

Eleven CPers Guilty Under Gag Act— A Blow at Democracy, A Gift to the Kremlin

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The trial and conviction of the eleven leaders of the Communist Party in New York is a first-class monstrosity.

It is a blow struck at the democratic rights and traditions in whose name the prosecution was conducted. It is a blow at the labor and socialist movements in particular. It is a gratuitous gift to the Stalinism it was designed to weaken. Any democrat, any worker, any socialist who allows his opposition to Stalinism to blind him to these facts and to their overwhelming importance is walking straight into a noose.

The trial was vicious in its foundation, its inception, its management, its conduct and its conclusion—vicious and hypocritical.

The prosecution was based upon the notorious Smith Act, a piece of reactionary and iniquitous legislation adopted by Congress for the purpose of depriving of their elementary democratic rights not only the Stalinists but any radical opposition to the present government and the capitalist system. It is an act under which beliefs, the mere advocacy of political opinions which are not popular in the government—not actions, but beliefs alone—are made a criminal offense. It is an act under which association with those who are responsible for such advocacy is likewise a criminal offense.

DECISION HITS BELIEFS, NOT ACTS

There is only one other country of importance in the world in which unpopular political beliefs and association with those who hold them are also a crime which the state punishes severely. That country is Stalinist Russia, where belief in "Trotskyism" or "Bukharinism" is punishable by a sentence of ten years—as the Smith Act provides—or by a virtual death sentence in the slave-labor camps.

The prosecution did not even bother to try to prove that the defendants had committed a single overt act to "overthrow the government by force and violence." It confused itself to presenting evidence which, regardless of its intrinsic merit, was calculated only to show that the defendants believed in certain principles and views which they sought to teach others. Basically, the evidence of the prosecution centered around the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the founders of the modern socialist movement, and the writings of Lenin and Stalin in so far as they derived, essentially, from those of Marx and Engels.

The "Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels, after one hundred years, again becomes a criminal document. The United States government has made it one, and by this act it joins the ranks of those very few other governments in the world today, all ultra-reactionary, in which it is likewise criminal. The mildest and most conservative social-democratic organization, which distributes the "Communist Manifesto," is, formally, under the Smith Act, subject to the same prosecution.

The presiding judge sat with a straight face while the prosecution stood with a straight face and presented "evidence" of the "conspiracy" which would have been thrown out of the court of any country in the world except those ruled by the most cynical totalitarian regimes. The prosecution proved to the hilt—mind you!—that the defendants had urged their fol-

(Continued on page 4)

Lewis Asks Joint Labor Fund to Aid Steel Strike

By SUSAN GREEN

This past week John L. Lewis raised a question of paramount importance to all workers—that of pooling the resources of organized labor, and presumably also its wisdom, to support any section or sections of the workers on strike.

In a letter to William Green, AFL president, Lewis proposed that the nine richest AFL internationals and the United Mine Workers each contribute \$250,000 a week (making in all \$2,500,000 a week) as a war chest for the 500,000 steel workers on strike, "to enable the great union to win beyond peradventure."

Lewis declared in his letter that the steel companies are not alone in their desire to deal the steel workers a crushing defeat, that united with the former are several other industries as well as investing insurance companies and the DuPont and Mellon financial empires. He was proposing, therefore, to make the strike of the steel workers "the uncompromising fight of all American labor."

In the opinion of LABOR ACTION,

this concept and this aim are exactly what the labor movement needs desperately.

As LA pointed out in a front-page editorial two weeks ago, the steel workers ARE fighting a battle for all labor. The question of pensions, contributory or otherwise, is a pretext for the steel companies; their real aim is to rock labor back on its heels and to stiffen Taft-Hartleyism. Labor solidarity should be the reply and Lewis' proposal is something to get enthusiastic about.

FLASH IN THE PAN?

Therefore, it is a great disappointment and even a misfortune that three days after the publication of Lewis' letter, the whole matter appears to have been a mere flash in the pan. Unless the rank and file of organized labor take up where their top leaders left off, nothing will materialize from this move by Lewis which made the front pages for a few days. William Green rejected the proposal out of hand; and while Philip Murray, CIO president, assumed the most constructive attitude of the

(Continued on page 4)

Discontent Spreads in UAW Ranks Against Ford Contract Provisions

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Oct. 11—Important manifestations of the widespread dissatisfaction among auto workers with the Ford settlement on pensions and contract have developed this past week to such a degree that the Reuther leadership finds itself in an extremely embarrassing position.

Right after the Ford settlement was announced, a meeting of all shop committees of Chrysler plants passed a motion to stick to the original UAW demands, including an adequate pension plan. This was an implied rebuke to the Ford settlement.

The national Ford council meeting provided something of a shock and a surprise to the Reuther leadership. The final vote to approve the settlement was 650 to 381, hardly the 90 per cent vote expected by the Reuther leaders. More important, perhaps, was the fact that the main opposition came from two strongly pro-Reuther locals, 900 and 400. Even a two-hour speech by Walter Reuther failed to convince the Reutherites from the shops.

(Continued on page 2)

CP Unions Get Ready to Split From CIO as Convention Nears

By BEN HALL

As the CIO convention prepares to meet at the end of this month, a split between the Stalinist and anti-Stalinist unions looms ahead. In fact, it is already taking place, slowly but inevitably, requiring only another few weeks for the last rites of "legalization" to give it final shape. The long months of jockeying for position, of maneuvering to impress labor's public opinion, wind to an end.

The CIO Executive Board in May, by a large majority, put an ultimatum to the Stalinists: carry out official CIO policy or resign all your posts of leadership. The convention can be expected to take practical measures of discipline to enforce this command.

Stalinism is fighting its last-ditch battle. It is clearly readying to split away from the CIO, presumably to form a new, third union federation. The convention of the United Electrical Workers authorized its Stalinist executive board to stop per-capita dues payments to the CIO. As the third largest union in the CIO, the only decisive mass organization still under the domination of the CP, the UE is to serve as the spinal column of the new outfit.

The Stalinist leadership of the tiny Farm Equipment Workers Union, defying CIO orders to merge with the United Auto Workers, takes shelter under the protective wing of the UE, voting to merge with the latter. There is a distinct possibility that the unions controlled by the CP will even refuse to attend the CIO convention. Mass meetings all over the country prepare local Stalinist memberships for split.

The Stalinists have compromised and capitulated before, even voting for resolutions denouncing the "interference of the Communist Party in the labor movement"—but not this time. Their course is one of desperation. At best, they will emerge with seriously weakened forces as local after local of their own unions quit them to stay within the CIO. At worst, they will be cut to pieces and decimated, perhaps obliterated, in a few years of bitter conflict.

But through their desperation runs the logical thread of Stalinist reason: Better a weakened union, a piece of a union, a shred of a union, so long as the Stalinist political line can receive the stamp of a union label. Such is the command of Russian foreign policy in the cold war.

Over the split road hangs a dust cloud of demagoguery and confusion laid down by the Communist Party to obscure its real goals. A dozen other issues are raked to the fore; but every honest and loyal union militant, recognizing that its real motive, its sole exclusive overriding consideration, is to fear away a chunk of the CIO for Kremlin politics, will fight tooth and nail to remain in the CIO and block the union-wrecking course of the Stalinists.

MURRAY DIDN'T START IT

The fight against Stalinism in the labor movement did not begin with a signal from Philip Murray. For years rank-and-file oppositions have fought bitterly to get rid of rotten CP union administrations or leaders who collaborated with the CP. The CP in the UAW died at the hands of an aroused membership. In the National Maritime Union and in the Transport Workers Union the membership rallied around former CP fellow travelers who had broken with the Stalinists (Curran, Quill) and who broke the hold of the party machine, thereby saving their own skins. In the UE, the opposition grew from year to year and today

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued on page 4)



Congress of Colonial Peoples Unites African, Asian Anti-Imperialist Fighters

By SAUL BERG

LONDON, Oct. 11—The second Congress of the Peoples Against Imperialism took place in this city on October 7-10. It witnessed the greatest gathering in recent times of delegates from all colonial movements struggling for national independence, as well as those parties that are fully anti-imperialist.

The impressive rollcall showed approximately 200 delegates from Africa, Asia, and Europe. (See box in this issue for more details—Ed.) In addition, for the first time, an American organization was represented—the Independent Socialist League.

The ISL representation was by an observer (with voice), because of the U. S.'s anti-democratic Voorhis Law which hamstringing the affiliation of U. S. groups to international bodies.

IMPERIALISM STILL MURDERS

Unquestionably the dominant feature of this congress was the unalterable determination of the colonial movements to fight TODAY for complete liberation. All the old saws about "education and preparation for self-government," etc., are dead as a doornail. The reports of repression in the African colonies showed clearly enough the ferocity of the struggle and its deep-rooted character.

In Madagascar the French government itself admitted that 100,000 of the Madagascar people were killed in the suppression of the revolt last year. Not content with this, the French government demanded the lifting of the parliamentary immunity of the deputy Raseta on minor charges of complicity in the revolt. Having obtained the lifting of immunity, the government changed the charge to treason, and Raseta was sentenced to death. As a result of a campaign of protest, the sentence has since been commuted to life imprisonment, and from his cell Raseta wired his best wishes and his full support to the congress.

The reports were everywhere the same. The delegate of the Uganda Farmers Union reported the suppression of his organization and the imprisonment of hundreds of its members—for terms up to 15 years—for demonstrating in favor of cooperative marketing for the native farmers, to eliminate the vicious profiteering of European middlemen.

The Algerian delegates reported the police repressions that made a mockery of the last elections there, and which included practically the physical destruction of some villages and the forced exile from their home villages of hundreds of independence fighters.

The delegates of the Moroccan Istiqlal (Independence Party) were able to report the censorship of their press, which results in their newspaper usually appearing more than half blank.

