

Stalinist Scheme Is Not a Labor Party!

Wallace and the Third Party

By IRVING HOWE

The most important domestic political event of the past week and perhaps of the entire recent period was the announcement by the PCA (Progressive Citizens of America) that it would enter Henry Wallace as a presidential candidate on a third party ticket. The PCA is an organization based on cooperation between the Stalinists, who in most localities provide its mass base, and an assortment of "fellow-traveling" liberals who have supported the Stalinist position on foreign policy.

At the time of writing, no word has yet come from Wallace himself: will he accept or decline the nomination? Since Wallace, however, is hardly a stranger to PCA affairs, he no doubt knew in advance of his nomination and consented to its being made.

PCA LEADERSHIP SPLITS

A rash of political developments and speculations followed the PCA announcement. Among the more important were:

1) There was a split in the leadership of the PCA itself. PCA Co-Chairman Frank Kingdon, Vice-Chairman Bartley Crum and National Board Member Albert Deutsch resigned from the organization. New York State PCA Chairman Raymond Walsh expressed his disapproval of the Wallace candidacy but has not yet quit the PCA. No doubt other liberal hangers-on of the PCA will drop out; many will find it a convenient pretext for breaking their increasingly inconvenient tie with the Stalinists. The result will be that the PCA will become even more than ever before a Stalinist creature. Wherever they control the outfit, the usual Russian-style resolutions of "enthusiasm" for Wallace were passed; thus, one was announced for the Southern California PCA by its executive Secretary, Bert Witt, long known as a leader of the Stalinist movement in New York City.

2) Another direct consequence of the PCA move was the implied threat of a split in the also Stalinist-controlled American Labor Party in New York State. The largest non-Stalinist union in the ALP, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, denounced Wallace's move and strongly implied that if the third party plan became reality it would quit the ALP. No doubt, in such an eventuality, a number of other non-Stalinist unions would quit the ALP—the textile, steel and auto workers' locals that adhere to it. This would also leave the Stalinists counting their own noses in the ALP.

3) The great majority of union leaders who commented on Wallace's proposed candidacy rejected it: Most vehement of those who did was Walter Reuther, UAW president, who denounced Wallace's pro-Russian policy. A. F. Whitney, head of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, rejected Wallace's candidacy but has not yet announced whether he would quit PCA.

4) Many of the Congressional "liberals" who generally agreed with Wallace's point of view rejected the third party candidacy. Even as pro-Russian politician as Senator Claude Pepper opposed the PCA move.

5) The only political group that enthusiastically whooped it up for Wallace was the Stalinist party. A series of "people's delegations," composed of all the well-worn figures who adorn various Stalinist front lists, visited Henry to tell him how much they wanted him. Henry said nothing for publication.

What did the whole situation add up to? First of all, there was the question whether Wallace would actually go through with the third party candidacy. Was he serious or was this just a maneuver calculated to pressure the Democratic Party into a more conciliatory attitude? At the moment, no one could say for certain, but it did seem as if Wallace had increased his bargaining position with regard to the Democratic Party. For, though he had no chance of getting elected, his candidacy would deprive Truman of enough votes in central industrial states—California, Michigan, Illinois, New York—to insure the election of a Republican candidate.

If, then, Wallace was merely trying to put the Democratic Party over the barrel by threatening it with a defection that would probably be fatal to its chances of electoral victory, there arose the next question: exactly what COULD the Democratic Party offer him as a satisfactory concession? The basic point of difference between Truman and Wallace—foreign policy—is so fundamental that no genuine compromise is possible. It therefore seems that if

(Continued in editorial column, page 3)

Congress Anti-Inflation Bill Mocks the People's Needs!

Let's Get Going!



Leaves Price Solution to Big Business

By SUSAN GREEN

Once again "the representatives of the people" have insulted the people's intelligence and mocked at their needs. In record time and with ample majorities both houses of Congress have passed what is euphemistically called an "anti-inflation" bill which, however, does nothing, absolutely nothing, about the cost of living, which is daily climbing higher.

This slap in the face has been delivered to the people by both political parties. While the measure was introduced by the Republicans and supported by them, it was voted also by the majority of Democrats in both houses. In the Senate, the vote was 77 for and 19 against, with 45 Republicans and 32 Democrats in favor. In the House the bill got 281 yes votes and 73 no votes; 178 Republicans and 102 Democrats were for, 29 Republicans and 44 Democrats were against. In other words, the fake anti-inflation bill is an empty Christmas package for the people from both parties.

After scattered and half-hearted efforts to amend the GOP bill, the Democrats approved it as "better than nothing." It is predicted in Washington that President Truman will sign this bill which is even more evasive than his own ten-point program, on the same ground that the Congressional bill is "better than nothing." Logicians have yet to prove how nothing can be better than nothing—and this bill is nothing!

"VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS"
The crux of this legislation is that "scarce materials" may be channeled "into essential uses" by VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS between business, industry and agriculture. The President had asked that allocation and priority powers be given to him—a bad enough solution since OPA has shown us what happens to government controls in the hands of politicians pressured by business. But the measure passed by Congress is even worse. It leaves the solution in the hands of business itself, which in large measure is responsible for the intensity of the problem.

For instance, steel is a scarce material and its scarcity is felt in the entire economic structure. Yet the steel corporations consistently and persistently refuse to expand production facilities to fill the gap. Apparently they like the scarcity—with scarcity prices and scarcity profits. Furthermore, by "voluntary agreement" steel is right now being channeled into and through the black market. The Congressional bill puts it up to these "cooperating" elements to solve the problem by voluntary agreement.

Or take the case of meat. Warnings have been coming to us that by spring there will be a real shortage with corresponding price boosts. The prices of meat should be rolled back and fixed at reasonable levels, and the supply be rationed. The Congressional bill with touching trust in the meat interests whose unheard of profits come from high prices, simply permits "voluntary agreements" to "channel scarce materials." Not a word for price roll-back, not a word for price fixing, not a word for real rationing.

(Continued on page 3)

Truman Presents \$17 Billion Program For Europe Control

The long-awaited presentation to Congress of the proposed European Recovery Program, better known as the Marshall Plan, has finally come. In a lengthy document addressed to Congress at the closing sessions of the special Congressional assembly, President Truman has put down on paper the major aspects of his program, so far as the European side of it is concerned.

The European Recovery Program (ERP) as set forth by the Administration, calls for a long-range aid

program which will expend the sum of \$17 billion over four years, with close to \$7 billion to be spent the first year—that is, 1948. In addition, the proposed administration of this huge sum of money and goods is to be delegated to various committees and officials under the control of the State Department and the President. Further details provide for the quantity and type of aid to be shipped overseas.

Thus, the most gigantic scheme ever devised by one nation for an

extension of its economic and social power over virtually an entire continent—with the exception of those countries directly under Stalinist Russia's domination in Eastern Europe—has become a reality. The debate in Congress, to commence at the next regular session, promises to be long, violent and among the most significant in recent years. The Republican majority has already indicated its objection to many features (particularly the expenditure of such huge sums of money), and will no doubt press for many revisions and additional qualifications to be attached to the measure. The full significance of ERP will unfold during the course of the debates and discussions. LABOR ACTION will follow this debate with close interest and intends to further clarify its position on the problem at that time.

Meanwhile, it is clear that the New Year of 1948 finds America entering what can only be described as a new period in its history—the period in which American imperialism, the most powerful which the world has ever seen—will seek to draw itself up to its full heights and establish nothing less than its full mastery over the entire world.

IMPERIALIST PLAN CARRIES HIS NAME



SEC. OF STATE MARSHALL

New Jersey CIO Jolts Influence of Stalinists

By STEVE VETRANO

NEWARK—A resounding blow was struck against Stalinist influence at the New Jersey State CIO Convention held in Trenton on Dec. 7, 1947. So severe was the blow that the professional Communist Party unity shouters rushed headlong from the convention and are now organizing a split.

They were badly jarred by a resolution whose unnecessary Red-baiting sections revealed the immaturity and weakness of its proponents but nonetheless correctly concluded that the presence of the Stalinists "within the Council of the CIO is not representative of the feelings and sentiments of the membership majority" and called upon all LOCAL UNION affiliates to "defeat" any members of the Communist Party and fascist adherents seeking election to office.

Those who wrote the resolution, instead of resorting to red-baiting, needed only to list the foul deeds committed by the Stalinists in the unions during the past five years in order to have indicted them. The fact that they didn't tell a story of its own. Some of them were as guilty as the Stalinists in weakening the trade union movement by devices such as Labor-Management Committees, advocacy of the No-Strike Pledge, the War Labor Board, and the introduction of wage incentive "speed up" plans.

The reality of the anti-CP and anti-fascist resolution registered quickly upon the Stalinists. To report back to their membership this resolution advising their own defeat the Stalinists would be wheeling in a Trojan Horse against themselves. They needed a dramatic incident around which to rally their membership. And they got it, inadvertently delivered by those who had just scored so tellingly against them.

The Majority of the Nominations Committee breaking with tradition,

refused to accept the United Electrical and Radio Workers Unions caucus nomination of James McLeish, President of District 4, UE, for the third vice-presidency. He was subsequently defeated in the convention floor on a roll call vote, 964 to 139. Elected instead was Ernest Polak, a UE delegate from Newark.

STALINISTS IN FRENZY

The UE Stalinized delegates were stirred to a frenzy which brought their floor leader Ruth Young to the microphone with an angry threat. "UE represents 25 per cent of the per capita membership of the State CIO. We're not going to stand by and have a few guys who don't represent a corporal's guard in our union speak for us. The entire UE delegation is leaving." However, delegates from Locals 103 Camden, 412 Bloomfield and 456 Jersey City did not leave the convention. Seventy-nine UE delegates plus several delegates from other Stalinist-dominated union locals such as UO&PWA & MMSWU walked out. A sad side light of this affair was that the SWP-UE delegates joined in the Stalinist walk.

The issue is now back in the locals with Stalinists reporting only the McLeish affair to the membership and urging disaffiliation from the N. J. State CIO Council under the excuse of taxation without proper representation.

It is an urgent task of every militant and progressive member of UE to demand that a full convention report be made to the membership of each local. They must fight against disaffiliation, to preserve the unity of the State CIO. They must insist that the central issue be discussed before the membership, namely, the advice of the State CIO Convention to defeat any members of the Communist Party and fascist parties seeking election to union office.

Pauley Speculations Shed Light on Grain Profiteering

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Do you:
Beat your mother?
Push blind people off curbs?
Take candy from children?
Are you:
A confessed scoundrel?
A speculator on the stock market?
A receiver of bribes?
If you behave in the foregoing fashion, or if you are a person of the type listed, don't be discouraged. The possibility of a dazzling career lies before you. You are probably ideally suited for a high government job—preferably one connected with the armed forces. For the only conclusion which can be drawn from the governmental investigations of recent months is that the political and administrative structure is wormeaten with corruption.

