imperialism as much as the French, Belgian, or Dutch people feared German imperialism. A federation of these peoples in an alliance against Russian imperialism is conceivable as a transitional measure. Tito is trying to raise precisely this banner against Stalin in the Balkans. But this program of an "Inter-Sea Federation" seems to us very difficult to realize within the system of two world imperialisms, who now divide the European continent into two spheres of influence. The program of Kerensky-Mikolajczyk also excludes it in a Europe dominated by the Americans.

Patchwork Schemes and Reactionary Dreams

Only the Socialist United States of Europe, before the victory of the socialist camp in the United States, can assure the liberty of all the peoples, big and small, since a single economic organization of Europe would render superfluous the national oppression of any member of the federation. All the other programs are reactionary, patchwork schemes germinated in the black cabinets of the bureaucracy or in some politically decapitated heads (Kerensky) who have been dead for some time.

World socialism opposes all the patchwork schemes and compromises an integral and thoroughgoing program of liberation for the peoples and the complete emancipation of the laboring masses. These patchwork schemes and reactionary dreams can only be realized if world socialism is unable to fulfill its program of proletarian and human liberation.

August 1949

Books for Germany: Help Build Socialism!

From many parts of Western Germany we have received requests for Marxist literature IN ENGLISH. Books and pamphlets by Trotsky, Lenin, Marx, etc., are in urgent demand, but any Marxist works are needed. Almost none of this literature is available at present. All books and pamphlets contributed will be widely circulated.

Help rebuild Germany's socialist movement! Send us your unused or duplicate copies of any and all Marxist literature, or any you can spare. They will be forwarded immediately to those who will make good use of them.

Send them to: LABOR ACTION (Attention: H. Judd), 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

MOVIE REVIEW

'Lost Boundaries' Packs a Punch, But Misses Fire as Social Study

By DAN SHELTON

When Louis de Rochemont started the March of Time, he opened a new chapter in the story of the American film. In its first period, the March of Time provided a hard-hitting, documentary-style news reporting which conveyed, at its best, an inkling of the potency of the screen as a vehicle of social comment. Scenes taken on the spot replaced studio sets, non-professionals the place of actors, and the documentary approach invaded Hollywood. The subsequent deterioration of the March of Time into a superficial, glorified newsreel propagating the ideologies of the Luce empire, was accompanied by an independent feature production. HOUSE ON 92nd STREET, BOOMERANG continued the documentary approach, making it serve as a back-drop for above-average thrillers. His latest production, LOST BOUNDARIES, is a bold attempt to deal with a social problem by utilizing not only the documentary technique, but also a true story.

Eight million Negroes are light-skinned enough to pass as whites. One of them, Scott Carter, discovers after his graduation from medical school that white hospitals will not hire him because he is a Negro, and Negro hospitals refuse him because he looks white. Odd jobs, poverty and the advice of friends finally convince him and his wife Marcia that they can "pass." Settling in the town of Keenham, New Hampshire, they become respectable citizens, their children ignorant of their race. The dream is shattered when the Navy revokes Carter's commission because of his color. The township turns against them; the son, unable to stand the truth, leaves home. It is the town preacher who provides the "happy ending" by a sermon on race tolerance.

AN HONEST FILM

Based mostly on the true experiences of Dr. Albert Johnston, and conveniently "planted" in the Reader's Digest by the Luce interests, this is nonetheless a bold, honest film on the Negro problem, produced at a time when such films have become fashionable not only morally but also at the box office. Happily, de Rochemont did not have to choose between a sense of social responsibility and profitable capital investment.

The first part grips by its realism and obvious honesty. There is no trace of soft soaping or of unconscious discrimination. Negroes are presented as human beings, in their own circles, and the very economy of the presentation cannot but have a salutary effect. A judicious blending of light and dark-skinned Negroes facilitates our identification and emotional involvement with the leading characters. The story is likewise outspoken in its social implications, thus offering a promise of a superior film.