It is no wonder that these same

colonial delegates had risen to a man at the first congress, held last year at Puteaux in France, to reject the attempt made there by social democrats to obtain agreement on equivocal formulas short of complete self-determination for the colonial peoples. At that time the delegates had been rightly suspicious of the elaborate preparations made for them—reservations in fancy hotels and all the rest. They rejected the bribe that was in effect offered them and refused to vitiate their struggle.

RUSSIAN QUESTION ARISES

At this congress, accordingly, the social-democrats were absent, but the suspicions toward ALL Europeans fostered by their bitter experiences created a dangerous tendency this year among some of the delegates from British West African colonies. These suspicions came out clearly in the discussion of the document "The Colonies and War," presented to the congress by its International Com-

mittee. The conclusions of this document can be summed up as follows:

- (1) Every colonial people is entitled AT ONCE to full independence.
- (2) No people which is not independent is bound by any decision to enter a war which may be taken by its oppressors.
- (3) The colonial peoples must be completely independent with respect to the two big power blocs in the world.

This document was attacked by some of the West Africans on the ground that the African colonial powers were only to be found in ONE of the two blocs, and they were absolutely against any mention of a struggle which did not concern them.

What was behind this attitude? There was unquestionably some Stalinist influence, since certain of these delegates stated that they believed Russia to be a socialist state. But what was more common was the fear that any mention of the Russian problem represented a maneuver sim-

ilar to that of the social-democrats at Puteaux last year, and also the motion, hinted at more than expressed, that "the enemies of our enemies are our friends."

This latter dangerous notion could have been answered to some extent by extricating the Russian question from the status merely of quarrels among the big powers and by pointing out that it involves as well the struggle for national liberation by the Ukrainians and the other peoples directly under Russian rule, by the peoples of Eastern Europe under the rule of Russian puppets, and by the peoples of Germany, Austria and Trieste who are subjected to four-power occupation.

MUDDLERS AT WORK

No such presentation was made in concrete terms during the discussion of the committee's document, but excellent speeches in general support of the committee's Third Camp po-

(Continued on page 3)

Basic Issues in the CIO Split— Smash Stalinism, Guard Union Democracy!

What are the basic issues in dispute in connection with the looming split in the CIO?

We are not dealing with an ordinary or normal fight between competing tactics and strategy for the labor movement. Stalinism plunges us into a mystery story where all the obvious clues are deliberately planted, right out in the open—as decoys.

The official leadership of the CIO (Murray) endorses American foreign policy and supports Truman and the Democratic Party, at least its Fair Deal wing. The Communist Party, through the unions it controls, repudiates American foreign policy and endorses the so-called Progressive Party.

In its long and devious history, Stalinism has had many different immediate platforms, one the opposite of the other and the third in contradiction with the two before. FOR Roosevelt and the Democratic Party—and AGAINST them as fascists; AGAINST the war as imperialist—and FOR it as progressive; FOR any and all strikes—AGAINST them; FOR incentive pay—AGAINST it . . . the dizzying list could be extended indefinitely with amazing and magical transformations of "progressives" into "fascists" and back and forth again.

This Is What Stalinism Means!

Each and every turn, together with the artificially concocted bolstering arguments, pirouetted around one pole: Russian foreign policy. The real master of the Communist Party, "their" government, is the totalitarian regime of Stalin and they have never deviated from its requirements by a hair. Stalinism would make the labor movement a simple tool of the Russian bureaucracy. It is inside the labor movement but it has nothing in common with it.

Its policies, its slogans, its demands at bottom have nothing at all to do with the interests of the American working class or the requirements of the union movement, but aim exclusively to squeeze the American capitalist class or the government into making concessions to Russian imperialism or (at the very least) weakening the former in its battle with the latter. Russia's cold war demands desperate actions; this and this alone explains the current policies of the CP and tells us all we need to know about its split course in the CIO.

Phil Murray, and trade-union officials like him, support American capitalism; but they are leaders of the American working class and as

such their strength and influence depends upon the power of the organized labor movement.

They can and must fight in their own fashion to defend the rights of the unions; they come into conflict at point after point with the very government which they support; they yield to the pressure of their own supporters and carry on strikes and political struggles to improve the conditions of the working class. They compromise with the capitalist class and collaborate with its political parties, but these policies appear to them and to the majority of workers who support them and their policies as the most "practical" and clever means of wheedling concessions for labor.

Between these two wings in the CIO—one which would debase organized labor into an impotent camp follower of Russian imperialism and the other which, in its own timid, halting, compromising fashion, seeks to serve the needs of labor—a bitter war breaks out.

The "issue," says the Stalinists, is militancy or compromise. But the test of the class struggle gives them the lie. Not once in a decade have unions led by the Stalinists blazed the way of working-class struggle. The miners' union and the militants of the UAW during the war, the UAW in 1945 and in 1948, and today the Steel Workers' Union and the Miners' Union, were in the forefront of the class struggles in this country. The Stalinists trailed behind the embattled battalions of the working class.

Over CP's Corpse—to Fight Conservatism

Socialist militants in the CIO are against Murray's policies of pursuing capitalist politics. Reliance upon the Democratic Party robs the powerful CIO of what it could win by independent class politics. The union movement must go forward to its complete class independence on the political front as well as on the industrial front.

But the issues NOW, in THIS split fight, boil down to one fundamental choice: Shall the union movement become tied to the Russian bureaucracy or shall it preserve every possibility of moving forward toward class independence?

Without endorsing the political platform of Murray's majority or condoning his methods of carrying on the fight, all socialists join in the struggle to eliminate the influence of Stalinism in the CIO so that over its corpse the labor movement can go forward—going forward also against right-wing conservatism and bureaucratism.

Battle of the Pentagon Reflects Clash Over Methods, Aims in U. S. Imperialism

By STEWART PITT

The battle of the armed forces that is currently occupying so much attention is indeed unusual. There has never been another occasion when the fundamentals of military strategy have been brought into the open for public examination.

While much will be withheld for secret sessions it is hardly likely that anything that either side can present which is of polemical value will be suppressed. The vicious, no-holds-barred atmosphere of the debate makes this improbable.

If these are strange and unusual occurrences they are consequences of sudden and startling changes in America's position which require drastic alteration of basic conceptions. What has emerged so vividly is the imaginative poverty of our policy-makers as to just what is implied by the new role American imperialism has in the world.

There are two fundamental issues which are the backdrop for the public debate; yet neither army nor navy dares grapple with either. First, there is the horrifying reality that the weapons of destruction have become so effective as to nullify any policy which puts them to use. If war is launched for given objectives, the very means of war may destroy the bases for realizing these objectives. War has acquired a self-momentum which, once released, defies the control of its initiators. After a country has been atomized it is difficult to impose any rule upon it, since it has been leveled to a stage of life below any that this society has known. At least that is what the scientists promise. The militarists are battling over the question of the effectiveness of utilizing uncontrollable weapons.

WHY THE NAVY IS HOWLING

Secondly, America has undertaken, with the Atlantic Pact, the defense of the entire capitalist world. It is not simply in the leadership of a coalition but the supplier of the basic strength, the economic heart and decisive military power. There has never been such an alliance before on such a scale. In this new role U. S. military thought can no longer restrict itself to national-defense strategy, nor even to Roosevelt's conception of hemisphere strategy. American imperial power is committed to the entire world outside of Russia and her imperial sphere.

Many journalists and editors, particularly the liberals, have reacted with violent antagonism to the navy because in outward formalities the issue seems to them to be that the navy is opposing military unification—and thereby threatening civilian control of the armed forces. There is such an element in the present situation and it plays a large role. Also the admirals traditionally have the justly deserved reputation of being even more reactionary than their army counterparts. They also have been the more tradition-bound, least flexible, more bigoted of the two.

These are good reasons for suspicion. However, in the present circumstances it is just some of these qualities, plus some new ones, which give special interest to the navy's position.

That there has been a change will be apparent to anyone who reads the statements of Admirals Ostie and Radford or even of the well-named "Bull" Halsey. The fact is, the navy is raising serious social and moral problems as well as political and strategic ones. That it is the navy that is doing so is not only explained

by its narrow clique interests but also because these interests have become attached to an aggressive conception of the military responsibilities necessary to assure American world mastery.

ADMIRALS ASK A QUESTION

The navy, not the army or air force, can say in the words of Admiral Connolly: "U. S. naval requirements in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean area are mounting due to continued waning of over-all British naval strength and the redeployment of their scant remaining naval forces in the Far East. Traditional reliance upon Britain for control of the seas is now visionary."

The Pacific has become an American lake with bases from Alaska to Tokyo and from the Philippines to Hawaii and an area of operations including Australia and even India. In defense of its oil the navy is involved in Arabia and the Middle East.

It is acutely conscious of its Atlantic commitments, as Connolly pointed out: "The responsibilities assigned to me—particularly since the signing of the Atlantic Pact—have increased." Indeed, contrary to previous opinion, the navy has accepted the Atlantic Pact and has carved out a spearhead role for itself within it.

Admiral Ostie makes it a cardinal principle that: "The continued defense of Western Europe depends in the future as in the past on the constant flow of goods and munitions and personnel across the oceans. Control of the seas is the prerequisite to this." The admirals ask a question that cannot be brushed aside: "The brunt of any land army attack [by Russia] would have to be met initially by the armies of Western European nations."

Can an "atomic blitz" give adequate and immediate assistance to these armies? Ostie answers: "Behind-the-lines bombing of the interior of an enemy will have a negligible retarding effect upon his armies in the field."

Ostie and the others cite the results of the strategic bombing surveys of World War II, all of which agree that bombing of key industrial plants was unsuccessful except for destruction of transportation. The only bombing that was effective was saturation incendiary destruction of whole urban areas and the people in them. This caused such havoc in Japan and Germany that "We are paying to rebuild bomb-torn Europe with the Marshall Plan."

