

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 10, 1950

FIVE CENTS

WAR IN KOREA:

The War by Presidential Decree

... page 2

Has Stalin Already Won Politically?

... page 2

First Week on the Home Front

... page 3

Dulles Plays the 'Sacrifice' Theme

... page 3

WHOSE WAR IS IT?

It Will Not Stop Stalinism — It Will Not Guarantee Peace — It Will Not Free Korea

The war in Korea is a warning signal to all the peoples of the world who long for nothing more than an assurance of peace.

In every part of the world, the imperialist powers that triumphed in the Second World War laid the powder barrels for the explosion of the Third World War. Now one of these powder barrels has exploded. If the war in Korea does not immediately touch off the Third World War, it is only because neither of the two rival imperialist blocs is as yet prepared for it.

But now that shooting has started in Korea, the conquest of this small country is precisely one of the steps needed in the preparations for the world war, and the conflict in that country does and can do nothing but bring the world closer to the outbreak of the global war.

The responsibility for the war in Korea does not fall upon the shoulders of the Korean people. It is not their war. They and their land have been made the pawns in a bigger war, its innocent and helpless victims.

Knifed at the 38th Parallel

It is not our war, either, the war of the people of this or any other country. The responsibility for it falls entirely upon the shoulders of the two big powers in whose interests it is being fought. It is these two powers, the United States and Russia, with their allies and satellites as accomplices, which committed the great crime against the Korean people at the Yalta and subsequent conferences.

The black history of imperialism contains no episode that surpasses the partition of Korea in the cynicism with which the interests and opinion of a people were ignored by their foreign traducers. A knife was drawn through the living body of Korea at the 38th parallel. Neither of the two powers that thus divided the spoils even pretended that this division was needed by the Korean people or corresponded to any interest they might conceivably have.

It Is THEIR War!

The line arbitrarily cutting the country in two parts, each incapable of living without the other, was drawn with the shameless proclamation that the mutilation of this country was required by the interests of two other countries. It is only a logical development that today the war in Korea is not in the interests of its people, its national sovereignty and democratic aspirations, but is required only by the conflict of interests between the powers that cut it in two.

The country once divided, both the United States and Russia installed puppet regimes over the people, in the South and the North respectively. Struggle between them for supremacy was as inevitable as the division of the country was unendurable. But the war that broke out

and is now raging is not a war of or for the Korean people or for its national unification and freedom. It is nothing but a continuation, in the open military field, of the struggle for supremacy in Korea particularly and Asia generally between American and Stalinist imperialism.

The Kremlin's Pawn

The so-called Northern government is not a government of the Korean people and in no way represents its interests. It is a totalitarian quisling regime installed by and completely in the service of the Moscow empire. The victory of its arms would mean nothing but the extension of the slave power of Stalinism over the whole territory of Korea, and therefore a disastrous blow to the people of Korea and the cause of democracy and socialism everywhere else.

If the government of Southern Korea were an independent one enjoying the support of the people, then, even if it were a conservative regime, its resistance to the Northern invasion would be a defense of the sovereignty of Korea from an imperialist assault by Russia. Every politically educated person knows that the Northern regime moved upon the South not simply after consulting its Russian masters but only after instructions from them.

However, it required only a few days of fighting to show how the people of South Korea regard the Rhee government. Neither the Southern army, specifically, nor the people in general have given any support to the Rhee government.

The United States' Pawn

This is now involuntarily acknowledged by Rhee's patron, the United States, in the decision it has found itself obliged to adopt in taking over virtually all of the responsibility for combating the militarized tools of Russia. It is now perfectly clear that behind the disguise of a war for Korean independence, which both sides hypocritically proclaim, stands the reality of a war between two foreign imperialist powers over a pawn on the bloody chessboard of the coming Third World War.

The Truman administration, unitedly supported by both capitalist parties, has now committed this country fully to an undeclared war, without even bothering to comply with the constitutional requirement for official authorization by Congress. By this undeclared war, docilely endorsed by the United Nations, which was established ostensibly but futilely to assure a durable peace, capitalist imperialism again emphasizes its inability to offer an effective democratic political alternative to Stalinist totalitarianism, and accordingly, its ability to deal with Stalinism, in every decisive test, only by purely police and military means.

Any victory gained in Korea on such a basis can only have reactionary consequences.

Far from ensuring the independence of Korea, it will guarantee its utter dependence upon, if not permanent occupation by, American imperialism.

Far from ensuring world peace, it will only bring closer the date of the Third World War, of the decisive conflict for world dominion between the capitalist and Stalinist blocs in which the peoples of this globe will be at least as much threatened by utter devastation as by imperialist conquest.

Far from encouraging the peoples to resist the ravages of totalitarian rule by their own democratic strength, it will stimulate the chauvinistic madmen who are already urging that a preventive war be launched against Russia by inundating it quickly with atom bombs.

No Support to Either War Bloc

The Independent Socialist League, therefore, protests against the ravishing of Korea by the two imperialist rivals. We urge the labor movement of this country, which has remained disgracefully silent in face of the Korean events, to proclaim its complete independence from the imperialist policy of the American government, as it has already rightly proclaimed its complete hostility to the policy of the Stalinist regime, and to renounce all responsibility for the course of either camp in the Korean war.

The program of social legislation which the labor movement has made the center of its political fight will necessarily be undercut as the war situation develops, along with democratic and civil liberties, as long as labor subordinates its own interests to U. S. foreign policy. The "fair deal" which labor has dreamed of establishing under capitalism cannot even be fought for successfully while labor has no policy independent of the existing "Fair Deal" of the Truman administration, which has steered the country into the present conflict.