Yet this promise is not kept. When the secret is "out," the son, in a significantly over-dramatized sequence, realizes with horror that he is black, flees his home and wanders through Harlem to see his "brothers." In one of the film's most powerful sequences, the horror of Harlem as experienced by his over-sensitive mind is revealed in images bearing closer resemblance to the Hearst portrayal of Harlem than to the real Harlem of underprivileged workers. In shorts doubly impressive because of their rapidity, some of the more unsavory Harlem types are tendenciously picked out. Tendenciously, because the artist behind the camera selects what he shows, despite his pretense to realism. Poor Negro crowd at a crap game (!), a sinister child of teen-age zoot-suiters, topped by a violent attack on a woman and a gun fight in the dark provide an image of Harlem that reinforces existing prejudices in the mind of the spectator, no matter how accurately they may reflect the boy's frame of mind. True, Canada Lee as the police sergeant, "explains" to him that Harlem is conditioned by social factors, but his cliché-laden sermon, however well-intentioned, cannot compete with the power of the "visuals" which, as they should in any film, carry the burden of conviction. The end result is apt to be a sigh of relief by the spectator; "It's a good thing I am not a Negro!" and his reaffirmation of the Negro's otherness, backwardness and sinisterness.

INADEQUATE ENDING

The township, having learned of Dr. Carter's secret, turns against him. Yet the intervention of the preacher with a plea for brotherhood and tolerance in the spirit of Christ resolves the conflict and, coupled with the son's return, brings the film to a happy end.

In a sense, the film ends where it should have begun. It utterly fails to discuss the Carters' relations with the rest of the town either subsequent to their "expulsion" from it or during their re-acceptance. It is hardly believable that a sermon will provide the answer to the problem of race prejudice. Yet less than 10 minutes are spent in the film on what should be its key problem while more than 40 are used for a personalized, inter-family account of how various members of the family "adjusted" to the shock of discovery. The film turns inward, and becomes a psychological rather than a social study. Such inversion, although socially less significant, would be entirely valid if a patently fake social solution had not been trotted out at the conclusion of the film. It is this social pretence which compels criticism.

How will Carters' acceptance into this conservative New England community work out in practice? Racial tensions are not known to be more than temporarily if at all susceptible to the holy water of religion. In fact, the son's terror at being told he is a Negro, the very violence of his reaction, give the lie to the film's contention that this problem can be solved by a speech. Where, after all, did the son get his prejudices and fear from, if not the community?

In short, this "True to Life" story comes to a close at a point most convenient for the box office and least desirable for a real discussion of the problems involved. And, in spite of its often admirable forthrightness, there is considerable pussyfooting even in the telling of the story itself. The whites are never shown in all the viciousness and ugliness of their anti-Negro prejudice, except fleetingly. Less diplomacy was exercised when it comes to Negroes expressing anti-white prejudices; their comments are so sharply put as to shock and again repel the spectator. The implied condemnation of the navy for its discriminatory policies is thoroughly blunted when the preacher reports that it is no longer in force.

Thus, the over-all impression remains that the unfortunate moral of the film is either, at worst, that religion is the savior, or, at best, that everything will turn out all right for the Negro—if he looks like a white man.

UE Carries Split Motion — —



(Continued from page 1)
 convention committees to guarantee their control. Without a formal agenda, the convention operated on a day-to-day basis, the only definite point of order being the election of officers on Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. In this way, the order of business depended on the readiness of committees to report, and that too was decided by the administration supporters who chaired all committees.

FITZGERALD RULES

Once the convention was organized, the Committee on Rules and Order reported. The first struggle in the convention took place on the amendment of the opposition that the election of officers be held on Friday at 10 a.m., when the convention would have had the opportunity to get upon resolutions, program, and the report of the General Executive Board.

James B. Carey, ex-president of UE, demanded a recall vote on this question, but was ruled out of order by Chairman Fitzgerald on the ground that there had been no credentials report and therefore no recall vote could be taken. Whereupon Fitzgerald called for a hand vote and the proposal of the administration was carried.

However, when Carey arose after the first credentials report to ask again for a recall, the request was ruled out of order on the ground that a vote had already been taken.

The administration, on a point of special privilege, presented a special resolution on collective bargaining as its policy document outlining its post-convention program. Carey, acting as the leader of the opposition, objected to the presentation of such a resolution without sending it to the committee where it should properly have been discussed.

Finally, Carey objected to the res-

olution because it was a weak document and a cover-up for the failures of the administration to keep the UE a strong and powerful union.

When Carey moved to refer the resolution to the committee, Fitzgerald said, as an afterthought, that the resolution would go to the committee and be reported back to the convention.