If the "atomic blitz" is employed again—and this is the keystone to the present army-air force strategy that the navy opposes—then Ostie warns: "A stable world economy may be impossible to achieve after another war." Nor will it give "immediate and effective assistance" to Western Europe since its effects are delayed and have no effect on the armies in the field. By that time "sizeable areas of friendly territory may well be occupied by the enemy to serve him as a future arsenal. Are we to atomize or otherwise destroy such urban and industrial areas where friendly peoples outnumber the invaders in a ratio of perhaps 50 or 100 to 1?" Here Ostie touches the most sensitive nerve of America's European allies.

NAVY VIEW MORE AGGRESSIVE

Clearly this is not a simple inter-service fight. The admirals are challenging the idea that the U. S. can base its strategy on long-range bombers operating vast distances from the U. S. to atomize Russian and perhaps European cities. The army and air force here stand as conservative

American-defensists-first. The B-36 is the symbol of an insular conception which by-passes actual commitment to European war except by lend-lease, advice, etc. Without any ability or desire to assess the super-bomber which can carry atomic bombs 4000 miles, its central position in the war plans implies the unaided suicide of the Western armies before a Russian attack.

Ostie states this quite bluntly: "The strategic bombing force . . . is designed for independent action. . . . It serves none of the primary demands for our vital minimum security—the defense of Western Europe, the protection of forward bases, the early reduction of enemy military potential and command of the sea."

The navy's proposals, by rejecting absolute dependence on the super-atomic bomber, call for more aggressive world-conscious plans which would commit American military forces from the very first instant of direct combat. A tactical air force, integrated with land armies and control of the seas, would carry American military might to all corners of the globe in advance. It would permit an agreement with Russia on atomic armament while extending U. S. bases to every possible attack springboard.

This is a violent, aggressive, reactionary sentiment but it is not conservative and it does probably fit the pattern of American imperialism's world role more clearly than that of the B-36.

The symbol for the navy, and the starting point for the current conflict, was Secretary Johnson's veto on the mass plane carrier United States. It might seem that the Navy's huge "floating target" approach is just as vulnerable as the B-36. However, its purpose is "mobile air power," that is, the ability to bring American planes to every part of the world as part of tactical and, therefore, interdependent military plans.

The navy command does not reject the bomb as such but only as the exclusive "independent" weapon.

Circumspect atomization, integrated with direct military objectives, coincides more closely with the necessities of world war, in the navy's opinion. Besides, the admirals point out, there are deadlier weapons and surer ones than the bomb which the present strategy has shunted aside. In general, the navy proposes the fullest utilization and integration of all means of destruction from advanced bases.

IS WAR CONTROLLABLE?

But in questioning control for dependence on the bomb, the admirals have called into question the very premises of modern war. Radford said: "In planning to wage a war, we must look to the peace to follow. We must know what kind of a peace we wish to have and what price we are willing to pay to achieve it. . . . A war of annihilation might possibly bring a pyrrhic military victory, but it would be politically and economically senseless."

While the navy proposes to concentrate attack on opposing armed forces and strategic objects only, all the lessons of the last war indicate that mass bombing of urban areas does "pay off" in the long run, which makes it difficult to resist by a military mind which is accustomed to calculating expendable humanity.

Therefore the question is posed in all its frightful clarity: "If we now consciously adopt a ruthless and barbaric policy toward other peoples, how can we prevent the breakdown of those standards of morality which have been a guiding force?" How can war result in any but a pyrrhic victory? How can any political aims be achieved by war? For war has achieved an autonomy by the very scale of its destructive powers.

Whatever the outcome of the present debate, whatever formal disposition is made of the navy's charges and demands, the full horror of the picture it has made public may present new hurdles to the proponents of an atomic armament race.

Against Ford Contract - -

(Continued from page 1)

One of the Flint locals passed a resolution urging Ford workers to defeat the proposed settlement.

The vote at the Ford national council was significant for another reason. The Thompson forces at the big Ford Local 600, covering over 70,000 workers, voted for the settlement. That is, Reuther got his majority with the assistance of an anti-Reuther faction.

But in the subsequent issue of Ford Facts, the huge article on page one by Tommy Thompson, president of 600, was hardly any consolation to Reuther. Besides pointing out that Reuther was outsmarted by John Bugas, ex-FBI agent who is chief negotiator at Ford, Thompson states bluntly that the contract is lousy, and then recommends approval for lack of anything else to do!

Certainly, this approach is hardly calculated to endear Thompson to Reuther or, vastly more important, to endear the Ford workers to the settlement. The whole thing makes it very difficult for anyone to gloss over the settlement and paint it up as another great victory for Reuther, although it seems that some of the national press is doing so.

Although many people will think that the Thompson position is absurd, as a matter of fact it makes sense to many workers, who feel that the situation is a mess and, after saying so, one has no choice but to vote yes and try to live with it. The specter of unemployment due to a prolonged steel strike yields a strong influence in that reasoning.

Reports that at least one out-of-state Ford local voted approval of the settlement indicate that what we may call the Thompson position may obtain a majority vote among all Ford workers.

REUTHER DODGES

What else can the Ford workers do besides approve the contract? What can they do if they vote no? The answer is: there is no law against further negotiations—it's been done before in the labor movement! Of course Reuther is putting on a real drive for approval, since any other

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.

course would be a calamity to his prestige and fortunes in the CIO.

In reply to this argument about further negotiations, Reuther spokesmen say, that nothing can be gained that way. "And do you favor a strike?" Many workers said yes, but actually immediate strike action is not necessary. Its timing is a matter of judgment, to include steel union developments.

What irritates many workers in the discussions is the fact that Reuther's spokesmen, as well as himself, argue about things that are not germane or decisive. In this they are given support by the anti-Reutherites whose vehemence and often ultra-leftist arguments simply set up clay pigeons for Reuther to knock down easily.

Reuther states, for example, that those who want to turn down the revised company-security provision favor "wildcat strikes and minority rule." And there are always people who fall for that bait and say, "Sure I favor wildcat strikes," whereupon Reuther can make an effective reply. But most of the opposition to company-security clauses and to the "revised" one in the Ford contract is based on the very sound premises and arguments of the resolution officially adopted at the last UAW convention. Reuther doesn't talk about that!

In regard to the pension plan, the

N. Y. Election Campaign Compounded Of Dirty Politicking and Confusion

By WILLIAM BARTON

NEW YORK, Oct. 17—Last week's registration in this city for the coming combined election for municipal offices and United States senator was an all-time record for a non-presidential year. Preliminary reports from the rest of the state, mostly from the large population centers, likewise reveal a large turnout. Some of this may be the product of the intense campaigning of Republican Senator John Foster Dulles. But even more may be a result of retaliation to his unusually reactionary campaign.

Governor Dewey's leading political adviser has devoted half his time thus far to attacking "collectivism," "statism," federal aid to education and "socialized medicine," as well as defending a mildly modified Taft-Hartley Law. He has threatened to lead a "fight back" if the "collectivists" have their way, using additional innuendoes of a possibly necessary right-wing "revolution."

DULLES SLUR CAMPAIGN

The rest of his efforts have been spent in an appeal to bigotry such as has not been found in the campaign material of a major candidate since the 1928 religious slurs against Al Smith. In striving to get a large vote against his opponent, Democrat and Liberal Party candidate former Governor Lehman, in a small community in the northern part of the state, he is quoted as having remarked: "If you could see the kind of people in New York City making up this bloc that is voting for my opponent, if you could see them with your own eyes, I know that you would be out, every last man and woman of you, on election day."

His tactics have prevented any open or "silent" labor support, such as his political mentor, Dewey, has sometimes been able to garner. The local Republican leaders in New York City are visibly embarrassed; many are reported to be eagerly awaiting his decisive trouncing, with the additional hope that it will help liberate them from the dominance of the for-

mer gang buster in the executive mansion.

The Dulles attempt to get votes by appeal to national and religious groupings has taken special twists, depending upon the locale of his speeches. In the rural areas he has been a "hundred per cent American." In Buffalo, he became the lifelong friend of Poland, thereby hoping to crawl into popularity among the large Polish working-class population of that industrial center, whom he cannot possibly woo in any other fashion. All are guessing about his possible approach when he comes home to New York City and has to face an audience that is not composed of his Wall Street cronies.

With all due caution, as a result of last year's prediction boners, many politicians, including Republicans, declare Lehman is safely "in." Besides the ineptness of his opponent, on his side is his identification with the Fair Deal, still popular with the labor population, his overwhelming (near unanimous) endorsement by the labor movement, his running on both the Democratic and Liberal lines. The Lehmans can remain heroes as long as labor has not organized its own party.

MORRIS DRIVE WEAK

The municipal campaign in the city has thus far found O'Dwyer pulling a "Dewey"—letting his opponents do most of the campaigning. However, he may easily get away with it, for he has behind him both the powerful Democratic machine and the majority of the city's labor movement, which has set up a united AFL-CIO body for the purpose. Their approach is to emphasize the administration record (which does not include the question of the transit fare), and O'Dwyer's ties with the New Deal-Fair Deal tradition. Opponents have charged O'Dwyer with trying to drag himself back into office on Lehman's coattails.

The campaign of the Republican-Liberal-Fusion coalition behind Newbold Morris has mainly attempted to resurrect the old cry of "graft" versus "good government," but many of the campaign leaders privately admit that this is finding few ears for lack of any sensational scandals. However, their campaign may be making some impression when it features the incumbent administration's responsibility for obvious widespread ailments, like the conditions

on the subways, the serious housing problem, the granting of large increases to hotel owners by the city rent commission, the need for improved parking facilities in midtown Manhattan, the lack of sufficient schools, playgrounds, etc.

But Morris and Company, because of their widely divergent official support, can offer no solution that makes any real sense, let alone solve the problems. The "business government" people of the Republican Party and the labor organizations that are the heart of the Liberal Party cannot have the same program in reality.