Out of the state woodwork in recent months have come crawling many things unknown to zoology. There was Representative Andrew C. May, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, who, it seems, found earning a moderately honest living as a Congressman too much of a moral strain. He tried more creative, but—alas!—more criminal methods. Then there was Maj. Gen. Bennet E. Meyers, second in command of air corps procurement during the war, who neatly compounded bribery, adultery, lying, graft, bulldozing, military rank, and a dash of what looks suspiciously like stupidity, into six-figure profits.

Thanks to that four-year cycle of ethical regeneration that precedes national elections we victims of capitalist politics are able to apply the magnifying glass to another specimen.

It's name is Edwin W. Pauley, and it is (ho-hum!) special assistant to the secretary of the army.

PRETTY PAULEY!

Pauley's job, according to an army spokesman, was a "temporary assignment to assist the secretary in connection with reorganization of overall procurement and industrial mobilization due to unification of the armed services." It was in this same field of military procurement, you patient readers will remember, that Maj. Gen. Meyers made his lush haul. With the briefest knowledge of Pauley's background it would be difficult for any person above the age of three, including the average professor of economics, to see wherein lies Pauley's superiority over Meyers. Who is this guardian of the nation's strength and honor? What is the Lincoln-like saga of his rise to power by hard work and selfless devotion to the public welfare?

Pauley is a millionaire oil man, not merely just another poor public servant. He has other and bigger fish to fry in the army than holding on to his miserable \$10,000 a year job. He was formerly treasurer of the Democratic Party. His function in that capacity was to shake down individual capitalists for support of the Democratic Party, a great deal of whose expenses go into convincing labor that the Democratic Party is the party of the workingman.

Pauley first came into prominence in 1946 when his crony Truman, that human square root of a minus one—and a beneficiary of Pauley's party financing—tried to lever him into the undersecretaryship of the navy. This little project was given the heave-ho largely through the efforts of Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, who charged, as the Herald Tribune points out, "that Mr. Pauley had offered him \$300,000 in campaign contributions in return for withdrawing a government suit to secure title to tide-lands oil deposits. Mr. Ickes

resigned from the Cabinet in the dispute with Mr. Truman over the Pauley nomination." Persons who remember the Teapot Dome scandal of the 'twenties will understand the interest of the oil tycoons in naval oil reserves and in fuel procurement. Pauley's desire to get his hands on the navy undersecretaryship was founded on something less than idealism or that oceanic feeling conveyed by the sight of the sea.

Failing to gain access to those profits apportioned with government oil, Pauley last summer tried the second-best thing—to secure an appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Army. Failing to secure Republican support, this project was shelved before it came up for public ratification in the Senate. Bravely struggling to get his feet in the trough, Pauley finally succeeded in snagging a post as "special assistant" to the Secretary of the Army.

Then he got presumably down to business.

(Continued on page 2)

Philadelphia Living Costs Highest of 32 U. S. Cities

PHILADELPHIA—Since the end of the war, the cost of living for a family of four in Philadelphia has risen by \$52. That much more is needed than two years ago to maintain a "modest" standard of living, as revealed by a federal survey released this week.

In March, 1946, it cost \$2,681, or about \$5 a week, just to provide the minimum necessities for a family with one working head, two children and a wife spending full time on ways and means of cutting corners and saving pennies.

In December, 1947, you must earn

\$62 every week to keep the family going. This does not provide for loss of a single day, whether for illness or because the boss doesn't pay for Christmas.

The cost of living in Philadelphia is the highest of all the 32 cities covered in the survey. It costs this family \$235 more for food than two years ago, \$56 more for clothing and \$20 more for utilities. But the largest single relative increase is the rake-off taken by the government itself. The Philadelphia family is paying \$95 more in taxes in spite of loss of wartime overtime and the coming of "peace."

Do You Beat Your Mother?—If So, Government May Need You

Charges Shed Light on Grain Profiteering --

(Continued from page 1)

Of what is Pauley accused? He is accused of having profited from market speculation based upon inside knowledge of army purchasing plans. This Pauley denies, stating that he released his holdings upon assuming his position. In point of fact, however, after a little prodding, despite previous statements that he had dumped his holdings in wheat, corn, oats, cotton-seed oil, lard and hides at a loss of \$100,000 after becoming the special assistant, Pauley himself recalled that he had bought 50,000 bushels of grain after getting the job. This grain, he dead-panned, was to be used as a

bonus for his employees. This sounds like a misplaced line from the script of Meyers, another adept at dropping the blame in the laps of less favored people.

The press has pointed out, for instance, that Pauley "carried on speculative trading while he was United States representative on the Allied Reparations Commission. He held that post with rank of ambassador from April, 1945, to March 1947." But this is not of primary interest to us. Any reader of LABOR ACTION possesses the necessary political insight into the economic consequences of the Marshall Plan as to be able to make

a modest killing on the market without inside information—provided, of course, that he has the necessary hundreds of thousands of dollars to play with and a withered moral sense like Pauley's.

What is a little more interesting is the process by which a character like Pauley, without the slightest expenditure of labor, can corner 500,000 bushels of grain, 300,000 pounds of cotton-seed oil, and 500,000 pounds of lard, thereby helping to create a shortage and higher prices at home, and reducing the amount of food that the starving peoples of Europe can have made available—all to guarantee what is known as a "substantial profit" to this scoundrel.

Pauley's little operation is perfectly legitimate under capitalism, as he was not slow to point out: "The transactions I have had on commodities are legal transactions and if Congress does not believe that that method of doing business is legal and proper, it is within their power to change that way of doing business." The grammar may be shaky but the logic is solid.

Stassen's reply that "Pauley's statement that he does not consider these dealings to be subject to censure indicates in my opinion that his sense of right is not fully developed and he should not be in high public office" is a little hasty. Let the brash Stassen start his campaign to reform the stock market by establishing the difference between legal and illegal operations. That will be a feat which will make the metaphysical disputes of the theologians of the middle ages seem the height of rationality.

DR. PAULEY PRESCRIBES

For all his legalistic bluster, however, Pauley was a little shaky as to the appeal of his trapeze act. He therefore tried another tack. The real reason for his speculations, the press records him as saying, was that "he decided to protect himself and his family against inflation by purchasing commodities. . . ." This statement undoubtedly wins Pauley the LABOR ACTION Crying Towel for 1947, awarded annually to the most needy capitalist brought to our attention.

Being of a philanthropic bent Pauley did not confine the applicability of his action to himself. "I think," he warbled, happy over his new find, "every citizen should protect himself against the continued inflation by acquiring commodities that will increase in value as his dollars decrease in value." What can a rational person say?

Listen to the scoundrel: "If the purchase of grain creates human misery, then my selling of grain relieves human misery. I did both. Over all, I made a profit. I went into this business to make a profit and I have done pretty well."

Senator Homer Ferguson made a fair translation of this cant into Eng-

lish: "...you are of the opinion that those people with money should go out and buy vital commodities and accumulate them so those who do not have so much money will have to pay higher prices."

PAULEY THE PEANUT MAN

"Senator," said Pauley elsewhere in his testimony, "my little market transactions are peanuts in the whole scheme of things." By "the whole scheme of things," of course, Pauley does not mean this erring world as seen by God "under the aspect of eternity." He is referring to current business practice. And he is probably right as to his own evaluation of his operations. The New York Times indicated this: "Mr. Ferguson said he understood Secretary Anderson"—the reference is to the Secretary of Agriculture—"had a list of 600 heavy speculators in food commodities, gleaned from the records of the commodity exchanges."

As things now stand these leeches will never be exposed to the light of

day. The press quotes an experienced congressional investigator as saying: "An effective investigation can only be conducted by an adequate, trained staff. The Senate war investigating committee has the only large, expert staff in Congress, with ten experienced lawyers and investigators."

But it is not simply a technical question. As in the May, Hughes and Meyers cases, there is a very obvious effort being made to contain the investigation within safe channels. And make no mistake—the Republicans are no less worried as to where a genuine investigation would lead. Kenneth C. Royall, secretary of the army, Pauley's boss, has maintained a remarkably courtly attitude toward Pauley. The United Press states: "Sen. Homer Ferguson (R., Mich.) said an effort had been made to get the names of large commodity market speculators, but the administration had refused to divulge them." Truman is very unhappy over the plight in which the Republicans have placed his cronies—especially when Pauley, crowded by the investigating committee, says with pointed double meaning: "I think it's well known that I am for Truman. I believe in him; and I think he is a great man, and I don't want to do anything to hurt him."

If anything seriously informative is to develop from these investigations it will only be by the people of this country raising such a clamor that Washington will not dare turn a deaf ear.

Labor and veterans' organizations! Demand full scale investigation of war and post-war profiteering. Let's see who our masters are and what they're made of!

Relief Committee Protests Listing By Att'y General

NEW YORK, Dec. 15—The following statement was issued today by Rose Karsner, chairman of the American Committee for European Workers Relief:

"The inclusion of the American Committee for European Workers Relief in the list of 'subversive' organizations submitted by Attorney-General Clark to the Civil Service Commission could have been based only upon a complete misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the Committee's character and work.

"The facts concerning the ACEWR are these: Our Committee is not affiliated with any political organization and does not impose any political requirements upon either its members or supporters, or the recipients of its aid. It engages in no political activities of any kind. Its functions are solely and strictly confined to sending food, clothing, medicine and similar means of relief to working class victims of war, fascism and hunger in Europe. The Committee's publicity deals only with the urgent need for such aid and with appeals for support in its relief work.

"Regardless of the Attorney-General's list, the ACEWR is determined to carry on work of providing food, clothing and other relief for as many needy European workers as possible."

Notes on West Coast Labor Movement...

By WILLIAM BARTON

OAKLAND, Dec. 17—The long smoldering resentment between the management of the city owned San Francisco Railway System and its workers has reached the strike level. The AFL Carmen's Union has called a membership meeting to protest the firing of two of its members at which a strike vote may be taken. The men were discharged as a result of the union's attempt to show that the seven-minute check-in time allowed for workers was not enough. All union members were instructed not to report before the seven minutes allotted, and the results were a noticeable delay in all schedules. A reported for the San Francisco Chronicle showed that the actual time required for necessary "chores" before vehicles were ready to leave was eighteen minutes. Nevertheless, the two men who were helping to prove this were fired for "sabotage." The CIO Transport Workers Union, which also represents many of the Municipal Railway employees, has failed to comment at this writing, but it has likewise vigorously protested the seven-minute time limit.

tant rank and file stevedores, not to Harry Bridges and company. The followers of the Communist Party line in the national leadership have done little to encourage militancy during recent years. What the bosses fear is a recurrence of the traditional spirit of West Coast longshoremen, symbolized by the 1934 and 1936 strikes.