It was this point that formed the basis for the most important discussion at the convention, since the record of the UE and its leadership was debated fully at the Tuesday session.

OPPOSITION GIVES LINE

Carey presented a minority resolution on the tasks of the UE which was a vastly superior document to the administration's generalities. The nine-point program of the opposition resolution contains the necessary basis for a development of the post-convention period.

Fitzgerald demonstrated, what he meant by administration "democratic" methods by calling nine speakers for the majority and only three for the minority in the morning session. The chairman explained himself by saying that he hadn't known what resolutions the speakers supported. It would have been quite simple for him, however, to have called alternate speakers for and against.

Despite that, for the first time the opposition rank and file took the floor against the administration. The high point of the discussion was the demonstration against Matles' defense of the administration. The demonstration was so intense that Matles could not finish his speech and had to leave the microphone.

Already the convention has demonstrated that a militant opposition with a program calculated to advance the real interests of the workers has

the possibility of defeating Stalinism without need to resort to jingoism and flag-waving.

CLEVELAND, Sept. 18 — Under the chairmanship of James B. Carey, secretary of the CIO, 300 delegates to the 1949 convention of the United Electrical Workers gathered at the CIO Hall tonight to map out the strategy of the anti-Stalinist forces in their fight to oust the CP machine which controls the third largest union in the CIO.

Surrounding Carey at the chairman's table were the three opposition candidates for the main offices of the national organization: Fred M. Kelly (Lynn, Mass.) for president; John Dillon (New York) for organization director, and Michael Fitzpatrick (Pittsburgh) for secretary-treasurer. They made the pre-convention pep talks while Carey presented the program worked out by the steering committee for the convention fight.

PROVISIONAL LINE ADOPTED

It was a four-point program, summarized as follows:

- (1) That the opposition act concertedly, carry out decisions arrived at democratically at the caucus and avoid precipitate and individual acts.
- (2) That the opposition caucus will remain affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations regardless of the dictates of the Communist Party.
- (3) That the opposition use every effort to free the UE of CP domination and oppose any conditional amendments, coming from any source, that would prevent an organized opposition within the UE against the officialdom or any part of it.
- (4) To recommend that the election of officers be held on Friday, the final day of the convention, rather than on Wednesday, as proposed by Fitzgerald-Matles-Enspack & Co.

This provisional program providing for the possibility of an early convention split, if it proves to be unavoidable, or a post-convention struggle, was adopted unanimously by the caucus. Its provisional character was indicated by Carey when he remarked that much depended on the actual relationship of forces and the strategy of the Stalinist leadership of the UE.

The proposal for a postponement of election of officers until the final day of the convention, while democratically sound, runs against precedent in the CIO. The Murray forces in many unions employ this very same system and the Stalinists will probably defend their rules vigorously upon the grounds of precedent.

DENOUNCE CP MISLEADERSHIP

Carey predicted out-and-out victory for the opposition forces in a press conference prior to the caucus meeting. At the caucus itself, while expressing complete confidence, his remarks were more tempered.

As might be expected, in comparison with the caucus as a whole (as expressed at its Dayton conference),

Kelley and Fitzpatrick struck a more conservative note. Both underscored "pro-Americanism" in their remarks. But the real impulsion behind the anti-Stalinist ranks was aired in the endless list of grievances recited by both of them and by candidate Dillon: loss of 100,000 members of the UE in two years; loss of 10,000 in two months; failure to get decent contracts from General Electric and Westinghouse, etc.

Carey stated that the Stalinist leadership was "intellectually bankrupt... cost the UE money... can't negotiate a good contract in GE... can't gain the respect of the leaders of the CIO..." Toward the close of the session he raised an admonitory finger. "We do not share leadership of this caucus with anyone outside of the UE," he said, adding that assistance from any number of sources was accepted. Several delegates interpreted this as referring to ACTU (Association of Catholic Trade Unionists), which has intervened strongly in the fight and over which many of the progressive members have expressed concern.

The caucus adjourned early to permit some concerted pre-convention lining up of doubtful votes, every one realizing that the opening session would largely determine the outcome of the present struggle.

Defeat Curran Purge in N MU — —

(Continued from page 1)
 working conditions, the fight to retain the hiring hall are virtually ignored, but Curran is brazen enough to suggest that the vacations of union officials be extended.