The technical aspects of their campaign often become downright ludicrous. Morris will speak at a Liberal Party meeting somewhere in Manhattan, then leave just before Robert Wagner Jr., the Democratic-Liberal candidate for borough president, takes the rostrum; he will then rush around the corner to speak on the same platform with Oren Root, Republican candidate for the same office. Morris has not been forced, as yet, to say anything about the senatorial campaign, though he is a life-long registered Republican.

Interestingly enough, most of the spadework for his organization is coming from the Liberal Party cadres. If he should be elected, the city would witness the ironic sight of a party, whose leaders did not have confidence that they could run an independent ticket, actually carrying the Republican Party to victory in the nation's largest city.

An equally aggressive campaign is being undertaken by American Labor Party candidate Congressman Vito Marcantonio, and most of his running mates. Shrewd politician that he is, Marcantonio is not making Henry Wallace's mistake. He is discussing foreign policy only by inference. His most emphatic declarations have been his call for a return to the five-cent fare, his demand for strengthened rent control legislation and administration, his program against discrimination and his stand on labor issues. Fortunately the voters, by now, well understand the close association between the ALP and the Communist Party. At best, he is expected to keep the established ALP vote, with the greatest strength coming from his own machine-controlled district and the increased Puerto Rican population, among whom he has established much prestige.

S. F. BAY AREA NOTES

Green Backs Beck but Bay Area AFL Stands Behind Retail Clerks

By ARLENE WILLIAMS

The muddled picture of the jurisdictional war which was started by Dave Beck's henchmen in the Bay Area teamsters' unions against the Retail Clerks Union is still far from being cleared up as of this writing.

As reported in last week's LABOR ACTION, the teamsters, under the familiar guidance and tactics of the unscrupulous Dave Beck, launched an attack, with the aid of the employers' association, to smash the Retail Clerks as the recognized bargaining agent of the food-store employees in this area. Despite the fact that the whole AFL in the area rallied behind the clerks and were thereby successful in splitting the employers association by signing individual contracts with a majority of the independent merchants as well as two of the chains, the teamsters remained adamant in their rule-or-ruin policy, slapped a boycott against the stores signing with the clerks, and signed back-door agreements with Safeway and Lucky stores, the two largest chains involved.

Although the retail clerks have been the recognized union here for the past several years, they nevertheless submitted the whole question of jurisdiction to an NLRB decision which is as yet forthcoming. The difficulties faced by this union are obvious to any and all who are familiar with the strikebreaking and scabbing tactics of Beck & Co. in previous similar situations.

However, despite the fact that William Green and Daniel Tobin have given the teamsters the go-ahead signal for their union-busting drive, the AFL Central Labor Councils in the area have reiterated their stand to back the clerks to the hilt in defense of their justified strike, as against the teamsters' drive for power in the area.

The Central Labor Councils had declared previously that should the teamsters not desist in their strike-breaking actions, all unions in the area would institute a boycott against all teamster-delivered goods, which might ultimately tie up the whole area in a general strike.

AFL President Green has once again intervened in the situation to warn the AFL councils that he will impose "drastic actions" against them unless they refuse to take sides in this dispute. The question of the stand that the Central Labor Councils will take in view of such threats

from the national AFL will be determined at their special meeting on October 17.

It is to be hoped that they will continue their militant struggle against Beck and Tobin. The drive to dominate the West Coast labor movement on the part of the teamsters has as yet been met with no serious opposition and their union-busting methods have run rampant from one end of the coast to the other with only dire results for the workers involved. There is an opportunity to stop them once and for all with a united labor movement.

FARM WORKERS WINNING

An unheralded victory was won last week by the National Farm Labor Union (AFL) in its successful fight against the cotton growers of California. For the first time in recent years, the agricultural workers of the state succeeded in banding together for a fight for union recognition and a wage increase. The history of the sad defeats of the agricultural workers in the past is all too well known and the victory of the cotton pickers should certainly provide a spur for the workers in other products in this industry to organize and fight for their demands.

The California State CIO Council, charged recently with being "a notorious front organization of the Communist Party," opened a three-day convention session in San Francisco on October 14. Tim Flynn, Northern California CIO regional director, requested the national CIO to revoke the council's charter. As a result anti-CP CIOers decided to boycott the convention. Concentration points of the convention were said to be a "fight for autonomy and democracy in the CIO" along with defense of CIO Longshore President Harry Bridges, whose perjury conspiracy trial begins November 14.

John F. Shelley, president of the California State Federation of Labor, has tossed his hat into the political ring by announcing his candidacy for the vacancy now existing in the Fifth Congressional District. Shelley has received the endorsement of the Union Labor Party, San Francisco's unit of Labor's League for Political Education. He has also received the official endorsement of the Democratic Party.

Next-A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

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

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

New York ISL Fall Festival and Dance

Featuring Rex Clayton
and his Jumping Jive Band

First N. Y. Performance by
Leon Del Monte

"Debate between Thomas Norman and Shack Maxman"

FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 4
CARAVAN HALL, 110 East 59 Street, N.Y.C.
Admission \$1.25

Capture of Canton Will Test Ability Of Chinese CP to Stabilize Regime

By JACK BRAD

The fall of Canton brings to a close the two-and-a-half-year civil war in China. Except for the rice bowl of Szechuan, deep in the Yangtze valley, every major section of traditional China is in CP hands.

The Nationalist government, founded by Sun Yat-sen and buried by Chiang Kai-shek, is split into three major factions operating from as many separate centers, while the largest section of the Kuomintang bureaucracy has gone over to the Stalinists.

A new national state has been proclaimed in Peking, the old capital which faces the regime inward and northward toward Russia, just as Nanking as capital in its time signified that the KMT faces seaward toward the imperialist concessions.

The new state is the political monopoly of the CP leadership, which is in the process of using this new power to expand and consolidate its bureaucratic-collectivist hold on China. Many military problems still face the regime but they are secondary and will no longer require primary concentration of energies.

POCKETS OF RESISTANCE

President Li is established together with his personal clique in the southern province of Kwangsi, which is his home base. It may be that these warlords can hold out indefinitely in the wild hills and jungle just as the inner province of Yunnan, which Chiang recently consolidated for loyalty to himself by the simple means of bribing the ruling warlord, may resist the CP armies indefinitely from the tribal wilderness and impassable hills.

There is also Tibet, both inner and outer, a vast area with sparse, impoverished nomadic peoples living under a theocratic tyranny, whose capital Lhasa has become the center of diplomatic intrigues, with India extending offers to strengthen the hands of the separatists. There are parts of the Chinese Northwest, which have not yet been captured for the CP, but here it is only a matter of time.

Szechuan, which supported the KMT during the war, is split politi-

cally. Half of its warlords favor adherence to the CP to have what they can and the other half have been put on Chiang's seemingly inexhaustible payroll and their loyalty is decidedly measurable. This catalog of what remains outside of Stalinist control is enough to indicate that the CP is master in the land.

The Kuomintang now has its official capital at Chungking, capital of Szechuan province, but actually only a handful of minor clerks have been sent there as a token government. President Li, in Kwangsi, has only his personal troops to support him and has been reduced to the status of a local warlord. On Formosa sits Chiang Kai-shek with the remnants of his private army and air force and the loot of twenty years, still the master of the chaos that surrounds him, still hoping to gamble against the advent of war between Russia and the U. S.

Whatever opposition eventually takes the field against the CP, this Kuomintang will never again play a role in China. Its latest ignominy was the silent disintegration of its armies before the capital at Canton.

The entire southern campaign has had an eerie character. Not one battle was fought, not one sizable skirmish. Kuomintang lines held until the CP armies got ready to march, and as they advanced the KMT armies simply melted away. The Nationalist armies no longer exist. With each step backward, the Southern armies broke up into their component units, each general taking refuge for himself. Up to the last scandal, bribery and personal looting were the order of the day.

The commander-in-chief defending the entire strategic coastal province of Fukien was found to be collecting a payroll and supplies for an army roster of 40,000 while he had with him some 2500 officers and several hundred men. The supplies were sold on the black market and the money was divided among the officers. This happened only a few weeks ago. Not

even the decadent state of czarist Russia sank so low in its fall.

This was the party of the nascent capitalist class of China. With its disappearance an epoch comes to an end. Never will this class have another opportunity to impose its aims on the country.

CANTON WILL TEST CP

Canton is not simply another city. It was the heart of native capitalism. As long ago as the middle of the 16th century this city became the major trading port with the Portuguese and later with the Dutch and British. During the last century, it was here that the only major popular resistance was organized by the commercial classes over the heads of the corrupt imperial government at Peking.

Canton was the heart of the Kuomintang and the city where Sun Yat-sen was first able to set up a nationalistic government. And in the great revolution of 1925-27 Canton supplied the armies for the northward march. Shanghai, by contrast, was always a foreign city, which grew to power around the imperialist concessions. Until 1927 the city was administered by foreigners. Canton was just the reverse. The British set up their concession on the island of Hong Kong outside the city, and the local tradesmen continued to flourish.

This week the leading citizens were negotiating the city's surrender to the CP. They raised no objection to the desertion by the KMT nor did they demand that it defend them. The KMT was no longer their party or state. They showed no compunction in welcoming the new rulers.

Canton also has been the fortress of the working class. While for many years disorganized, this situation now presents a serious test in social relations to the CP. Since few of the industries there are immediately nationalizable because of their small size, it will be labor-capital relations. The problem will be how best to conquer the workers, crush them in the party's embrace and still maintain

good relations with both classes.

In Canton the national class conflict is posed most sharply. The CP alliance with the national capitalists will be tested here.

At the mouth of the Pearl River, which runs through Canton, is Hong Kong and its adjacent British holdings on the mainland. The policy the CP adopts toward this imperialist outpost will indicate its immediate intentions in international affairs more than any declaration.

The British, for their part, have indicated quite clearly that Hong Kong is a test for them too. If Hong Kong is left alone recognition is almost certain to be quick and the British colony will be the window of Chinese Stalinism toward the West, as its main port. It appears probable that that will indeed be the CP policy, though this is by no means certain. Such an eventuality would not, in any fashion, modify the Russian orientation of the state in international politics. The entire situation will be extremely revealing, however.