The workers of Chevrolet in the East Bay area this week learned of a profound tragedy suffered by one of their co-workers. Robert Van Kleek, worker on the assembly line at the Oakland passenger car plant, attempted to warm his trailer home with a new kerosene stove. The stove exploded and immediately set fire to the flimsy structure. Van Kleek rushed his wife and oldest son to safety. But, before he could do anything about it, he was prevented from getting in to the other room to save his two trapped younger children. Only the action of his neighbors prevented him from desperately rushing into the flames.

The workers at three Chevrolet plants in Oakland and San Leandro, through the official union stewards and committeemen of UAW-CIO Local 176, immediately collected about \$600 for Van Kleek and about \$200 additional for groceries. The company collected some money among its office employees and asked the union to contribute its collection to be included in his regular GM check. The union, though it did not want to haggle at such a time of bereavement, felt that this was a typical attempt by GM to propagandize at the expense of a man's tragedy, and gave him the money in its own name. Incidentally, Van Kleek, with his wife and surviving child are living with friends in another trailer. It is impossible to comment after hearing such stories, but one can only hope that the Chevrolet workers, who so promptly came to the aid of one of their fellows in misfortune, are as quick to get going to see that the barbaric system that forces people in this day and age to live under such miserable conditions is fast changed.

One of the first NLRB elections involving Taft-Hartley Act provisions occurred among the workers of 26 dried-fruit plants in San Jose last week. These workers had for some time been represented by Local 6 of the CIO International Longshoremen & Warehousemen. Because the leadership of the union had refused to sign non-Communist affidavits, the leadership of the local Teamsters Union, which has been raiding the CIO in the food industry for the past two years, thought this was the appropriate time to attempt an NLRB election. With the CIO union not allowed on the ballot, the official choice was between the Teamsters and a "No" vote. The result: Teamsters—343; No—1,287. All observers agree that this implies a continued support for the ILWU, which is following up its apparent victory with a series of wage and conditions demands. Which proves there are more ways of fighting the Taft-Hartley Act than cringing, even if the lead had to come from people with the unsavory politics of the leaders of Local 6.

An interesting report from this same local indicates that, despite a powerful national union organization, it is still sometimes necessary to act on the shop level to secure adequate working conditions. The workers on the loading dock at the Oakland passenger plant had been promised gloves since way back when. One day this week they felt the stall had gone on long enough and refused to continue working. Within a short time the plant management rushed around to local retail stores and got enough gloves.

Speaking of the ILWU, whose Stalinized national leadership is our all-out political enemy, it has come to an agreement with the waterfront employers for an eight cent an hour increase for longshoremen. Not enough information has been received to comment fully. However, to the extent that this is any sort of victory, full credit goes to the mil-

CCNY Students Protest Ban On Free Speech By Officials

Two weeks ago the City College of New York banned a speech which Arnold Johnson, a leader of the Communist (Stalinist) Party, was scheduled to make to a student club. The ground offered by the college's dean for this action was that Johnson was an admitted member of the CP, one of the organizations listed as "subversive" in Attorney General Clark's recent declaration.

In other colleges similar actions have been announced. Howard Fast, a Stalinist whose business is the manufacture of historical novels, has been prevented from speaking in a number of New York colleges on the ground that he has been convicted of "contempt of Congress" as a result of his refusal to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee. At Wisconsin University, a State Department employee accused of being a "subversive," Marzani, has also been prevented from speaking.

In these incidents we see the first fruits of Attorney General Clark's listing of "subversive" organizations. An organization is described as "subversive" though no public hearing to determine the meaning or the accuracy of that description has been held. Thereupon a college bans a member of that organization—apparently acting on the convenient assumption that Clark's declarations were already an established, "official" criterion for determining who is or who is not "subversive." And simultaneously the CCNY administration acts on the assumption that merely Attorney General Clark's belief that an organization is "subversive" is sufficient ground for depriving its representatives of freedom of speech.

In a word, the CCNY administration is seizing upon Clark's statement as a basis for, in effect, partially outlawing a minority organization.

STUDENTS PROTEST

Happily, there was a wave of considerable protest among CCNY's students and teachers, who realized how dangerous an attack on academic freedom had been launched under cover of Clark's declaration. Something of that lively, rebellious spirit of CCNY in the thirties reasserted itself. For the students, most of whom were neither adherents nor sympathizers of the Stalinists, realized that if Johnson and Fast were banned today, then socialists and Trotskyists and various other sorts of radicals might be banned tomorrow. They grasped the fact that attacks on academic freedom and free speech tend to be cumulative; once some dean or other thinks he has a right to say which speakers a student shall hear, he is likely to keep asserting that opinion with increasing frequency.

That is why student members and supporters of the Workers Party and its sympathizing youth organization, the Socialist Youth League, issued vigorous protests against the bans on free speech on the campus, and planned to participate in all student actions to upset such bans. As readers of LABOR ACTION know, there are no more determined enemies of totalitarian Stalinism than those who adhere to this paper's point of view. But we know that the attack launched against the Stalinists is, in this instance, based on reactionary motives and stems, directly or indirectly, from the increasingly sharp international conflict between Anglo-American imperialism and its Stalinist rival.

The best and only effective way to smash the Stalinist movement on the campus, and elsewhere as well, is to defeat it politically in open debate and uninhibited struggle of ideas. It is true that at this very moment when the Stalinists are yelling for free speech in America, their Czech counterparts are spreading terror against dissidents in Prague's universities. And no doubt students here are allowing their justified disgust with Stalinism to tempt them into supporting the ban. But that is a serious error.

HOW FIGHT STALINISTS?

The Stalinist movement on the campus suffered its most severe blows at precisely the time when there was a considerable freedom of expression—during the 1930s. For those were the years when the Stalinist student groups had to compete in open ideological competition with genuine radical groups—Trotskyists, socialists, etc.—who exposed the totalitarian nature of Stalinism from a Marxist point of view.

Those familiar with the history of the radical student movement in CCNY will remember the period when the Stalinist student group suffered severe defeats because the pressure of student public opinion forced it to debate such issues as the Moscow Trials. It was only when the Trotskyist youth movement in CCNY was an influential ideological group that the Stalinists bit the dust time after time. And much the same thing is true today. So long as the Stalinists are able to pose as the "radical" martyrs suppressed by reactionary college administrations, their influence will increase. But if radical students work to defend the Stalinists' civil rights, if they see to it that the Stalinists have a right to speak openly—thereby giving anti-Stalinists the opportunity to attack them openly—then it will be possible to defeat the Stalinist student movement and rebuild a genuine radical youth movement in America.

DECEMBER NEW INTERNATIONAL FEATURES BENSON ARTICLE ON UAW PRESIDENT

All comments on the October issue of *The New Internationalist* have been universally favorable. But the December number promises an even more interesting and informative issue:

It rounds out the discussion of the UAW Convention with an excellent article by Herman Benson entitled "WHAT IS Walter Reuther?"

Hal Draper, who becomes the new Managing Editor with the next issue, has written on the meaning of a much abused formula, *The Inevitability of Socialism!* This lengthy article was considered so good that in spite of its length (10 pages) it is all published in this issue.

A problem that undoubtedly needs more discussion is considered in an article by Irving Howe's "Why Stalin Needs Slaves." The problem of forced labor under Bureaucratic Collectivism is considered in a review of the recent book *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia* by David Dallin and Boris Nicolaevsky.

James T. Farrell contributes an article on "The First Irish Marxist—James Connolly" who was executed by the British imperialists for his leading role in the Easter Rebellion. The first part of this article will be published in this issue dealing with Connolly, the man. The second part will consider his ideas.

J. Robles, a South American comrade of long standing and experience in the Marxist movement, discusses political tendencies following the general strike in an article entitled "Trotskyism in Bolivia."

Also, Book Reviews. Why the SWP Blocked Unity—resolution by the Workers Party and "Thomas Mann's War Guilt."

(Continued from page 4)

ers' Union, cannot so easily imitate Lewis. And we are referring not to Reuther but to the real militants. The authors of the Taft-Hartley Act took this into careful and cynical account.

JUDGING THE MOOD OF THE WORKING CLASS

Furthermore, there is the important question of the mood of the workers today. A year ago, at the SWP convention in Chicago, Cannon delivered a "political" report. It was all in favor of socialism in the United States and full of the sweep of the workers toward the American revolution and of the sweep of the SWP in the working class. That's how it is; ask him for a concrete political analysis and you get an oration on socialism—an excellent thing, but for other occasions. In his speech to the membership, Cannon sings two odes lower: "At our party convention a year ago we somewhat [ahem!] overestimated the depth and strength of the first post-war wave of labor radicalism." What, then, is the correct estimation? For once, we really do get it (we say, "for once," because to Cannon the truth is either pleasant or it is not the truth). He says that a year ago "the reactionary counter-offensive was beginning to unfold in full force"; the "Black Hundreds of reaction . . . are aggressively invading every phase of American life today"; reaction is "taking advantage of the passivity of the workers"; the "workers felt impelled to draw back, to take a more cautious attitude"; at present the workers are "passive or in partial retreat before the reactionary offensive"; and more of the same—all of it, unfortunately, true. In a word, capital has taken the offensive; the workers are on the defensive and even in retreat.

What follows from this significant change in the situation? For Cannon, no change in policy or even in approach to the problem seems to be required—he is for socialism. Trotsky used to say, in connection precisely with the question of policy to be followed when the workers are on the offensive as against policy to be followed when they are on the defensive: if a man used the same movements going down the stairs that he used going up, he would fall and break his neck.

When the workers were on the offensive, the militants, the progressives, were able to move forward without losing contact with the backward or conservative workers because the latter swung in right behind them. The militants could put forward the boldest, most aggressive fighting programs without isolating themselves, without cutting themselves off from the rest of the working class. Now the workers are on the defensive, "passive," "in partial retreat," they "draw back," they "take a more cautious attitude." At last Cannon sees this. This means, among other things, that the fighting program of the militants does not get the same response from the rest of the workers as it got yesterday. It means that the vanguard is cut off from the rear-guard which constitutes the real troops of the labor movement.

The workers must be organized to resume their offensive against capital. But the PRE-CONDITION for that is to halt the retreat and to begin to organize an effective defensive struggle, for we do not even have that today. And the pre-condition for that, in turn, is that the vanguard militants re-establish effective contact with the "retreating" and "passive" troops of the labor movement, and re-establish it in a way that best assures the halting of the retreat and the most substantial resistance to the offensive. This, you would think, is A B C. But Cannon does not seem to know where the political alphabet begins. He has his "criterion of the class struggle," but seems unaware that it must be applied to the working class that actually exists.