Although the rallying cry of the Curran group is "Throw out the Communists," an attractive wrapping for an otherwise unattractive platform, the Stalinists are a tiny isolated group. At most, the CP can mobilize two dozen votes in this convention of more than 600 delegates. In vain, it attempted to get a sizable caucus together, changing its name every other day. The innocent dupes who supported it yesterday swing away. Attacked from the right and from the left on the convention floor, it makes no effort to put forward an independent policy; only the feeble voice of the Daily Worker replies to the attacks of the genuine left wing.

CP STRENGTH BROKEN

The days when the CP held the N MU in an iron grip are gone. Virtually all the leading figures of the CP but they have broken away, leaving it a small remnant with no decisive influence.

The real opposition to Curran, the real left wing, of the N MU, is the Independent Caucus, composed of left-wing anti-Stalinists. Some are prom-

Discussion: A Criticism of Murray's Acceptance of Decision in Steel

By KEN HILLYER

The much-heralded report of the President's fact-finding committee in the steel situation will have great repercussions throughout the labor movement, regardless of its effect in steel itself. Truman has devised a formula for by-passing Taft-Hartley, and thereby the onus for its use, while achieving the same purposes through his committee. Truman has intervened in such a fashion as to make the federal government the decisive force in the fourth round.

In the first place, the committee's report institutes a wage-freeze. If its decisions are accepted by the labor movement, and at this moment Murray has put the CIO in a position from which it can hardly do otherwise, the pattern for 1949 negotiations will be no increase in wages.

What will this mean in plants which have already renewed their contracts while leaving the wage clause to be settled after the national pattern is set? There are hundreds of such local instances. In most of the cases, the workers yielded on many needs for improvement of working conditions in the expectation of the much-heralded fourth

round. Now they are apparently to receive neither.

This condition is especially true in the smaller and medium sized plants. What are workers in such factories going to get out of the proposed "package"? Suppose the small employer, following the lead of his betters but with perhaps more justification, claims an inability to pay?

The committee based its decisions on the assumption that the wages of the steel workers were already high and any further increase would be a threat to the entire economy. If this is true for the steel workers, it is equally true for most of heavy industry, with the exceptions of aircraft, textile, electrical equipment. It certainly holds for coal, auto, rubber and farm implements. The wage-freeze formula would doom these unions to no increase this year.

At the recent convention of the UAW, Walter Reuther stated that the unions were not going to stand by while a small group of selfish men tried to freeze labor's living standards. Will these words prove to be more than rhetoric?

The steel companies put themselves in an excellent position to fight the

report by denying in advance the propriety of the board's intervention in the dispute. The steel union, by contrast, disarmed itself in advance.

Take Your Choice

John Williamson, the Communist Party's labor secretary, writing in the CP magazine Political Affairs, gives both sides of a question.

In the same issue of the magazine, January 1949, one reads on page 26 of his article that one reason for the defeats suffered by the organized workers in the recent period" has been—

"... the continued weakness of the Left-progressives in a number of trade unions, and of the Communist Party itself, in all the basic industries."

And on the very next page, the same luminous writer explains that one reason why "the bourgeoisie is particularly determined to remove the CIO as a threat to their war plans" is—

"the increased activity and strength of the Communist Party, especially among the basic workers organized in the CIO."

CORRECTION

An unfortunate typographical error in last week's LABOR ACTION seriously distorted, at one point, the meaning of the article on the N MU convention. A paragraph dealing with the Independent Caucus of the N MU was left out and appeared instead in the middle of the article on the UE convention. Our apologies.

In another handbill they added: "All the democratic procedures for which the Rank and File Caucus fought at the last convention were repudiated by these officials now that they and not the Communist Party machine are in power."

I have always fought against control of our union by outside groups, said Curran, front man for the CP machine up to a few years ago. You don't want democracy, he continued, you want anarchy... democracy demands a certain amount of discipline... you want the right to tie up ships whenever you feel like it... the Communists are inimical to our organization... so are the Trotskyists but they are small potatoes... drive the Communists out of the N MU.

CURRAN LOSES MAIN TEST

Four hundred and five delegates voted for the amendment; 198 opposed it; 12 abstained. Although the N MU constitution requires the votes of two-thirds of all seated delegates, Curran ruled that the amendment had carried, erasing the abstentions away. This flagrant, desperate action of Curran's opened the eyes of quite a few misguided Curran supporters.