Finally, Canton brings the Chinese party to the Viet-Name border for the first time. It can now make liaison with the forces of Ho Chi-min, and this would alter the relations between the various factions in the Viet-Nam national alliance. It is yet to be seen how Ho will react to the new situation and whether the Chinese CP will make direct overtures.

In any case, the French are faced with a new urgency in Indo-China. American policy has thus far followed the French to the present brink of disaster. But there is no way to turn with this policy any more. Long postponement of an American policy for Southeast Asia is no longer possible. No doubt Nehru's current tour of the capitals of the imperialist world is related to this matter. The State Department's White Paper offered no guide. These events tend to force the hands of capitalist imperialism, and the U.S. and France will be forced to reorient their policies in Asia.

WORLD POLITICS

Is a Russian Offensive Due? Western Europe Faces Critical Period

Since the moment when the world learned that Stalin possessed the atomic bomb it is possible to note the beginnings of a shift in general Russian policy. While this shift has not yet blossomed forth into a new, major Russian political and diplomatic offensive—comparable to the period after the end of the war—it definitely marks a change in the steady retreat noticeable for some time in Russian policy. One might say that the ponderous machine of Russian imperialism is now grinding to a halt, so far as retreat is concerned, and beginning to resume offensive action.

At the same time, and obviously related to it, we find a definite slowing up of American activity, penetration and influence over the Old World continent. The reason for this is not hard to find. It lies primarily in the fact that the early effects of the Marshall Plan loans, which might be compared to large injections of blood plasma into a dying man, have now begun to wear off.

It was because of the great stimulus provided to production and economic life that America was able, last year, to exert such an influence in the affairs of Western Europe. But, on the one hand, European economic life is now running into new types of difficulties over which the Marshall Plan can exert no influence, and, at the same time, counter-tendencies which insist upon reassertion of Europe's independence from American influence are now running stronger than ever.

In the cat-and-mouse game played by America and Russia over Europe, the role of chaser and chased change constantly. Are we in for a new and mighty Russian offensive, leading to an American retreat and further Russian advances? While this would not seem to be the case (primarily because Europe itself has entered the fray as an independent factor), it is certain that the advantages now lean toward Russia and we may expect a continuation of this.

A quick survey of Europe at this moment indicates a whole series of new political and social crises are now being prepared and will burst out into the open before long. At this moment, these problems are limited by national boundaries but we know from the Russian technique that efforts will be made to raise them to an all-European plane and give them as wide a scope as possible.

GERMANY

The action of the Russian-dominated SED [Stalinist] Party in proclaiming the establishment of a "German Republic" has completed the formal splitting of Germany. This monstrous split is the result of three years' activity on the part of the Western powers and the Russians, and obviously has no support from the Germans themselves. The particular way in which the Russians organized their "government" stinks even more unpleasantly than the Western powers' technique in forcing the Bonn Constitution down the throats of the West Germans.

The Russian-SED clique simply proclaimed a "Republic" brought in prepared lists of cabinet members and functionaries—strangely enough, almost all of them were Stalinist leaders, with the particularly obnoxious GPU assassin Gerhard Eisler as minister of propaganda (information)—and then postponed scheduled elections for one year.

This cynical act deceived no one, of course, but it has wider implications. For example, the Stalinists claim their "government" to represent all of Germany, whereas the more modest Bonn Constitutionists speak only of the West. A whole set of demagogic demands was drafted as the program for this "government," including withdrawal of all troops, ending of reparations (with the significant catch phrase used to exclude "war industries"), etc.

The Russians have even followed up with the unanimous gesture of withdrawing their Berlin troops a few miles out of the city, about 15 minutes distance by car! It is easy enough to ridicule all this, but there is more involved.

Allied policy in Germany is totally bankrupt, and the Bonn Constitution is starting to founder badly. The Russians are aware of this, and know that all tendencies within Western Germany—including the most conservative—will lead to more and sharper conflicts with the Allied High Commissioners. Their demagogic program is bait set out to spur this on and to entrap the unwise. It would appear that the Russians, now using a totally quisling German government of Stalinist hacks and assassins, are launching a new phase in their struggle for mastery of all of Germany. That is the stake, nothing less.

If they succeed in confusing independence movements within Germany, and if the Allies continue their present policy of arrogant interference, blundering and antagonism towards the German people, they have a more than comfortable chance of succeeding. As the

Allies liquidate whatever good will remains on their side of the ledger, the Russians begin a clever game of gathering in anti-Allied sentiment. The struggle for Germany, on a new plane, goes on at full speed.

FRANCE

France, with its new governmental crisis, well illustrates the economic and social problems of the Western European nations which have achieved a definite measure of recovery as a result of Marshall Plan loans. The limits of this recovery would now appear to have been reached, and economists indicate not only a slowing up in the rate of this recovery, but a definite tendency for stagnation of economic life, particularly so far as European trade and foreign commerce are concerned.

The great problem in France is the everlasting race between wages and prices, with its accompanying problems of inflation, unemployment, etc. There is absolutely no sign of any solution to this; in fact, the resignation of the Queuille government (which achieved the remarkable durability of one whole year) is based upon this fact.

After the sudden devaluation of the English pound, the French franc quickly was devalued to the unprecedented rate of 350 francs for one dollar. (Many people still alive recall when it was 7, 8 or 10 for a dollar.) This led to a spurt forward in prices, and the French labor unions, now divided into three rival unions, were obliged to renew their demand for wage increases and a raising of the minimum monthly wage rate. The Socialist within the coalition government, representing France's most thoroughly discredited party, saw an opportunity to regain some working-class support and caused the cabinet's overthrow by demanding wage increases. Daniel Meyer, labor minister, presented these demands and Queuille quickly resigned.

France is still without a formal government, although this will quickly be remedied. But whether the new minister is Jules Moch (notorious Socialist who gained the enmity of the French miners by his action in breaking their last year's strike), or another liberal politician, it makes little difference to developments in France. The important thing is that the labor movement again gives some signs of a restirring and awakening, although it must be recognized that the Stalinists, still firmly in control of the CGT and the industrial workers of the nation, stand most to benefit.

The reason? The dim failure of their rivals—the Catholic unions, the Socialists, etc.—to offer anything satisfactory or inspiring to the workers of France, and the people as a whole. It is a matter of a revival of Stalinist influence largely through default.

AUSTRIA AND ENGLAND

To one or another degree, the same pattern of instability and coming crisis is exhibited in Austria and England. The results of last Sunday's general Austrian elections signify more than a blow at Stalinism, which was expected. There was a general shifting to the right, as shown by the factor of the conservative Catholic People's Party, together with a still greater shift to the right in the form of 12 per cent of the total vote going to a revived, reactionary Nazi party (Independent League).

The Austrian Social-Democracy, which has now become one of the most conservative and die-hard sections of the social-democratic movement as contrasted with its pre-war "left" position in the International, suffered a greater setback than had the German Social-Democrats. They will remain on, however, as very reduced junior partners in a pathetic coalition government. Their defeat, however, may well lead to a stirring of left-wing sentiment within the Austrian Social-Democracy, whose members see all the pre-war blunders being committed again, only in even less favorable circumstances.

As for England, the pressure is rapidly increasing for general elections, and the actual launching of the campaign will surely introduce what promises to be the most exciting and significant election since the end of the war, with the Labor Party staking its fate against the Tory party of Churchill.

Throughout Europe, the same pattern of internal dissatisfaction and economic crisis is once more stirring people into activity, thought and weighing of proposed solutions. The offensive-defensive action of the two great, overbearing powers remains as before (and will remain indefinitely), but its influence has considerably died out for the moment. It would appear that neither can act decisively now, short of military action—i. e., war.

Their tendency is thus to cancel one another out as hostile forces; hostile, we mean, to the resurrection of a free and independent Europe. The sooner this is grasped by socialists and democrats in Europe, the bolder and more courageous will become their activities.

Henry JUDD

Colonial Peoples — —

(Continued from page 1)

sion were made by Jef Last of the Dutch left-wing socialist organ De Vlam and by Leon Szur of the South African Socialist Group. Lahia, international secretary of the Socialist Party of India, made an exceptionally powerful speech for the same position, criticizing it only from the standpoint of ambiguity. What he wanted was not passive neutrality à la Sweden or Switzerland, but an "active neutrality" uniting colonial peoples and the workers of the imperialist countries in revolutionary struggle to end war. He stated that this must be adopted not only as a pre-war but as a mid-war policy.

It remained for the official Trotskyists to muddy the waters by presenting their stand on the Russian question in its crassest form. In the U. S. the Socialist Workers Party and its paper The Militant has (discreetly) showed its position of "unconditional defense of Russia" into the background, but this was far from the case with their fellow Trotskyist delegates at London. Their ignominious document, presented by the delegates of the two Ceylon parties, is detailed elsewhere on this page.

But what cannot be emphasized too much is the effect it had in vitiating any attempt to clarify the Nigerian delegation. One after the other the official-Trotskyist delegates presented their positions in such a fashion as to appeal demagogically to the Nigerians, placing ALL their emphasis on attacking American imperialism and quickly slurring over their differences with the Stalinist regime.

In any case, as the Moroccan and Algerian delegates pointed out, even though they were themselves absolutely opposed to both power blocs, it was apparent that the congress could not achieve unity on the committee's document. Since they felt that the main purpose of the congress was not to adopt comprehensive theses but to mobilize maximum support behind the struggles of the national organizations, a declaration should be drafted (they said) that could achieve unanimity. The congress agreed unanimously to such a procedure; and such a declaration, dealing specifically with the struggle

for full independence in the African and Asiatic colonies, was adopted the following day.