Now, to judge the question of "compliance" from the standpoint of whether the "complying" union can use the Labor Relations Board or not, is, in our opinion, wrong; at best, it is a secondary consideration. "Compliance" or "non-compliance" does not dispose of the problem of actual struggle which every worker and every union faces. With or without "compliance," with or without the Board, the capitalist offensive will continue and end by breaking us all unless it is resisted by the workers in an organized way. They must stand and fight!

The militants, as always, will lead the fight; but they must have the maximum support from the masses,

or they will lead without being followed and the fight will be doomed in advance. How overcome their passivity? How overcome their disappointment with the past strikes that yielded so little? How counteract the huge, organized reactionary wave that is lapping at their consciousness? If these less advanced workers, whose existence and weight in the labor movement Cannon seems to recognize, feel that they are being called upon to strike in order to defend the right of the Stalinists to lead their unions, how will they respond to a call for strike? To say that their feeling will be unwarranted; to say that this will not be the real or even a minor issue in the struggle; to say that this is only what the capitalist class, seeking to provoke the strike, will hammer on and poison the workers with—all this is quite true, but beside the point. If such workers say to themselves (if they don't, there will always be enough newspapers to say it to them): That union signed the affidavit and got a "break" from the Labor Relations Board; my union didn't sign, now the company will not give us a contract, so I am forced to strike on behalf of the rights of the "Reds"—it is not hard to imagine the results. The best militants become completely isolated; the work of the capitalist offensive is facilitated.

This is how the militants and progressives in the UAW thought of the problem, and only ignorance or demagoguery can deny it. And if they were contemptuous of the Stalinist opposition to "compliance," it was because long and bitter experience has taught them enough about Stalinism and its allies in the labor movement. They know the Stalinist game well. They had reason to be apprehensive about the designs of the Kremlin and its readiness to plunge the unions into reckless and irresponsible adventures which serve no working class aim but serve very well the reactionary aims of Russian imperialism. That is why these militants even bent over backward in order not to fall into any Stalinist trap. And that is also why the SWP, by its rotten alliance with the Stalinist criminals, compromised and disgraced itself so deeply in the eyes of the real militants.

Did Reuther capitulate on the matter of "compliance," as Cannon says? Yes, he did! We say this about him because, with the power, prestige and

authority he enjoys not only in the UAW but throughout the labor movement, it was up to him primarily to pick up where Lewis began, to reinitiate the fight against "compliance," to lend his important name to this fight, and to turn the tide of capitulation that began with Green & Co. or at least to make a serious attempt to turn it. His capitulation is another reason why we are not Reutherites, but only supporters of Reuther as against the Stalinists, their window-dressing and their witting or unwitting tools.

But what we say about Reuther, we refuse to say about the militants who make up the most important and most promising force in the Reuther group—and in the UAW as a whole. They were motivated by considerations which are a credit, not a discredit, to them. They are genuinely concerned with preserving the union, with building it up, with making it an even more militant and progressive vanguard of the labor movement than it ever was, with making it completely independent and immune from the sinister influence of Stalinism and no less independent of all ties with capitalist politics. We are with them heart and soul, and we will help with whatever strength we have to build a powerful and victorious movement. If they shared our views in full, they would have made their own fight against "compliance"—without Reuther and against Reuther and with a clear demarcation from the Stalinist demagogues and the 11:55 P.M. "radicals" of the Addes-Thomas-Leonard type. We believed that even with the front broken by the AFL, a victory for "non-compliance" at the UAW convention would have been a great step forward. The bulk of the militants did not see it our way—Reuther certainly not. What was in their minds, we have tried to set forth without apology but without condemnation, either. We had neither the ability nor the desire to impose our views upon them.

SOCIALISTS OPPOSE CRIMINAL ADVENTURISM

But, having failed in this, and having recorded their failure, what followed? Should we, the socialists, have revenged ourselves upon them for this, punished them—and the UAW as a whole!—by turning our backs upon them and calling on the members and

delegates to vote into control of the union the Stalinist wrecking crew and their unprincipled allies and patrons, the cliques of the Addes-Thomas-Leonard camp, as the Cannonites called them up to recently? A fine socialist policy that would be!

As for Cannon's brash dictum that "progressives-will-never-submit," we will see what we will see. Cannon took a year to abjure his phrasemongering at the SWP convention; this time he will take less. We say again: Without taking responsibility for the situation into which the official labor leadership has placed the unions and the working class, without taking responsibility for the decision on "compliance" which is not their decision—more than one militant will have to "submit" and no serious person will attach an iota of discredit to him for it. Just to provoke our critics we will say further: Again without taking responsibility which does not fall upon them, in those situations where the Stalinist bureaucrats, at the behest of their totalitarian masters, seek deliberately to plunge workers into criminal adventures under the guise of attachment to lofty working class principles, it will be the duty of militants to PROPOSE "compliance." For their sake, we hope our critics do not yield to this "provoking" statement.

We wrote earlier that the SWP policy—if you can designate as "policy" something which has no chart, no sails, no rudder, no ship, no water under it, but only a captain—stood in the way of the next stage of the forward development of the UAW. Fortunately, the obstacle was not too serious. It will not impede progress.

The real militants are already at work, discussing the task of working out and working for the clear-cut fighting program of an independent group. They are the militants who want more than mere "anti-Stalinism," who want a line that marks them off clearly from all the conservative and reactionary elements who jumped on the "Reuther wagon" who want a positive plan and policy for working class progress. They are no "Reutherites" either. The carrying out of the task they have taken up is the most important one to be undertaken in the UAW today.

INTRODUCTORY OFFER TO LABOR ACTION
 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription to LABOR ACTION as follows:
 6 month subscription (26 issues) for 50c.
 1 year subscription (52 issues), together with pamphlet "Plenty for All," to be mailed to me, for \$1.00.

Name..... (please print)
 Address.....
 City..... Zone..... State.....

Editorials

Henry Wallace - -

(Continued from page 1)

Wallace is merely trying to pressure the Democrats, he is putting himself in a somewhat difficult position. They may give him and his supporters a few jobs, but how can they give him any political concession?

If, however, Wallace really intends to go through with his candidacy, then there arises the question: Why? Well, Wallace himself, while knowing that his chances for election are nil, may think that he will build himself up as a leader of the forces of dissidence and dissatisfaction in this country. As such, he might be able to profit in 1952.

MOTIVATIONS BEHIND STALINIST POLICIES

While that may explain Wallace's personal motives, the motivation of his principal backers, the Stalinists, is something else. Here Max Lerner, for once, has written something sensible: he suggests that the Stalinists want an uncensored, reactionary Republican elected as President. "The reasoning is that Russia will be better off in the cold war if it deals with an American government which is obviously reactionary and imperialist than with one which still has some substance of liberalism, along with the trimmings. If this is true, it is the sheerest sort of adventurism on the part of the Communists who are trying (sic!) to use Wallace and the PCA progressives for their purposes."

The American Stalinists are pursuing the same sort of adventurist policy, but of a different kind, that the French and Italian Stalinists have recently followed. In France and Italy, the Stalinists follow a policy accurately described by one French writer as "neither recovery nor revolution." Their main objective in those countries is simply to create such a considerable degree of chaos that no economic recovery will be possible—an objective calculated to weaken the western imperialist powers and thereby strengthen the Russian imperialist bloc.

In America the Stalinists must know that their present third party binge will result in isolating them from many of their liberal cohorts, as well as in the election of a more anti-Russian president than Truman. Yet they pursue the policy of expending themselves in behalf of their Russian masters.

For it is clear that the basic support of and motivation for this third party movement is Stalinist. The Stalinists run and control the crucial lower-level PCA apparatus and it is they who provide the organization, ideology and campaign workers for the PCA.

THIRD PARTY VERSUS LABOR PARTY

Under the circumstances the third party movement, if it is actually realized, is likely to result in a tragic deflection of genuine rank and file rebelliousness, of genuine mass dissatisfaction into the sterile channels of Wallace-Stalinism. Where these sentiments should be utilized for the building of a party of the workers, a Labor Party based on the organization and needs of the workers, it will now be derailed into the Wallace-Stalinist campaign, the major objective significance of which is its apology of Russian imperialism.

It is interesting to note that one of the main arguments being offered against the third party is the same fallacious one often used against the idea of a Labor Party. "It will split the progressive vote and insure the election of a reactionary President." But that sort of argument can be used all the time against ALL proposals for independent labor action.

We socialists, however, don't object to Wallace's candidacy because it splits the "progressive vote" or because it splits the Democratic Party. Quite the contrary; we are only too glad to see a capitalist party split. We object to the Wallace candidacy and to the entire movement behind it because in domestic politics it is committed to the support of the capitalist status quo and because in foreign policy it is committed to the support of Russian imperialism. The Wallace movement is not a substitute either for independent political action on the part of the labor movement or for the socialist movement which seeks to change the basic structure of society. The Wallace movement is rather an attempt to patch up the thoroughly rotten structure of capitalist society as well as of appeasing the totalitarian oligarchy of Stalinism. There is therefore absolutely nothing progressive in its political program or backing. And because many will equate this third party with a Labor Party it will serve to discredit independent political action.

In the coming months it will be a special task of socialists to make clear the difference between the Wallace movement which the Stalinists have cooked up and the idea of a genuine independent Labor Party based on the trade unions. The un-

CORRECTION:

An unfortunate typographical error crept into the third from the last paragraph of our editorial on the United Mine Workers disaffiliation from the AFL. As it appeared in the paper, a line was dropped in the sentence referring to Lewis' possible endorsement of Dewey. It thereby connected Dewey with a possible third party movement—making little grammatical and no political sense whatsoever. The original read: "There are those who connect Dewey's hedging on the Taft-Hartley law with a possible endorsement by Lewis. There are those who speak of Lewis trying to organize some kind of third party (not a Labor Party!). Maneuvers," etc.

attractive features of the former should not be allowed to distract attention from the need for the latter.

In the meantime Wallace has to make up his mind: to run or not to run. If he doesn't run, he may yet make a deal with his former cronies of the Democratic Party. If he does run, then he locks the chains which bind him to the Stalinist movement and acquiesces in his status as its prisoner.

(Next week's LABOR ACTION will further discuss the difference between a Wallace-Stalinist third party and a Labor Party.—Ed.)