His two-thirds vanished when he needed it most. The amendment just adopted applied only to applicants for membership. The committee worked two innovations into another amendment: (1) making "communism" incompatible with membership in the union; and (2) outlawing the circulation of material which "slanders" the officialdom. These planks, decisive for the inner life of the union, would have established the legal framework for action against Curran's opponents.

The voting balance swung away from the Curran group. 405 again voted for, but 215 voted against and eight abstained. It failed to get two-thirds.

The convention is not yet over and the balance turns on a hair. A few delegates shifting one way or the other can make or break the two-thirds. But it appears that Curran has reached the high point—and has failed.

Even if he had put over his whole program he would still have had to fight the questions out in a referendum vote where his chances are dimmer than at the convention. The votes of the delegates do not accurately represent the feelings of the membership. The port of New York, with 7,000 members, is represented by only 14 delegates, while small river barges with a half dozen members get one delegate each. Curran controls the small inland sections of the union but not New York, 13 of whose delegates are anti-Curran. At a port of New York membership meeting, called during the first week of the convention, 3,000 members voted against the Curran resolutions and only 10 in favor.

Time works against Curran. Grumbings against his administration for a "do-nothing" policy become louder. In the port of Houston, which sent pro-Curran delegates, membership meetings are now in the control of an opposition wing. Daily life of seamen goes on. Beefs are not settled; the hiring hall is in danger; Curran cannot feed forever on the straw of "anti-communism."

First Test Vote in UE — —

(Continued from page 1)
 spirit of democracy constantly. The big debate of the first two days was the hotly controversial collective-bargaining resolution. By the end of Tuesday morning, eight administration speakers to three oppositionists had taken the microphone.

Only after Al Lowenthal, opposition delegate from District No. 4, Newark, objected to the president's partiality did Fitzgerald agree to recognize alternate spokesmen. When Fitzgerald pleaded he didn't have the ability to distinguish the rival delegates; a roar of laughter swept the convention.

SPERRY TELLS 'EM

A high point of the collective-bargaining fight by the opposition was reached in the speech of Paul Jennings of Sperry Local 450. He effectively exposed the hypocrisy of the Stalinist attack on the steel fact-finding panel technique by citing arbitration cases of the UE leadership. It was a speech ringing with militancy and a stinging blow to the Stalinists. Matles had to admit the excellency

of the contracts obtained in Sperry, the \$135 a month pension, etc.

Cameron, district representative and delegate from Local 475, attacked Local 425, represented by Dillon, minority candidate for organization director. Cameron boasted of the \$1.80 average wage and attacked the steel fact-finding panel decision. Dillon, in an effective answer, exposed the drop in membership in Local 475 from 25,000 to 8,000 members. Citing the \$1.84 average in his plant, Dillon stated: "The Local 475 representative has been the best organizer for the UAW and the AFL. The officers have been discredited and cannot mobilize workers in GE and Westinghouse."

Unity or split is a question that lies underneath the convention proceedings but has never reached the surface. Will the opposition stick it out as a minority or will it split now or later? Will the Stalinists, faced with an opposition that can only grow and harass it, institute further expulsions? No one is answering these questions.

Steel Workers — — Minority Resolution at UE Confab Scores Leaders' Do-Nothing Record

(Continued from page 1)
 the board, a sum not even sufficient for substandard living, is "definitely socialistic."

WORRYING OVER SECURITY

The union further shows that there is nothing at all "revolutionary" in the non-contributory insurance and pension system, since government studies reveal that there are 3,000,000 workers covered by social insurance, most of them financed entirely by employers, and that there are 3,200,000 employees under pension plans, a majority of them on a non-contributory basis. Incidentally, these figures also proclaim how infinitesimal is the number of workers getting such benefits from their employers.

In the steel industry itself there are companies financing pension plans for their workers, though very inadequate ones. Of the big steel companies, Jones & Laughlin—fourth

largest and the only one that has indicated a willingness to bargain with the union on the basis of the non-contributory principle—already has a non-contributory pension plan, according to the press; yielding the workers the pittance of \$48 a month on retirement. Presumably this company, if it actually accepts the non-contributory principle as the basis for further bargaining with the union, will fight against raising the amount to the \$100 recommended by the board. There may also be involved in the attitude of Jones & Laughlin an effort to break the practice of industry-wide contracts, a practice more beneficial to the union than to the companies.