HEALEY SQUELCHED

During the last day of the congress, the many resolutions dealing with the struggles of each colony were adopted with few modifications. However, the declaration of the European delegation on the tasks of European workers in the fight against imperialism, reported out by Healey (orthodox Trotskyist from Britain) gave rise to considerable discussion. Jef Last (of De Vlam), followed by Saul Berg (American ISL), argued for the inclusion in the declaration of a paragraph that would deal with the necessity of fighting for national independence in the Ukraine, in Eastern Europe, and in Germany.

The discussion was of a purely educational value, since the declaration of the European Commission was merely up for acceptance into the congress minutes and was not subject to adoption, amendment or rejection. Its value was demonstrated by the hysterical, abusive attack then launched at Last and Berg by Healey. Berg had deliberately limited himself to formulations with which the orthodox Trotskyists are supposed to agree: the idea of an independent Ukraine (advanced by Trotsky already in 1938), the idea of the withdrawal of all occupation troops from Germany, etc. There was no mention of "Russian imperialism" in the proposal offered; only the ques-

tion of national independence was raised.

Healey's summation, in which he "answered" the criticisms, began with an oration on the history of the Russian Revolution that managed to be dull, vicious and semi-Stalinist simultaneously. The delegates began to mutter, then to object, and finally started yelling at Healey to stop—to the extent that Chairman Fenner Brockway finally put a stop to Healey's presentation on this subject. The reaction of the French-speaking delegation, when they heard the translation was more sophisticated: they burst into laughter.

In any case the leucubrations of Healey & Co. were fortunately not the main theme of the congress. Despite the sometimes acrimonious and suspicious tone of many of the debates, the congress emerged with a new International Committee that unites far stronger colonial forces than the preceding one. The new committee has 14 representatives from Africa, five from Asia, six from Europe. It was made clear that, but for the U. S. law above mentioned, there would be an additional representative from the United States.

In the case of Africa and Asia, every affiliated organization that is nation-wide in scope is represented. The new committee will have the task of organizing activities that will bring to the attention of world opinion the principles of the congress and the struggles of its national organizations.

From Four Continents They Came—United Against Imperialist Powers

Underlining the world-wide significance of the Second Congress of the Peoples Against Imperialism is the wide range of the movements represented, heavily weighted by the organizations of struggle from the African and Asian cockpits of the anti-imperialist fight.

The rollcall showed delegates from the following African colonies: French-ruled Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, the Cameroons, Madagascar; British-ruled Sudan, Uganda, South Africa, Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Ashanti and Sierra Leone. In addition, there were delegates from organizations of African workers and students living in Great Britain.

Asiatic organizations included the Socialist Party of India, the two Trotskyist parties of Ceylon, the Indian Peasants Union, and organizations of Viet-Name workers and students in France.

Socialist and democratic organizations from the imperialist nations, represented at the conference, were numerous, but unlike the delegates from the powerful movements for colonial liberation, they could only voice the sentiments of the small anti-imperialist vanguard among the European workers. Conspicuous by their absence were the treacherous social-democratic parties that participate in or have participated in the imperialist governments of Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

From France, delegates were present from the RDR (Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire), the French groups of official Trotskyists (Parti Communiste Internationaliste), and Garry Davis' "Citizens of the World" movement. From Great Britain came the Independent Labor Party, the Commonwealth group, Crusade for World Government movement, Peace Pledge Union and several local Labor Party branches.

From the Netherlands came representatives of the left-socialist paper De Vlam, and from its émigré center in France came the Spanish socialist POUM. And, as noted in the accompanying article, an American organization—the Independent Socialist League—was represented for the first time.

Richard Wright, Famed Negro Novelist, Sends Message Backing Colonial Congress

My Friends and Fellow Workers in the Cause of Freedom and Liberation:

I greet you in the name of fifteen million American Negroes who have always identified themselves with your struggles and sufferings. We American Negroes are separated by three centuries from Africa and the environment of colonial oppression; yet our experiences in the New World have kept alive in our hearts and minds the meaning of oppression, and for that reason we understand your aims and aspirations and we speak your language.

The world nears the end of a long and shameful period. The exploiting, capitalistic states of Western Europe can no longer oppress and hold in subjection millions of human beings. Repeated wars have weakened the oppressors. Their greed for world markets and raw materials have brought the industrial techniques of the West into the daily lives of millions who are mastering them and using them in the fight for human freedom.

It is from the mouths of colonial colored peoples today that one hears of democracy, freedom, and human welfare. The only constructive social and political programme in the world today are in the hands of Chinese, Indians, and Negroes. Indeed, the hope of the Western world resides in the lives of those whom they for-

merly exploited and maligned. In your deliberations here remember that your position has changed; you need no longer plead or beg for rights; you need to map out plans of struggle for both yourselves and the rest of mankind. Be bold enough to assume the simple fact that virtue and right are on your side, and that your oppressors stand self-condemned before the eyes of the civilized world. Be bold enough to assume that millions of your former enemies are bogged down in confusion and will respond to your plans for the construction of a new world to a degree that you now do not suspect.

The key to the events of today is the realization that one world is dying and that another is being born. Mankind can consider itself lucky that there remains still on earth such a vast pool of men who have resisted corruption and still retain in their hearts a humane vision of life.

The hope of the future is in your hands and as you speak and talk that simple fact must inform and suffuse all you do and say. You must make that dialectical leap from the stance of defence to that of leadership; you must project and plan your desires and needs so that men will know what you want, and by doing so you shall fill that moral vacuum which the states of the Western World have left in the hearts of mankind.

As one man seeking to do what he can, I give you this pledge: I stand with you; I am on the side of the oppressed; I pledge that I shall never give one iota of aid, in word or in deed, to those who seek to extend imperialism or racial rule; I pledge to help to define freedom so that common men can understand it and believe in it; I pledge to you that I shall fight the good fight and keep the faith.

The sense of life is on your side, and our struggle has reached a pitch of development where your confidence and readiness for action will prove decisive.

The world today is preoccupied with the coming war; each side seeks to snare men's minds for the conflict. We must fight shy of committing ourselves in this conflict. The aims of the coming war do not guarantee freedom for you and me. War aims are not our aims. It is our solemn duty and sacred obligation to oppose the aims of war with the claims of peace and hope and construction.

You men who fight against oppression are the heirs of the ages. It will be your job to bind together the shattered remains of peoples and cultures, to help redirect the energies of men toward creative goals. It will be your duty to help mankind recapture, retake the estate of that which is human. Richard WRIGHT

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.

114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.

GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Tel. IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 43

October 24, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper

Editorial Board: Hal Draper,

Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett

Business Manager: Joseph Ross

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

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



Background of the Prosecution Against the Eleven Communist Party Leaders—

Smith Gag Act Won—Democracy Lost

By WYATT LEE

NEW YORK, Oct. 15—A federal court just this past week took seven hours to consider evidence presented over a span of nine months and rendered a guilty verdict against eleven Communist Party leaders charged with conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the United States government.

Immediately after the verdict, Federal Judge Harold R. Medina imposed sentences for criminal contempt of court against the five defense attorneys and Eugene Dennis, a defendant who conducted his own defense. Bar associations to which the various defense attorneys belong are expected to act quickly on disbarment proceedings.

Immediately following the outcome

of the trial, Truman rewarded the government prosecutor (McGohey) with a judgeship.

Although actual sentencing of the eleven had not taken place at this writing and appeals against the verdict will undoubtedly be carried to the Supreme Court, it appeared that the Department of Justice had won a major victory in its long campaign to make membership in a party designated as "subversive" automatic proof of criminal activity.

This impression prevailed in legal circles despite the assertion by Judge Medina in his jury charge that a verdict of guilty would not mean the outlawing of the Communist Party.

The jury was not permitted to consider the legality of the Smith Act

—the statute under which the trial was conducted and which places "advocacy" on the same plane as "overt acts"—but were warned by Judge Medina that "that was a matter of law" and not for mere mortals to discuss. The judge, however, in his charge supported the constitutionality of the Smith Act wholeheartedly, backing up every contention of the prosecution.

The only previous time the Smith Act was tested was in the case of the Minneapolis trial of 18 members of the Socialist Workers Party. Convictions in that case were upheld by the U. S. Circuit Court, and the Supreme Court three times refused a review.

HOW IT STARTED

The indictment against the twelve CP leaders—including William Z. Foster, whose trial was postponed because of illness—was handed down in the summer of 1948. At that moment the "cold war" between the U. S. and Russia was at its height and the Democratic Party was in the middle of an election campaign.

The "Communist problem" had been whipped up to major proportions—two Republican nominees for the presidency debated the question of how to handle the menace—and this trial was to be the "definitive answer" on how to handle "reds" in a democracy.

The American CP was in a particularly vulnerable position at the time. Abroad the Stalinist regime was consolidating its stranglehold on the nations brought under its orbit by a series of ironhanded repressions, frameup trials against all shades of opposition and coups that abandoned any pretense of coalition governments.

Against this background—Stalinism at its lowest ebb in public support, a vengeful Administration and with anti-red hysteria sedulously cultivated for months—the government seemed able to make any charge stick against the CP.

The Department of Justice, however, resorted to the Smith Act in bringing the trial. This law, passed by a Congress under the patriotic fervor of an impending war, is deliberately designed to circumvent precedents set down by the Supreme Court in other civil liberties cases. It has been a cornerstone of the Constitution that in order for a government to deal with a hostile opposition an overt act of subversion must be proved, or a "clear and present danger" of an overt act demonstrated.

Under the Smith Act, a conspiracy "to advocate or teach" such doctrines is equally criminal. Prosecution under this law, which has been condemned by almost all persons and organizations concerned with democratic rights, brought the Stalinists support from sources which themselves view the CP's record of totalitarianism with deep abhorrence.

STOOLPIGEONS VS. HACKS

In presenting the prosecution's case, U. S. Attorney John F. X. McGohey and his four special assistants relied primarily on the testimony of Louis Budenz, former Daily Worker managing editor, who chucked his job for another at a Catholic university. Budenz's story of the party and his particular interpretation of Stalinist theory, told previously in a book and from numerous lecture platforms, became the key to the government case.