Scientist as Loot

Tons of blueprints, reports, micro-films and drawings of machinery and various types of processes have been taken from Germany and handed over to big business in the United States as part of the booty of the last war. The material is made available through the Office of Technical Services of the U. S. Department of Commerce. It is available, that is, to the capitalists of this country. Russia has been doing the same thing, but with one added step. She has been taking the machinery itself. American capitalists are satisfied with the blueprints and models of each type.

But in addition to the various chemical processes and machinery there is another booty that interests both Russia and the United States. That booty is MEN.

Russia holds millions of men as slave laborers. The United States does not need any additional manpower for her roads, farms or industries, and therefore did not take masses of people for slave laborers. It would be difficult, it is true, for American capitalism to force the idea of slave labor upon the people in this country at the present time. Nevertheless, slave labor is a permanent institution under Stalinism and decaying capitalism. The United States will perhaps be no exception.

Although the United States did not take masses of people during this last war, she is taking "labor" of a particular type. They are the scientists of Germany. There aren't many, so it is not necessary to lock them up at night. Just an occasional check on them is all that is necessary.

These men of science have no choice. If they attempt to remain in Germany they will either be taken by the Russians, English, French or the Americans. The Russians will not fool around with formalities, just ship them to Russia. The other countries threaten to put the scientists on trial for war crimes (and what scientist is not implicated with the war machinery of his country?). So the scientists "agree" to leave Germany and go to work under "surveillance" in the countries of the conquerors.

The Washington Outlook section of the magazine Business Week, in its issue of October 18, openly informed big business that "If you want a German scientist to work for you, it's now possible to negotiate a deal." The article continues that the War Department had recently put its OK on a number of deals and that "there are about 450 Germans still in this country; others in Germany have been cleared to come here. Scientists released to private jobs are kept under Army G-2 scrutiny. Their permanent disposition is still unsettled."

HORSE PLAYERS WANT BOOKIE AS GENEROUS AS THE GOVERNMENT

By PAUL BERN

Besides the proposed \$17 billion to finance the Marshall Plan for stabilization of Western European capitalism under American domination, the Truman Administration submitted a draft of proposed legislation intended to stimulate the flow of private capital into Europe. While the European Recovery Program is a long term investment by American imperialism to stabilize European economy and guarantee advanced bases for the coming war, the American capitalist government is not overlooking possibilities for profitable investments in European industry by private corporations.

Under this proposal the government would very generously underwrite investments by "United States citizens or to businesses beneficially owned by United States citizens." By its terms, "the administrator (of the ERP) may guarantee the convertibility of foreign currency received by a United States corporation which establishes a factory, plant or other project abroad in furtherance of the purposes of this act."

The American capitalist would not have to take ordinary business risks. This proposed act would guarantee the amount of the investment made in furtherance of the European Recovery Program. In other words, the capitalists taking advantage of this scheme would have all to gain from the exploitation of the European worker and nothing to lose. This government guarantee would be good for fourteen years and the total liability of the federal government under this scheme could not exceed five per cent of all appropriations under the law. Under the present proposal of \$17 billion this would amount to \$850,000,000.

Only a "modest amount" of capital could be expected in the first year of the program, according to the report, which said:

"In the existing political and economic situation in Europe it does not appear likely that a really large flow of private American capital to the participating countries will take place in the near future, certainly not in the first fifteen months of the program.

"It is hoped that as conditions improve, the normal flow of private American investment abroad will be revived. Even at this date, however, several American firms are known to be considering the possibility of medium-sized investments in one or more of the participating countries."—(N. Y. Times.)

After reading this item some horse players were heard saying they wished they could find a bookie as generous as the American government is to some of our poor capitalists. You put up your two bucks—you can't lose—either you get your money back and you break even, or you have a darn good chance of making a buck.

STALIN AND HIS RUBLE

More than one myth, of the big and little variety, has been shattered by the dramatic Russian devaluation of the Stalinist ruble. True enough, this myth shattering is incidental to the event and its significance, but it provides interesting sidelights on some of the more common ideological illusions of our day. There is shattered, for example, the Stalinist contention that Russia has already achieved socialism (a society without economic crisis), and the Daily Worker headline on the event, "Ruble Strengthened," will go down as the most ludicrous of all in a period of outlandish headlines. So too the myth circulated by the Socialist Workers Party that capitalism is gradually being restored in Russia by a process of primitive accumulation of capital by the peasantry, together with the growth of bond-holding by individuals, is casually shattered by the simultaneous wiping out of 90 per cent of the Russian peasants' hoarded stocks of ruble capital, and the liquidating of bond values to a mere one-third of their previous value. Pity on a poor class of future capitalists so brutally mishandled!

The actions taken by the Russian government one week ago are now familiar to all: The ruble was devalued (at a 1 to 10 rate for those possessing cash currency—mainly workers and peasants—and at lesser, sliding scale rates for those having bank savings); an entirely new currency has been issued; state bonds held by individuals are exchanged for new bonds at one-third their former value (66 per cent devaluation) and bearing a low interest rate of 2 per cent; the "free market" of the war period, together with the existing rationing system are abolished and a new price schedule, fixed by the government, replaces the former system. Devaluation and abolition of rationing constitute the essence of the plan, with both measures necessarily accompanying each other, as we shall indicate.

The forces that made necessary this action, carried out by the familiar decree method of the Stalin gangster regime, are clear enough. The war brought drastic inflation to the Russian currency, with vast amounts of rubles going into circulation and few consumers' goods to be bought. Savings bank deposits were 12 billion rubles this year as against six billion in 1939. A "free market," alongside of the fixed prices government market and with considerably higher prices, was set up to absorb some of the excess money accumulated by the well paid bureaucracy and functionaries. But obviously, given the limitations of such a "free market," its effect was minimal. Such a market also led to the growth of speculators, small traders, black market operators and "profters" in small matters. Since holders of inflated rubles could not invest this money in non-existent private industry, they had to put them into state banks or government bonds or, as in the case of the peasant, into the mattress. The bloated currency threatened to overflow into all branches of economic life, particularly the new plan now being carried out. The hoarded savings, the accumulated cash had to be wiped out. It was done. The dictatorship issued its decrees and, cleverly coupling this action with abolition of rationing, wiped out the neo-Nepmen, gained a certain temporary popularity among the masses (who had little or no savings) and unquestionably strengthened, in the narrow technical-financial sense, its monetary system. Sharpest and most cruelly affected is the peasant mass which loses, at one fell swoop, nine-tenths of its cash and two-thirds of its bonds. So much for the immediate motivation of the actions.

FOR WHOSE ADVANTAGE?

Are these measures steps in a "leftward" direction? Will this undoubted strengthening of the regime ALSO be of benefit to the masses of workers? In our opinion, a whole series of reasons indicate that while the Stalin government may have strengthened itself (in the Draconian terms of the decrees there is a certain measure of hastiness and panic which indicates a tendency for the regime to again grasp tightly all those strings having to do with trade and commerce that slipped out of its hands during the war—as if the Polturo was anxious for a renewed internal consolidation of its power), there is every reason to believe that actually a sharp blow has been struck at the workers' living standards, and the basis laid for still heavier blows in the near future. But, it will be said, rationing has been abolished for all. Is this not for the benefit of the masses? To begin with, we note that the cash ruble exchange of one for ten not only hits the hoarding peasant, but also the great bulk of low-paid Russian workers, who certainly have no savings accounts. This, it may be argued, is a small matter since they would have little

cash. Furthermore, did not the decree announce that wages would remain the same while the currency exchange was taking place?

WILL NOT ADD CONSUMERS' GOODS

The question is, what does this ambiguous formula mean? The exchange of new for old rubles is now complete. No decree lowering wages generally has been announced AS YET, but how is it possible, through one or another means, for Russian economy to avoid a lowering of its wage scales? We find it impossible to believe that, given the huge devaluation and the abolition of rationing and the lowering of prices, there will NOT be a cut in wages. It will come because, given the character of Russian economy, it must come. Stalin, as always, will choose the moment and design the camouflage and concealment. Why must it come?

Because these actions, important as they may have been, will have absolutely ZERO effect upon general Russian productivity. The entire business will not add one extra commodity to the starved consumers' goods markets! It will not produce a single shoe, piece of furniture or loaf of bread. Nor will it have the slightest effect upon the well known Stalinist policy of all-out emphasis upon heavy goods industries and all-out de-emphasis upon the light consumers' good industries. This is deliberate Stalinist policy and will remain so as long as the regime exists. Its "long-range aim," as C. L. Sulzberger remarks in the New York Times, "is to outstrip the United States in heavy industry for both economic and military reasons."

So long as this prevails, the only way to REALLY raise the workers' living standards en masse by a great leap forward in consumers' products, will be sternly forbidden. Currency reform or no currency reform, there is no sign of such steps. And if the mass of consumers' goods does not increase, how is it possible for the regime to permit wages also not to be devalued? Not to do so, in some way or other, would mean a terrific competitive pressure by these wages in the struggle for possession and purchase of those commodities actually produced. The new price list represents price cuts of 10 to 12 per cent on such items as bread, flour, beer, cereals and other staples. Some measures will have to be taken, at a later stage, if these price cuts are not to be sheer demagoguery and the entire government price control system endangered. We shall see what happens.

BUREAUCRACY IS BENEFITED

In the entire readjustment now going on, the Russian bureaucracy is clearly benefitted, as against the worker. True, his savings and accumulations are sharply bitten into (it is interesting to note how the sliding scale of ruble exchange benefits the small, petty, middle bureaucrat with a small bank account and strikes hardest at the really well-to-do bureaucrats!), but at a much lower rate than the workers and peasants who lost ten rubles for one. So he emerges from the deal with still infinitely more money than the worker and poor peasant, and with all his prior privileges and powers untouched. This is part of the Stalin demagoguery, attached to every decree the Gangster in Chief signs. Rationing is "abolished," yes, but who is in a better position—in the long run, a better position even than before—to buy the limited goods available? If prices cannot be maintained, who will STILL be able to buy? The answer is evident. The bureaucrat—small or big—will still hold all the aces.

And, finally, what of the new price system? Here the problem of workers' purchasing power is the all-essential. Some goods have been lowered in price, but far more have remained the same and others have even been raised over their former ration store prices and have come much closer to the higher "free market" prices. This raise went on to the prices of milk, eggs, tea, fabrics, shoes and clothing. It counteracts any possible benefit accruing from lowered prices on the staple items we have mentioned.

Pravda has claimed that the new system will increase "real wages and result in the growth of the role of wages and cash income of the rural population." This claim has the same relation to truth and fact that all Pravda claims do. The fact is that these measures of internal consolidation, by and of themselves, have no direct effect on real wages or standards of living. A great mass of hoarded savings and inflated currency has been destroyed; nothing else. Its real effects lie still in the future; in the workings out of the constant struggle between worker and bureaucrat, masses and regime, consumers' goods and heavy industry, prices and wages that characterizes Russian life.