With the miners striking to the slogan "No pensions—no work" and with the steel workers on the eve of a strike on the issue of health insurance and pensions, the worry of the working people over their insecurity stands out in bold relief.

Following are the most important sections of the opposition caucus' minority report on the resolution on collective bargaining at the UE convention, around which the first test vote took place.

The undersigned members of the Resolutions Committee are opposed to the statement or resolution on collective bargaining presented by the majority because it is an apology and not a program of action. We cannot condone the inaction of our union by blaming the Steel Board.

We must face the issue squarely and courageously. The plain facts are that our union has wandered away on a political frolic of its own, has isolated itself from the American labor movement and has practically abandoned national collective bargaining.

The only effective bargaining going on is being conducted by the local unions. Negotiations with Westinghouse and General Electric, the pacesetters in our industry, began last spring, long before the Steel Board was even appointed. Nothing has come of them. But what is worse, our union has remained silent and the resolution on collective bargaining does not even mention them. We cannot divert the attention of our membership from this by claims of progress in collective bargaining with small independent companies which employ a handful of workers. The pattern of collective bargaining in our industry are fixed and not with the small producers.

It is apparent to the entire labor movement that our union has lost the initiative and is content to mark time while our sister unions in the CIO lead the fight. Our union, which has always been in the forefront, is now hanging back, paralyzed by fear, indecision and inaction.

The majority report makes large claims of pioneering in winning holidays with pay, in leading the fight for paid vacations, shift bonuses and

overtime pay in all mass production industries, but it is strangely silent about the current fight for pensions.

Where are we in this struggle? We cannot ignore the bald fact that what passes for a pension plan in our industry is in fact a plan for executives but non-existent as far as the workers are concerned. Nor can we ignore the fact that wages in the electrical are lagging behind those in steel and auto—while wages in electrical machinery average \$1.385 per hour, average wages in steel are \$1.65 and in auto \$1.63. Instead of searching for excuses for our failure we should now resolve to establish pensions in the electrical industry so that retired workers will no longer depend on charity to live.

Therefore we propose:

- (1) That UE stop discrediting those in our union who seek to restore the union to its proper place as a militant labor union;
- (2) That UE devote all of its strength and activity to collective bargaining and stop diverting its energies into suicidal political adventures;
- (3) That UE return home to its membership;
- (4) That UE take its membership into its confidence and give direction and guidance to them in an effort to solve their immediate problems and improve their working conditions;
- (5) That UE vigorously demand a pension of \$100 per month on a non-contributory basis from the electrical industry exclusive of government social security benefits.
- (6) That UE shall not rest until its membership is covered by a non-contributory plan of social insurance which will provide adequate life insurance, a weekly sickness and accident benefit of 75 per cent of weekly earnings, hospitalization costs, a schedule of surgical benefits which will cover costs and complete medical care;
- (7) A general wage increase to equalize earnings with those prevail-

ing in steel and auto;

(8) That UE restore to its members the right to fight for and hold union security;

(9) That UE return at once to bargaining with GE and Westinghouse to secure these vitally necessary improvements.

(Signed)

William Drohan, Local 1102
 James B. Carey, Local 101
 Paul Jennings, Local 450
 George DiMartino, Local 320
 William O. Emery, Local 201
 C. O'Donnell, Local 524
 John Perrin, Local 202

New York Public Meeting

Europe Between Two Imperialisms

First-hand report by

MAX SHACHTMAN

just returned from a tour of England, France, Germany, Denmark, Holland

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30 — 8:00 P. M.

CORNISH ARMS HOTEL

311 West 23rd Street, near 8th Ave.

Adm. 50 cents

Students 25 cents

"FORUM"

Discussion and Information Bulletin of the Independent Socialist League

has replaced the former "Bulletin of the Workers Party." Like its predecessor "FORUM" is mimeographed. It will also carry informational articles and material on socialist and Marxist movements abroad.

While primarily intended as a bulletin for discussion within the Independent Socialist movement and its sympathetic circles, "FORUM" is also available to the general public. Price per copy is 15 cents. Since it is published as contributions make necessary and at no stated intervals, readers who wish to be sure to obtain copies as they appear may subscribe at the rate of \$1.50 for 10 issues. Send sub to: Independent Socialist League, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.