Buttressing Budenz's testimony, the government led a parade of ex-CPers to the stand. Most were FBI stool-pigeons planted in the CP. Others were once genuine members of the party now, for one reason or another, turned professional witnesses. They appear in deportation cases and the like, putting the finger on whoever is in the dock, and then return to some petty civil-service job provided as their compensation.

The defense, for its part, suffered under a number of handicaps, some of which were of its own making. First, the defendants themselves, the CP political bureau set up after the party purge of Browder and those suspected of still supporting him, were mostly a collection of nonentities, politically speaking. Foster, the only one with a history and tradition in the political movement, did not stand trial. The others are for the most part party hacks who made their way to the top through complete subservience and the decapitation of their betters. Only Jack Stachel had been around long enough in a leading political capacity to speak with authority and he did not take the stand.

Secondly, the defense attorneys adopted a strategy of delay that gave unmistakable evidence of an unwillingness on the part of the CP to boldly present its political stand and to fight for it in the court. Such discretion may be the better part of valor as far as Stalinism is concerned but it made this case have little in common with the great civil liberties fights of the past.

NOT ON POLITICAL PLANE

For example, the opening fight against the blue-ribbon jury system, a wholly justified condemnation of an undemocratic process, was eventually transformed into a time-con-

suming bickering and complete shift of emphasis from the trial itself to its methods.

Again, the baiting of Judge Medina became an evident attempt to cause a mistrial rather than a vigorous defense of the rights of the defendants.

Their unwillingness—and perhaps inability—to lift the defense to a political plane showed in the failure to call all of the defendants to the stand. In this connection, the CP defense was always torn between the desire to appear as persecuted radicals and the equal desire to utilize the super-patriotic record of the Stalinists during the war. Again and again the defense sought refuge in its record on which for a Marxist must be peripheral issues—the questions of racial equality, struggle for rent control, schools, etc., etc.

If the tradition of struggle for civil liberties has little to gain from the conduct and defense of the CP in this trial, the oft-bemirched banner of capitalist democracy is being trailed once again in the mire. Another conviction has been obtained under the notorious Smith Act, another legal plank has been nailed on the coffin of free speech and free political activity.

As mentioned above, Judge Medina was careful to state in his charge that the trial was not directed against the Communist Party, that conviction of the defendants did not mean the outlawing of the CP. An amazing bit of legal mumbo-jumbo, this statement is an obvious contradiction of reality.

Not only does the decision of the jury place every member of the CP in jeopardy, but it places under direct threat of criminal proceedings the member of any political party, group or tendency which may incur the disfavor of the reigning administration.

This is the victory for "democracy" that was hailed throughout the country when the jury brought in its verdict of guilty against the eleven defendants.

Lewis Asks Joint Fund - -

(Continued from page 1)

three men, he did nothing to implement it. What was wrong?

In the first place, Lewis' method of procedure was highly questionable. Normal procedure would have been to call an inter-organization conference on the question of support for strikers, at which conference discussions could take place and a plan could be worked out. Lewis' high-handed "I propose" and "I suggest" could arouse nothing but resentment. Furthermore, his bursting into the press with his letter almost before Green had a chance to read it, let alone answer it, afforded good ground for AFL and CIO officials to characterize his proposal as nothing but "a grandstand play."

The fact that Lewis referred only to the steel workers aroused his own miners. One local sent a telegram to Lewis along the lines that "a kitty should be raised to alleviate poverty in the mining fields first" and "charity begins at home." Commentators of every stripe took the occasion to accuse Lewis of not really having the interest of strikers at heart at all but of posing as the distributor of largesse to his weaker brethren.

Again, Lewis must know very well that no union, however rich, will agree to part with a quarter of a million each week. Furthermore, the idea of calling on only the ten richest internationals is entirely unwarranted. Strike support can and must come from all unions, big and little, rich and not rich, according to their ability and willingness. This is how strike support is organized.

Finally, if Lewis was serious, why did he make his contribution contingent on the others? Why wasn't he the one to set the example?

GREEN SAYS NO

William Green, on his part, was only too eager to find purely formalistic reasons for rejecting the Lewis proposal. He wanted to know, for instance, if Murray had asked for aid for the steel workers? Another limping objection Green made is that the AFL unions are autonomous and would have to determine for themselves whether to disburse money as suggested. (There is no reason why

the unions for their autonomous and he could not submit the matter to democratic decision.)

Green seemed to emphasize that the establishment of organic unity within the ranks of labor is a basic primary requirement for united strike action; that any combination of labor's resource "while divided as it is today, is impossible and impracticable." This is an obvious evasion of the question of unity. For if unity is desirable, then united actions in strikes are desirable not only in themselves but as steps toward more complete unity. But Green says in effect: "We are not united. Let us stay that way."

Although Lewis addressed no communication to Philip Murray, the latter correctly took the opportunity to make a statement in the form of a press release. As indicated above, his position is the most constructive of the three.

He disregarded Lewis' proposal that steel workers be the sole recipients of aid and came out for the pooling of resources "for the common defense," thus slapping down the rich relative attitude struck by Lewis. Most significant is the general principle for labor unity which he formulated:

"As president of the CIO and the United Steel Workers of America I have consistently advocated unity of action on the part of all responsible and genuine American trade unions. It has been my hope and conviction that such unity of action in the political, legislative and economic fields will lead eventually to that organic unity which is vital for American labor to defend itself against its powerful political and economic enemies."

Such words deserve hearty approval, but Murray did not try to give them substance by calling for an inter-organizational conference to make today's strikes really the fight of all labor. And since the issues of the current strikes are as much political as economic, the agenda for such a conference would have had to include the question of an independent party of labor, the only real expression of labor's political unity against its enemies.

The Lewis proposal brought into the limelight the importance and the meaning of labor solidarity and labor unity. Lewis seems to have played around with it, Green to have run away from it, Murray to have left it an abstraction. Now, it appears, the rank and file of the great labor organizations make it a reality.

Logic

Upton Sinclair, in the N. Y. Post, September 27, retails a political lesson of which he says: "It took me 30 years to learn that lesson; you have learned it in about 30 seconds." Here it is:

"I ran for Congress on the Socialist ticket in 1906, and then in California for Congress once, and for the U. S. Senate twice, and for governor twice. The most votes I ever got was 60,000. Then I tried the Democratic Party, with a program I called 'EPIC'—End Poverty in California, and got 879,000 votes. From all my experiments I have learned one useful lesson, that third parties are no go in the good old USA."

Since he couldn't get elected on the slate of the Socialist Party—which is not a "third party" as that term is usually used—Sinclair concluded third parties are no go; and since he couldn't get elected even on the Democratic ticket, he concluded that that was just the thing to do, since at least he got more votes to solace defeat. All of which proves conclusively that the trade-union movement should not organize its own labor party—it's better to get wiped up with the Democratic label on you. Kind of makes you feel better, or something.

Fog Over Progress

"The secrecy surrounding the development of the atomic bomb has 'spread like a fog' over all sorts of unrelated subjects, with the result 'that many developments are kept secret that might have led to major advances elsewhere in American industry,' according to Prof. Robert F. Bacher, former scientific member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission."—N. Y. Times, October 6.

A Lesson in 'Objective Reporting'

Russell Porter, who covered the CP trial for the New York Times with an "impartiality" that can only be matched by Westbrook Pegler discussing a trade-union problem, had this to say about the reaction of the CP's defense attorneys when they were sentenced for contempt of court: "Each of defense counsel then protested, against the sentences. Most of them shouted angrily at the judge, denouncing him and attacking him with the same charges and in the same manner that had caused him to adjudge them in contempt."

Sitting in the same courtroom

and covering the same story for the same paper was Meyer Berger, who wrote:

"Then each of the lawyers spoke in his own behalf. Sacher in rich, vibrant tone; Isserman quietly and then with some show of legalistic heat. Gladstone's voice was restrained. McCabe's too. Dennis sounded bitter and defiant. When George W. Crockett Jr. spoke, his voice was softest of all. It could not be heard many feet away. Judge Medina ceased momentarily in his endless rocking and leaned slightly forward, making finger bridges the while."

A Blow at Democracy, A Gift to Kremlin - -

(Continued from page 1)

lowers to "concentrate" their activities among workers in the basic industries—steel, railroads, automobiles and the like. If such evidence were presented against the Stalinists, or any other political organization, in a trial in countries like, let us say, England or France, the whole population would be splitting its sides with laughter, which would not subside even after the prosecutor had been run out of public life. The same kind of evidence could easily be found to hang half a dozen socialist organizations in this country, and even many non-socialist labor organizations.

We cannot speak for all of them, but we can speak for the Independent Socialist League. And we call the attention of the prosecutor to the fact that the League concentrates its main attention upon recruiting and popularizing its views among the workers of this country, among the Negroes, among the most exploited and oppressed, and not among the members of the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the bankers and bosses of General Motors, DuPont, U. S. Steel. Is that surprising?

IT IS NOT THEY WHO CAN FIGHT STALINISM!

The prosecution of the Stalinists was and remains a piece of political hypocrisy, of political vindictiveness. The U. S. government worked hand in glove with the Stalinist party during the war. The President of the United States did not even hesitate to use the Stalinists—and with such glee, too!—to help him gag and subdue the labor movement. As for the collaboration between the government and the Russian owners of the Stalinist party—that is too notorious to need comment here. Now that the two governments are in conflict, Washington has undertaken a purely police action, conceived by a police mind, against the American Stalinists who remain, fundamentally, what they were during the war and before it; who believe and advocate, fundamentally, what they believed and advocated during the war and before it. The only difference is this: during the war, the Stalinists were sub-leased by Moscow to the service of Washington; now the lease has been broken.

The American capitalist class knows no better way of dealing with the social and political problem of Stalinism than with police methods. What stupidity! What impotence! What a revealing sign of panic-mindedness!