Henry JUDD.

Mock the People's Needs - -

(Continued from page 1)

Another provision of this insulting piece of legislation extends for one year from February existing government control of exports and of transportation. This is supposed to be an anti-inflation measure. Note that such control of exports and of transportation has existed since the war, and side by side with it the dizzy inflation spiral. So how in the world can the continuance of this control, whatever it may be worth, be considered an anti-inflation step?

There's really no use in taking up the few other inconsequential items of this ill-conceived evasion of the problem of the high cost of living and of vital shortages. The bill is all of the same pattern.

Washington commentators in the press and on the radio have been quite frank and free in explaining the willingness of both parties to let inflation ride high, hazarding a collapse that will bring disaster. The explanation is the 1948 election. Ac-

ording to these commentators, neither party wants to disturb the price and profit structure right now. They say that Truman's strategy is simply to give the appearance of wanting control, but hoping to keep inflation booming until after election.

The Republicans wouldn't mind a bit of deflation before election if they, as Congressional majority, would not be blamed for it. So one commentator concludes: "Boom controls ahead will be mild, sort of window dressing, not real. Prices won't really be controlled. Rationing, if any, will be limited." The bill passed by Congress certainly confirms this opinion.

UAW President Walter Reuther had something to say about this criminal evasion of the number one domestic problem, but he didn't say enough. Before the National Press Club the other day he declared that labor "will have to take the initiative on the only front open to it—exercising its economic strength for wage increases." It is absolutely correct that

labor must now exert its economic strength for wage increases. But it is not true that this is the ONLY front open to labor.

Labor's economic strength gives it also political strength, which Reuther and all the other labor leaders allow to be dissipated "rewarding friends and punishing enemies"—all politicians of the capitalist parties. It is time to open the other front, the front of independent labor action in politics. No, Reuther did not say enough.

Checking off Wallace as "a lost soul" and at the same time condemning government and industry for failure on the inflation problem, the situation demanded that he say more. The next step is the call for a Labor Party, based on the unions, free of all capitalist attachments. With a fearless, militant program for the solution of our social problems, an independent Labor Party could rally around it organized and unorganized workers, professional people, farmers and middle class people.

Are You Tired Of Being Kicked About?

By GORDON HASKELL

I have been talking to my friend Jack about how we are going to build up the Workers Party to where it is a great force among the working class of people in this country, and can lead them right now in fighting for a better standard of living and also to smash the capitalist system and establish a system of socialism.

"Look, Jack says to me the other day, 'we have got to get a lot more people into this party if we are going anywhere at all.'"

"You are damn right," I says to my friend Jack, "and that is what I and all the other people in the party are trying to do."

WHY BE SCARED?

"Well," says Jack, "we don't seem to be getting as many new members as we should be. We have got a good program, and the people of this country sure need a change worse than they ever did before. Then what is holding us back from getting thousands of members?"

"One thing is fear," I says. "People know that things are rotten, and something has got to be done about the low wages and the high prices and the evictions and the lousy government. But they are just plain scared to stick their neck out."

"What are they scared of?" asks Jack. "Any fool can see that if the working people and their families, and the poor farmers who have always got a rotten deal, and all the other people that have been walked on will get together and put up a fight, why there is nobody that can do anything to hurt them."

"Well," I says to my friend Jack, "you are right, and there is no reason why they should be scared. But they have been getting the dirty end of the stick for so long, and the opposition looks so strong that they are afraid that the guy who takes the lead and rears up on his hind legs and challenges the powers that be will get chopped down. They are hoping that somebody else will get the ball rolling, and when it snowballs into a powerful movement they will join in too."

"I know lots of guys right now who will pat me on the back and say: 'You guys in the Workers Party have got lots of guts to tell the truth about this rotten system we are living in, and to call the government just what it is, a capitalist swindle. I sure admire you.' But when I say, 'Well, I am glad to hear it, and here is your application to join the party and give us a hand with the good work,' they suddenly remember that they have lots of things to do around the house, or that their old lady will get sore if they attend any more meetings in the evening except their union meetings."

TELL THEM ABOUT WP

"We must have been talking to the same guys," says Jack. "If every man in this town who says he is for socialism and would like to see the workers get together and clean out the monopolists and the moneyed powers and the crooks they put in office would join the Workers Party we would all get writer's cramp making out the applications. They are all sore at the way things are going, but they aren't sore enough right now to say 'The hell with it. I am tired of getting kicked around, and I will join this organization that is fighting for a system of socialism where no one will get kicked around ever any more.'"

"Jack," I says to my friend, "you have hit the nail on the head. There are plenty of people in this country who want a drastic change, perhaps even a majority. But right now most of them are thinking things over, hoping that maybe the depression won't come soon, or that Wallace or somebody will get elected President and patch things up for a while. It is a cinch that when so many people are sore, or scared, or just plain discouraged, some of them will come quicker than others to the conclusion that they want to back an organization which isn't afraid to tell the whole truth about things and to organize boldly to change them. It is our job to find these people, tell them about the program of the Workers Party, sell them a subscription to LABOR ACTION, and get them to join."

"We may not find them," I says, "as quick as we would like to. And lots of times we may spend time talking to people who aren't far enough along the road to be willing to join. But as long as the system keeps walking on millions and kicking them around, it is a cinch we aren't fishing in an empty pool."

"Well," my friend Jack says to me, "maybe you are right, and maybe I am a little impatient. But we could sure use a few thousand more members right now, or at least a few thousand dollars for the Workers Party Fund Drive from guys who may be hanging back from joining but would like to see us do a job."

"Give me half a dozen of them LABOR ACTION subscription blanks," says my friend Jack, "and I'll be seeing you around. Right now I am going fishing," he says.

WHAT TOO MUCH VODKA WON'T DO!

Pertinax reports these remarks of Marshal Vassily Sokolovsky, Commander in Chief of the Russian Army of Occupation, to a group of French diplomats:

"Your American and British friends," Marshal Sokolovsky said to the French, "complain that they cannot make both ends meet in their zones of occupation and must pay out of their own pockets to feed their soldiers and their German subjects. Please mark my words—as Commander in Chief of the Red Army, if I ever went to Generalissimo Stalin and told him I am unable to make the troops and the German population under me live off the land and, therefore, must press for importation of foodstuffs from the outside world to feed them all in the eastern zone, my fate would be quickly sealed."

"Stalin would order me to be shot on the spot and I could not help but think him right. Do you imagine that Nazi Marshal [Gerd] von Rundstedt, when he held command in France, would have been spared the gallows had he argued that the resources of the French soil were inadequate and appealed to Hitler to send him supplies?"

"The truth is that the British and Americans fail to balance their accounts because they bring to Germany all kinds of superfluous things, including electric brooms and cakes. But why do they do this? Surely they must have an ulterior motive."—(New York Times, December 17.)

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Ass'n
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Office: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: RYonsides 6-5117

Vol. 11, No. 52 Dec. 29, 1947

EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor
Editorial Board: Albert Gates,
Henry Judd, Irving Howe
Business Manager: Paul Bern

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, Foreign). Re-entered
as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1946, at the
Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of
March 3, 1874

NEW YEARS PARTY
Greet 1948 with the Members and Friends of
the Workers Party

CARAVAN HALL, 110 EAST 59th STREET
Wednesday, December 31, 1947, 9:30 P. M. Admission: \$2.00

Auspices: LOCAL NEW YORK, WORKERS PARTY
114 West 14th Street Phone: WA 4-4222

Continuing a Discussion of the Differences in the WP and SWP Positions

Two Policies in the Auto Workers Union - IV

By MAX SHACHTMAN

We have been forced into an inter-union.

In the first article dealing with the SWP's attack upon our policy in the UAW, we wrote that Breitman's piece in *The Militant* would not be the last we would get from the SWP. "There will be more, no doubt." To make this little prediction, it was only necessary to see how feeble and hollow was Breitman's attempt to justify the position of his party. It could not begin to calm the uneasiness and outright opposition to supporting the Addes - Stalinist bloc which was manifested in the party's ranks AND leadership as soon as the new policy was abruptly announced (as is so often the case in the SWP, without consulting the membership and with an explanation from the leadership only after it was forced to give one). To explain away the policy, the highest party mandarin was needed. So Cannon himself was led to a special membership meeting of the New York SWP and the text of his speech there was printed in detail in *The Militant* of December 8, 1947.

The question immediately rises: If the policy followed by the SWP leadership in the last UAW fight is so incontestably in line with the traditional policy of that party, if it is so obviously unexceptionably correct that it can be rejected only by out-and-out Social Democrats and their "little cousins" (the polite reference is to us)—then why all this fuss? This minute and frenzied defense? Just to answer us? That cannot possibly be the reason. How can a great leader like that waste time on an inconsequential petty bourgeois sect which is only said to exist, since its disintegration has been officially reported by the SWP on eight solemn occasions? Should he not devote his time exclusively to marshalling the masses who follow the triple-plated Bolshevik leadership of the SWP and its finished program?

There must be another reason for the special meeting and the full-page report in *The Militant*. It is safe to assume that Cannon had the task of explaining away the disgraceful adventure in his own party membership and that part of its leadership which could not or would not swallow it with enthusiasm. It is apparent from his report that he is not to be envied in the task which he finds so unwellcome.

Cannon knows what the central question in dispute is: It is the basic political difference between the Stalinist bureaucracy operating in the trade unions and the "native" reformist bureaucracy of the trade unions, and therefore of the basically different political position which Marxists should adopt toward each. He knows what our real position is on this question. Several years ago, at a Chicago conference of his party, Cannon presented a similar report. He explained, adequately if not thoroughly, what was the fundamental political difference between the two bureaucracies and why socialists should support the one against the other. Assuming the possibility of a lapse of memory, we have recently used more than one occasion to call Cannon's attention to what he himself said and published. We might as well have been talking to the man on the moon or quoting from him for all the acknowledgment Cannon made of his former position. It goes without saying that in his report he does not break this prudent silence; he perpetuates it.

FIVE QUESTIONS THAT REQUIRE ANSWERS

If Cannon does not deal directly and forthrightly with the central question, he does deal with lots of others. We are not disappointed. We get no more than we had the right

to expect. Water is water, and the river does not rise above its source. His speech is a fair sample of the contribution Cannon makes whenever a significant or theoretical question is in controversy. Political analysis: zero, and often less. Agitation: in sufficient quantity, as medical prescriptions say.

He is and remains a Trotskyist, 100 per cent for socialism! He is against capitalism, the capitalist class and the Black Hundreds of reaction who must, absolutely, be fought! He is for the class struggle, and everyone should know it! He is against the reactionary Taft-Hartley Act, red-baiting, sin and evil! He is against the Stalinist bureaucracy and Stalinism in general—do what you will about it! He is also against the reformist bureaucracy because—this must be clear—he is for democracy! He is for a clean banner, not for a dirty one! He is for different tactics in different union fights. They "may appear at first glance to be irrational and contradictory," but that is only because you are confused, not he. Banality chases platitudes down one column and up the next, shouting "Bull's-eye!" at the end of every paragraph. It is the only story about the river and its source, true in nature and true in politics.

But before we can accept the speech as sufficient proof that any Trotskyist or revolutionist could readily see the correctness of supporting the Addes - Stalinist bloc against the Reuther bloc, and that the policy could be opposed only by Westbrock Pegler, the Pope in Rome, the Toledo Blade, the Social Democrats, their little cousins and unnamed "nitwits," we need further assistance:

1. If the policy of supporting Addes-Stalin against Reuther was so obviously in line with the ABC of revolutionary trade union tactics, why did the National Committee of the SWP, at its Michigan meeting before the UAW convention, vote to reject the policy when it was proposed by one of its trade-union "experts"?

2. Were the two SWP leaders who have the most outstanding trade union experience and knowledge also little cousins of the Social Democrats when they led others in a bitter fight at that SWP National Committee meeting against the proposal to join and support Addes, when they denounced the proposal as adventurism in which the SWP would break its neck? (Supplementary question: Have the views of these comrades been communicated to the SWP membership so that it can discuss both sides of the question, in accordance with the democratic procedure which Cannon so uncompromisingly insists upon... in the unions?)

3. Is it true (it is!) that Cannon also voted against the proposed policy at that National Committee meeting, and changed his position only later? If it is true (it is!) can he spare a little more time to give the concrete reasons for his almost overnight change of position?

4. Is it possible (we have asked this before, but in vain) that the change of position had anything to do with the fact that one of the SWP "experts" was given a post by the Addesites, in agreement with the Stalinists, where he helped edit their caucus sheet—one of the foulest and most slanderous samples of Stalinist sewage-literature, published with the technique of forged documents and frame-up charges which Stalinist adepts have developed to its basest degree? And when one of its forgeries was publicly challenged as a forgery, and a frame-up as a frame-up, did the SWP fail to say anything about these Stalinist methods from which the revolutionary movement has suffered so cruelly, did its press fail to denounce them or dissociate itself from them because the adventurism against which it had been

warned had plunged it into a puddle of mud?

5. If the policy followed is so self-evident and if Cannon is so "proud to be a minority in such a fight" along with his UAW allies, why did the SWP militants in the Buffalo UAW so persistently avoid a commitment to the Addes-Stalinist group but ran for delegates on a platform of not supporting either one of the two groups, even though they knew their party's policy and knew they would follow it once they were elected? Why did the leading SWP militant in the Detroit UAW run for delegate, not on the Addes slate, but on the Reuther slate—the slate of the Social-Democratic dictator? Why did the SWP militants in the Chicago UAW openly defy the obviously correct and only-Trotskyist policy of their party by continuing to the very end to support the Reuther group and the Reuther slate?

In his long report, Cannon had no time for such trivialities. He is, against capitalism and all its works and poms and agents; he is for socialism. Safe subjects. Yet the questions we have asked and the very much self-evident answers to them are enough to show that Cannon's thunder against us comes from a kettledrum, his lightning comes from waving a match, his indignation comes from indigestion induced by over-indulgence in a maggoty policy. None of it is genuine, as we have learned long ago about all his theatrical posturing. The intemperate denunciation—bracketing us with Thomas-Rankin, Pegler, the Legion, the Pope and, most crushing of all, the Toledo Blade, in the tedious style of the Daily Worker—has a practical purpose, nevertheless. To the membership it says: "Have a care when you think and speak on this question, unless you want to bring down on your head the label, agent of the Workers Party!" At this threat, people blench, tremble, shrink into a corner, cross themselves and are silent—not all people, just some.

CHOOSING CRITERIA FOR A PARTY POSITION

As for the rest of his defense of the SWP policy, Cannon has little to add to Breitman except pretentious pomposity and out-of-date commonplaces which are not in dispute.

He supported Addes because he has a criterion. "This is the criterion—the criterion of the class struggle—by which we judge everything." Not bad, eh? He looks around carefully, footle in hand, and finds that the papacy, the American Legion, the bourgeoisie, Pegler, and the bourgeois press, including the Toledo Blade, supported Reuther. A bull's-eye! Conclusion: we are for the Addes-Stalinist faction, which was not supported by the bourgeois press but only by the Daily Worker and the Russian police service which pass the test of Cannon's criterion.

The criterion is faultless. The same cannot, unfortunately, be said of all those who try to employ it. Trotsky, who was not ignorant of the criterion, once pointed out that if Marxist policy could be established by simply reading what the capitalist press says and always doing just the opposite, any idiot could be a master of revolutionary strategy. It was not one of the kindest things Trotsky ever said, but it was one of the truest.

The American capitalist press, including the Toledo Blade, was for the defeat of Hitler. Therefore? The German Nazi press was for the defeat of Roosevelt in the elections. Therefore? The whole capitalist press (we do not vouch for the position of the Toledo Blade at the time) was also for Reuther against Addes and Thomas at the 1946 convention of the UAW; it is even likely that if the Pope had had a vote at that convention he would have cast it for Reuther the agnostic, and against Thomas the Catholic. Yet this class criterion of Cannon did not

prevent him too from supporting Reuther in 1946. Only a little while ago Curran was supported in his fight against the Stalinists in the National Maritime Union by the same capitalist press (again we are not sure of the position taken by the Blade); and it is doubtful if the College of Cardinals, the Legion Commander or Pegler called for support of the Stalinists. Class criterion in hand, Cannon supported Curran, thus making himself a "little cousin" of the Social Democrats, of the Navy admiral who hailed Curran's victory and of who knows how many Red-baiters.

It is hard to deal seriously with this argument which, when it is honestly put forward, is simpleminded. The capitalist class has its politics, based on its class interests. So does the working class and its socialist vanguard. On those occasions when the politics of both coincide or seem to coincide, it is always for different or for you wish for contrary reasons. It is only necessary to proclaim this at all times, publicly, concretely, in detail. The politics of the working class (or the revolutionists) cannot simply be determined by a given political position of the class enemy. They must be determined independently on the basis of the interests of the working class itself. Nothing more need be said on this score here.

OPPOSITION TO T-H LAW GROUNDED IN PRINCIPLE

But what about the Taft-Hartley Act—didn't Reuther support "compliance" with the provision for signing the anti-Communist affidavit and didn't Addes and the Stalinists oppose it? This Cannon-Breitman argument brings us to our last point, not because the argument is serious but because the question itself is.

We are opposed to the Taft-Hartley Act from start to finish. It was conceived and implemented by reactionaries and is being executed by reactionaries. It is anti-democratic and anti-working class, and is probably the stiffest legislative blow struck against the labor movement in a century or more. It was incumbent upon the labor movement to prevent its passage when it was submitted as a bill. Properly organized, the workers could have prevented it. It is now outstandingly imperative to conduct a systematic and uncompromising fight against it, culminating in the repeal of the act. Labor has more than enough strength to achieve this end; it is only necessary to organize and direct this strength in the right way.

Our opposition to the Act is grounded in principle. We are opposed on principle to any government regulation of the labor movement, no matter what the pretext or the form, opposed to any government intervention in the affairs of the labor movement. We do not regard the government as impartial in the struggle between the working class and its capitalist exploiters, or as standing "above" this struggle as a benevolent arbiter. We do not believe that the capitalist state can produce such a government, or any government except one which acts to preserve the basic interests of the capitalist class and to undermine the position of the working class. It is a basic conception with us that capitalist governments intervene in the labor movement or seek to regulate it only for capitalist purposes. The affairs and problems of the working class are for it alone to handle. Woe to it if it lets the capitalist camel get so much as a nose into its tent.

Our particular opposition to the provision which requires union officers to swear that they are not Communists or "subversive" and have no "subversive" affiliations before the union can avail itself of the National Labor Relations Board, is likewise grounded in principle. We are against the government dictating to the unions who their officers shall be. We

are against any discriminatory or exceptional laws for those who have particular political views or affiliations. In either case, we have an outrageous intervention into the internal affairs of the labor movement and an equally outrageous violation of elementary democratic rights. Those against whom this provision is ostensibly directed are in effect deprived of their right to hold office if elected by the democratic vote of the membership. The ENTIRE union membership is deprived of its democratic right TO VOTE FOR COMMUNISTS (real or alleged) OR TO VOTE AGAINST THEM.

(By the same token, we are also against any rules adopted by unions themselves which deprive members of the right to run for or to hold office on the grounds of their particular political views or affiliations. Reuther and Addes agreed on such a rule against the "Communists" in the Miners' Union and enforces it just as vigorously as Hartley wants to enforce his rule. We are opposed to all of them and to all such reactionary legislation, governmental or inner-union.)

LEADERS' TIMIDITY BREAKS UNITED FRONT

We opposed the Taft-Hartley Bill before it became law, we warned against it, and called upon the labor movement to unite in an effective fight against its passage. No such fight was organized. The labor leadership, all of it, failed to mobilize the strength of labor behind independent and militant class action and confined its "fight" to wordy speeches, articles, and resolutions. To this extent, the official labor leadership bears its clear and full share of responsibility for the passage of the bill. From this responsibility, none of them is exempt. They—and the workers as a whole—are reaping the fruits of capitalist politics in the labor movement.

Once the bill became law, the fight against it reached a new stage. The first step in this fight was to try to preserve a united labor front, particularly with regard to the odious, reactionary "affidavit" provision in the law, compliance with which is ostensibly non-compulsory. In our opinion, if the labor leadership, or all the unions or all the important ones, had unitedly refused to sign the affidavits—as Lewis, for his own reasons, refused; as the Stalinists, for their own reasons, refused—that particular provision in the Act could have been smashed and its purpose nullified. The reactionaries would have suffered a stinging defeat, labor would have won a big victory and would have had a splendid jumping-off point from which to smash the Act as a whole. We opposed signing the affidavit and called upon all union members to fight against their organizations complying with the provision.

But the united labor front was not preserved. The AFL leadership was the first to break it. Its timidity, combined with its fear of mobilizing the ranks and launching them into militant struggle, combined further with its blind and narrow-minded hatred of the Stalinists (whose defeat, in its minds, is possible only with the aid and leadership of the capitalist government), impelled it to jump in with the decision in favor of signing the affidavit. Once Green & Co. broke the labor front, a good three-quarters of the fight against "compliance" was lost, at least for the present.