If Stalinism is no danger to this great citadel of capitalism, why don't the government so jittery? If it is a danger, if it progresses with its "concentration" upon the workers in the basic industries, why don't the representatives of American capitalism also "concentrate" there and show the workers how much superior to Stalinism they are in every social and political respect? Why don't they fight this political movement politically—instead of with the end of a nightstick, the way a cop fights the social problem of prostitution or juvenile delinquency? Is it because it can't—even in the United States?

The trial and conviction, including the utterly stupid sentencing of the defense attorneys, is a free gift to Stalinism. Only a provincial American politician, with his head boxed in by impermeable metal, can fail to see this. Perhaps not in the United States, or not to the same degree as in the United States, but in virtually every other country of the world the Stalinists will have a Roman holiday in their propaganda against the rival of Russian imperialism—American imperialism. There is not a single democratic or half-democratic country in the world where people, including the mass of anti-Stalinists, can be convinced of the democracy or justice in prosecuting and imprisoning Stalinists for advocating their beliefs—not one! There is not a single democratic or half-democratic country in the world where Stalinists run such a risk for advocating their beliefs—not one!

The American ruling class, its government and its courts, have given international Stalinism a new weapon. Messrs. Smith, Truman, Clark, McGohey and Medina may congratulate each other on their high degree of political cleverness. As for ourselves, we expected nothing more intelligent from our reactionary and bankrupt ruling class. We do not call upon it to fight Stalinism, we do not expect it to fight Stalinism in any way that would contribute to social progress, to the maintenance and expansion of democratic rights. The trial of the Stalinists is only the latest proof of its incapacity.

SMASH THE SMITH ACT—TO DEFEND DEMOCRACY!

It goes without saying that we do not have the slightest solidarity or sympathy with the Stalinist leaders, and it is not they who are our concern. We know these gentlemen for what they really are.

We have not forgotten how these hounds bayed for the blood of the Minneapolis defendants who were tried in 1941 under the same Smith Act. We have not forgotten how they clamored their approval of the countless blood-baths, their Russian masters organized and still organize against working-class and revolutionary critics and opponents of the Moscow tyranny. We know these professional exploiters of the labor movement, who are in it but not of it. We know that the life and progress of the working class and of socialism depends in large measure upon the death and destruction of Stalinist totalitarianism.

But that does not and cannot mean that we turn over the job of crushing Stalinism to the capitalist class, to its police agents and its police methods, or that we approve turning it over to them. The basis on which they deal with Stalinism, the way they deal with it—are a menace to the working class, its movement, its interests and hopes. And those are things we are concerned with.

In complete independence of the Stalinists and in opposition to them, it is the duty of every supporter of the working-class movement, of every socialist, even of every democrat who is not in the labor movement, to combat all that is so clearly reactionary in the prosecution of the Stalinists, all that is so clearly directed against our democratic rights, above all against the very basis of the prosecution—the infamous Smith Act.

CP Unions Ready to Split - -

(Continued from page 1)

threatens to throw out the CP apparatus.

These rank-and-file insurrections convinced the Stalinists to use any and every method to hold on to their remaining unions. They faced little splits every year, every month, as their bureaucratic methods forced local after local out of their unions, even out of the CIO. Locals in the Public Workers Union, in the Office Workers Union in the UE, in the FE, left voluntarily or were speeded out with kicks.

But so long as they enjoyed the "autonomous" right to bureaucratism and to carrying out Russian foreign policy a general split policy was unthinkable. Today, however, the Stalinists face not only insurrection from within but the open hostility of the top leadership of the CIO, headed by Murray himself. A split therefore becomes inevitable.

During the war, Stalinism in the CIO enjoyed the protection of Philip Murray. As long as it followed the orthodox no-strike policy, pounded the drums for the Democratic Party and for the war, and respected the War Labor Board, Murray overlooked its crimes against the labor movement; he ignored its authoritarian regime, its expulsion of critics, its incentive-pay policies; its housing of all militants.

He allowed it the autonomous right of totalitarianism in its own bailiwicks. Murray and the Stalinists formed a bureaucratic alliance, which strengthened the hold of the Communist Party and made the task of anti-Stalinists more onerous.

Singer Workers Retreat After Long Strike; CP Local Leaders Blamed

By A. WINTERS

ELIZABETH, Oct. 16—The workers of the struck Singer plant voted today to accept a contract which just barely kept last year's terms plus a few improvements.

The basic demand, the elimination of the incentive system, was lost. Lost also was the right of the union to have a voice in determining norms under the standards system (speed-up). Incentive workers received no increases. The majority of day workers in labor grades 7, 8, 9 and 10 received two cents an hour more. Other semi-skilled and skilled workers (a small group) received from three to six cents an hour. Plant-wide seniority was lowered from seven years to five, and workers received three weeks' vacation after 15 years instead of after 20.

The sentiment for acceptance was overwhelming and very little discussion around the demands themselves took place. This was very convenient for the Stalinist leadership of the United Electrical Workers local, since a real discussion would have revealed

In the UE, Murray called off James Carey, his right-hand man, who was elevated into the secretary-treasurehip of the CIO. Carey, former president of the UE, had been leader of the anti-Stalinist opposition. He withdrew from UE affairs and the opposition carried on without him.

Murray was satisfied that he had domesticated Stalinism to serve the top CIO officialdom. But as wartime fraternities between the United States and Russia chilled into cold war, as Russian diplomats hurled invectives at American delegates on the floor of the United Nations, the Stalinists belittled insults at the CIO leadership. At the order of the Kremlin ringmaster, the trained seals somersaulted.

With his great prestige, it would have been a simple matter for Murray to call on the rank and file of the CP-dominated unions to organize caucuses to throw out the Stalinist leadership. But no! At the UE convention less than two months ago, he withheld open material and moral support to UE oppositionists even though he himself was already moving against the Reutherites in the UAW while the Steel Workers Union in Michigan ran joint staves with the

CP against anti-Stalinists.

In faction fights within their own unions, anti-Stalinists would gain confidence, ability and independence in battle against the bureaucratic CP machine. The membership would be aroused. In a general atmosphere of rank-and-file activity, a new critical, democratic breeze would air out

the CIO. But Murray has no taste for such a fight; the habit of ousting leaders might continue; but not Stalinist bureaucratism; not bureaucracy in general might be weakened.

THE DANGER FROM MURRAY

Yesterday: an alliance with the CP without regard for the rank and file. Today: a fight against the CP without mobilizing the membership. The method: a new undemocratic principle of super-centralized union organization. The Stalinists are to be driven out by a wave of the pen. It is decreed that all international unions must carry out CIO political policy or get out. The CP is not waiting for the execution of the new device; it is already preparing the split.

But the new organizational concept remains. It sets a precedent for quelling all critics and undermines the leading role of such genuine left-wing unions as the UAW which has often blazed the trail for the American labor movement without regard for "official" policy. Tomorrow the UAW will find it necessary to break ground for a new political policy, for the formation of a new independent labor party; and it will hit against the hard

rock of an undemocratic political centralism.

What is an obstacle to the labor movement proves to be an advantage to the Communist Party. At the head of its parade, this American representative of brutal, murderous, Russian totalitarianism raises the banner of "autonomy" and "democracy." Stalinism is indeed the most dictatorial and bureaucratic tendency in the labor movement. It seeks the "autonomous" and "democratic" right to impose the Kremlin line upon its union membership. The first task of any militant in a CP-dominated union is to win autonomy—autonomy from Russian imperialism.

Far better than Murray's method, with far more lasting benefits to the labor movement, would be the democratic struggle of the rank and file against Stalinism, a method which served the UAW so well.

The coming split in the CIO will witness splits in CP-controlled international, jurisdictional fights, NLRB elections, faction fights. While condemning Murray's new formula of undemocratic centralization, every union activist must unhesitatingly take the side of the CIO and rally every union member against Stalinism.

Farm Equipment - UE Merger Set; Casts Light on CP Plans in CIO

By KEN HILLYER

The Farm Equipment Workers Union (CIO) will merge with the United Electrical Workers (CIO) before the national convention of the CIO scheduled to take place in Cleveland on October 31. This, it appears, is certain because the International Executive Board of the FE has voted acceptance of the merger proposal of UE and has submitted it to a membership referendum.

The FE represents a majority of the organized workers of the International Harvester Company (26,000) although the United Auto Workers (CIO) has a sizable bargaining group (17,000). The FE also has one plant of the Borg-Warner chain, which is organized overwhelmingly by the UAW and is serviced by a national Borg-Warner department of the UAW. Other than in these two companies, FE has no strength at all.

In the two companies cited above, UE has nothing. If the question is unity to increase the workers' strength, the natural unification would be with the UAW.

MOVE TOWARD SPLIT

The background fact is that the FE leaders decided that their contracts needed the backing of a larger union; and the UE, as the third largest CIO union, could provide the needed strength. But that would also be provided by the UAW, the second largest CIO union. The FE has decided to go

to the UE rather than to the UAW solely and simply because the UE is, like itself, run by the Communist Party force.

Why this hasty move right at this moment? The CIO executive board has recommended the lifting of the FE's charter, since it refuses to recognize the 1948 CIO convention resolution to merge with the UAW. The Stalinists, maneuvering both the FE and the UE according to their plans, want to force the hand of Murray and the CIO, thus precipitating the split. Presumably, they hope to yell afterward that they are for "unity" and that the CIO is persecuting them without cause.

The terms for the FE-UE merger, provide for retaining the Farm Equipment setup intact, but the rest of the provisions are not known. The quickie referendum that has been arranged is, of course, a farce. The Stalinist leadership, which has screamed hysterically about "ultimatums," and "you don't give a guy time to think about it," is rushing the question to a membership referendum, with no discussion possible.

The only unit which seems opposed to the setup is the Auburn (N. Y.) local at International Harvester. They revealed that the executive board voted for merger as the first step toward the setting up of a third national labor federation (Stalinist). Grant Oakes, FE president, denies this, but it seems to be in the cards.