Nevertheless, given the moral value of the refusal of Lewis and the UMW to sign the affidavit, which met with a warm response from all labor militants, we still believed that a similar refusal by a union as large and influential as the UAW could mark the beginning of a turn in tide in favor of restoring a sufficiently strong labor front to ignore the "compliance" requirement of the Act. That is why we

laid such heavy emphasis on the question while the UAW membership was preparing for its convention. A firm decision by the whole UAW against "compliance" would have had a tremendously invigorating effect upon the whole labor movement.

If the UAW was led by real militants, with a bold social program and real confidence in the fighting capacity of the working class, and if the problem was not obscured by the demagogical fight of the Stalinists and their allies, they would have put the UAW convention ringingly on record against the "compliance" clause. But that is not what the UAW leadership is. That is not what its spokesman and pace-setter is. Reuther is a faint-hearted opportunist, a capitalist-minded labor leader who thinks that the workers cannot win their fight by organized class action or without shrewd negotiations and deals at the top with "friends of labor," that the workers must not "go too far" lest they "antagonize" these "friends." That in itself would not be decisive. But the best and most promising militants in the UAW, preoccupied with the fight against the Stalinist gang and its clique of front-men and fearful of doing anything that might play into their factional hands, were not prepared to break with Reuther. It is with these militants, who are the most important progressive force in the UAW, that every serious socialist should concern himself because the future rests with them.

That the Stalinists should be most energetic in the fight against "compliance" is easy to understand. They care nothing about the hide of the labor movement, but they are strongly attached to their own hides. For Addes, Thomas and Leonard—the heroes of the No-Strike Pledge, and the Incentive Pay Plan—to accompany their last gasp in the union with a loud bark against the Taft-Hartley Act, was pure and unalloyed demagogy, a hypocritical gesture which cost them nothing, committed them to no action (for which they thanked their stars) and was calculated to trap a few "radical" flies (which it did). These champions had ample opportunity to show their mettle and their colors during the war and, very recently indeed, during the "pension plan" negotiations in Ford which Leonard, in particular, conducted so miserably. Very few militants were duped by these demagogues at the UAW convention and they treated their "fight" with merited contempt. They demanded of the demagogues that they present a program based upon the actual situation, which is precisely what Addes & Co. could not do.

CAN PROGRESSIVES SUBMIT TO LAW?

Now, we cannot and do not take the slightest responsibility for the policies of the leaders, Reuther's included, which brought the unions to their present situation. We warned against these policies and advocated different ones. Neither do we take responsibility for the policies by which these leaders propose to change the present situation. Consequently, we take no responsibility for the decision in favor of "compliance" with the affidavit provision; we do not uphold those who made the decision; and from our standpoint there is no justification for the decision. The adoption of our policy, we continue to hold, would not only have rendered it unnecessary to sign the affidavit but made it possible to fight the Act effectively and rid the labor movement of it quickly. That is one thing.

But when Cannon says in his speech that "there is no such thing as a progressive who submits to the Taft-Hartley Law," that is another

thing. He is either trying to say something quite different from what the words convey, or else he is talking big and thinking small. If his words mean what they say, they are bombastic phrasemongering. If he means that no progressive or revolutionist is permitted to sign the Taft-Hartley affidavit, that is "submit" to it, he is trying to dictate the abandonment by progressives of all positions of leadership in those unions that have already voted "compliance" and in those which will vote it tomorrow until the labor movement—presumably without the leadership of the progressives or their participation in this leadership—somehow (just how?) manage to repeal the Act. It is possible to think up a more preposterous and aristocratic policy, but it is not easy.

Socialists are opposed on principle to imperialist wars. But until they have enough strength in the working class to overthrow imperialism, they "submit" to these wars. They are opposed on principle to capitalist military conscription. But until the workers are able to oppose it effectively, they "submit" to the draft and do not thereby cease to be socialists or progressive nor do they abandon their principled opposition. We know that there are pacifists and anarchist phrasemongers who think otherwise. They are nice people who should be left alone.

It may be said: War is different; the draft is different. The government forces you to submit and if you are in the minority you have no option. The signing of the Taft-Hartley affidavit, on the other hand, is not compulsory. We do not need the Labor Relations Board to which signing the affidavit gives us access. We can get what we want from the employers by mobilizing the masses for militant struggle. This may be said and there were quite a few windjammers at Atlantic City who said as much.

Ostensibly, "compliance" is not compulsory. You don't go to jail if you refuse to sign the affidavit and you can even strike without signing it. But the gentlemen who framed the act were not without cunning and their cunning is not without effect. If a sufficiently united labor front had been maintained, and if (which is really another way of saying the same thing) the position and mood of the workers were what it once was and what it should be, all this cunning would have been unavailing. But the "ifs" are precisely what are lacking. We must look at the situation as it is.

Once the labor front is broken, the "non-complying" unions, especially if they are not as strong as they would like to be, fear "raids" by the "complying" rivals for their jurisdiction, fear a plague of inter-union warfare which would only step up the capitalist offensive and further jeopardize the whole union movement. They are then under the pressure of all the capitalist institutions, all of capitalist "public opinion" AND under the pressure of other unions. That is why Lewis, who has an exceptionally firm hold on the industry covered by his union, and a firmly-enforced "compliance" test of his own against "Reds" inside his union, can make his grandstand play against signing the affidavit, serene, further, in the knowledge that no one will accuse or even support HIM and his fellow officers of being "subversive radicals." (This posturing, the Trotskyist Cannon describes to his membership as "courageous defiance"!)

The real progressives in a union like the UAW, which is far weaker and less prepared for fight than the Min-

(Continued on page 2)

WP Fund Drive Approaches One Third Mark!

By YETTA BARSH, Fund Drive Director

DECEMBER 22—Buffalo, which last week took the lead in the national Fund Drive by oversubscribing its \$600.00 quota by 7 per cent, has secured that lead with another \$50 contribution early this week. Our surprise was surpassed only by our pleasure. Not that we hadn't expected Buffalo to keep plugging. They had promised, in their two-week whirlwind quota fulfillment—breaking all records in this drive—that more would be forthcoming. We rather expected that the branch would take a few weeks to catch its breath. Apparently we, not Buffalo, are a little shortwinded. Good work! Congratulations! And thanks! We hope others will follow the pace which you in Buffalo have set.

Indiana and Oregon are holding fast to their positions of

second and third in line. But this week our old reliables in Streator, Ill., nosed Baltimore out of fourth place. And Baltimore's 81 per cent fulfillment, established in the first week of the drive, still shines.

This week, too, Hibbing, Minn., entered the running with its first contribution. The most marked advances, however, were made by Los Angeles, which contributed another \$110 toward its goal, raising its percentage from 5 per cent to 27 per cent of fulfillment; and by Boston, whose percentage standing rose from 33 to 66.

The Manhattan Unit of the Socialist Youth League, youth section of the Workers Party, has volunteered a quota of \$30 and has requested that it be listed as a separate participant so that its progress in the drive may be recorded independently of that of New York City. The Manhattan SYL becomes the twenty-eighth unit to enter into the Fund Drive. It is a significant and a very welcome addition.

In addition to the contribution listed above, San Francisco made its third large contribution—\$97.22; Philadelphia added \$33 to its share and New York contributed \$274.50. But New York is lagging badly, as are Newark and Seattle, and we're wondering why we haven't heard from Detroit and Akron yet.

Despite good reports of possibilities received from almost every branch and continued high enthusiasm in the prospects, in general the receipts of the third week of the drive have been disappointing. The gain last week in the over-all national percentage was only 4 per cent—much too little to gain our 50 per cent fulfillment by January 1. In part, we know it's due to the Christmas delay in mails but, also, we feel certain some of the local Fund Drive directors are not moving in full gear yet. Let's get it rolling. Bring your branch up to par with 50 per cent fulfillment by the New Year!

And thanks for the support.

Branch	Quota	Dec. 22	Pct.
Buffalo	\$600.00	\$490.00	115
Indiana	50.00	50.00	100
Oregon	50.00	50.00	100
Streator	20.00	18.00	90
Baltimore	100.00	81.00	81
Philadelphia	400.00	279.50	70
Boston	60.00	40.00	67
Hibbing	5.00	3.00	60
National Office	3,500.00	1,100.00	31
San Francisco	1,000.00	312.70	31
Los Angeles	500.00	135.00	27
New York City	4,000.00	1,046.50	26
Reading	75.00	19.00	25
Chicago	1,500.00	313.00	21
Cleveland	500.00	83.00	17
Newark	400.00	57.79	14
Seattle	400.00	50.00	12
Akron	400.00	00.00	0
Connecticut*	50.00	00.00	0
Detroit	800.00	00.00	0
Hibbing	5.00	00.00	0
New York Misc.	20.00	00.00	0
No. Carolina*	200.00	00.00	0
Pittsburgh	25.00	00.00	0
St. Louis*	60.00	00.00	0
San Pedro	100.00	00.00	0
West Virginia*	150.00	00.00	0
Youngstown	200.00	00.00	0
Manhattan SYL	30.00	00.00	0
	\$15,185.00	\$4,338.29	29

*These quotas have not yet been accepted and are therefore subject to change.

Buffalo, Seattle First Stops On National Speaking Tours

As announced in last week's issue, Emanuel Garrett, editor of LABOR ACTION, and Max Shachtman, National Chairman of the Workers Party, will open speaking tours, designed to cover all branches of the Workers Party from coast to coast, on January 8. Comrades Garrett and Shachtman will speak at public meetings and branch meetings. Below we print the itineraries of the two comrades. Places and subjects of public meetings will soon appear in LABOR ACTION.

City	Dates
Buffalo, N. Y.	January 8, 9, 10
Detroit, Mich.	January 11, 12, 13
Chicago, Ill.	January 14, 16, 17, 18
Streator, Ill.	January 15
St. Louis, Mo.	January 20, 21
Cleveland, Ohio	January 23, 24
Akron, Ohio	January 25, 26
Youngstown, Ohio	January 27, 28
Pittsburgh, Pa.	January 29, 30
West Virginia	January 31, February 1, 2
Baltimore, Md.	February 4, 5
Reading, Pa.	February 6
Philadelphia, Pa.	February 7
Newark, N. J.	February 8
New York	February 9
Boston, Mass.	(To be announced later)

City	Dates
Seattle, Wash.	January 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
San Francisco, Calif.	January 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Los Angeles, Calif.	January 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
Chicago, Ill.	January 28
New York N. Y.	January 30

LABOR ACTION will carry announcements of all public meetings held, and will report the progress of the tours.

WORKERS PARTY
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Enclosed find a \$..... contribution to the \$15,000 fund drive.

Name..... Date.....

Address.....

City..... State.....