Labor Needs Independence Too!

Unless the powerful labor movement adopts an independent policy of its own, based upon militant opposition to all imperialism and an aggressive championing of a genuinely democratic policy all over the world, peace will remain the precarious interlude that it is today, and the Third World War, with all its horrors and barbarism, will prove to be inevitable.

If it does adopt and pursue such a policy, it can become the rallying center of all the peace-loving peoples of the world and a powerful guarantee of that peace which we must have in order to solve the problems that face us all.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

It's War by Presidential Decree; Truman By-Passed Both Constitution and UN Action

By GORDON HASKELL

The United States has been swept into the war in Korea by executive action, in a way which has by-passed democratic procedures.

This is of importance to the American people, both because of the immediate consequences and because it is one further step in a process of substituting executive and administrative actions for legal ones.

At the outset, it should be clear that socialists have never worshipped at the shrine of legislative action. Legislatures and Congresses have been known to pass laws which are just as harmful to democracy, which have deprived the people of democratic rights, just as much as executive orders.

They have been known to usurp powers contrary to the purpose of the Constitution, and in the service of powerful minorities against the interests of the great majority of the people. As Independent Socialists are at all times for real, living democracy, the democratic rights of the mass of the people, they have denounced and opposed such legislative action as vigorously as similar executive decrees.

Further, it is clear that in this case President Truman's action in sending American armed forces into the Korean war enjoys the support of a majority of the members of both Houses of Congress, or at least the reaction of the vast majority of them points to that conclusion.

UN A COVER

Then why didn't the president ask for a congressional declaration of war? Surely not because Truman really believes that American military forces are engaged in suppressing bandits, as he has said! Surely not because of the delay involved since, with both houses of Congress in session, convening them for a declaration of war would have taken an hour or two at most.

Most of the capitalist press either dodges this question, or tries to explain it on the theory that the United States is merely an agent of the United Nations in the Korean war. Legally this is supposed to mean that as the Congress has ratified the UN charter, it has pledged itself in advance to support the UN by military means.

But this pretext will hold no more water than the "bandit suppression" argument.

First of all, as the days go by every effort is made to lead us to forget that Truman ordered American armed forces into action BEFORE the Security Council of the United Nations called upon its members to help South Korea repel the invasion. The United States presented the Security Council with an accomplished fact, which they either had to back up or repudiate.

Secondly, no one believes that by accepting the UN charter the Congress or the American government as a whole has agreed to

The blunt fact is that the United States has entered a war on the initiative of the executive department of the government, without consulting Congress, and with the hope of using the United Nations to bolster its action with arms and to cloak it with international legality in the eyes of world opinion.

Why did the Truman administration decide on this course of action? From his "banditry" announcement, it would seem that Truman does not want to give the fighting the legal stature of a war, as that would involve all kinds of difficulties. It is quite possible that the major difficulty he wished to avoid was the fact that American public opinion had not been and is not prepared for war at this time.

Most Americans, it may seem, support Truman's action in Korea. Yet how much of this support is due to a feeling that such

action will prevent a major war? The whole propaganda line of the administration and its supporters has been based on the idea that the North Atlantic Pact, the arming of Turkey, the support to the French in Indo-China, the development of the atom bomb, and the annual expenditure of 16 billion dollars on the armed forces will PREVENT war. Under these circumstances wouldn't it be a little risky to ask Congress to support a war right now, and to throw the question open to public debate?

IS IT WAR?

But now the government is running into another difficulty. If there is no war, how far can it go in applying wartime measures?

One example: The National Mediation Board has called on the Switchmen's Union of North America (AFL) to call off its

strike against five railroads because of "current critical developments." The union leaders have asked what "critical developments" the board is talking about, which would require their membership to give up to the railroads in their demand for a forty-hour week without reduction in take-home pay.

Senator Wayne Morris has stated that the "critical development" is the fact that the United States is at war, and has demanded that Truman suppress the strike. But the senator should know that the United States cannot be at war without a declaration of war by Congress.

There is another complication. General MacArthur has broadcast that he will treat captured North Koreans as prisoners of war, and that he expects the North Korean army to abide by the international rules which cover the treatment of war prisoners. But the rules of war have never applied between policemen and "bandits."

All this may seem like a lawyer's discussion which has little relation to the actual situation. In a way, it is. Yet even lawyer's discussions have importance when they are defending the democratic rights of individuals or attacking the subversion of the democratic processes, however imperfect these may be, by governments.

The trend toward rule by executive order has, in recent times, been directed against the democratic rights and interests of the people, in large measure. The most significant instance up till now has been the executive order which set up the "subversive list" and put real steam behind the witchhunt against Stalinist and dissident opinion in the country. Now we are at war by executive decree.

And if the war should turn out to be a long and difficult one, involving large-scale measures of control and suppression on the home front, with all that is done by executive order also? If so, how much democracy will be left in America after "democracy" has been guaranteed to those Koreans who survive the struggle?

Dulles Puts the Needle On the 'Sacrifice' Record

The first repercussions on the home front of the United States' entrance into the Korean war already foreshadow what a full-scale world war would mean for the people and for labor.

Even without the declaration of a "war emergency" situation by Washington, government figures below the top as well as press spokesmen have already called for the kind of "sacrifices" which became familiar during the last war—sacrifices, that is, from the single side of the working people and at the expense of their interests, while the profit-makers cash in.

While some of these may be "jumping the gun," such a highly placed figure as John Foster Dulles, special adviser to the Secretary of State and Truman's Republican partner in foreign policy, has already made a speech in which he sternly warned that "we shall all of us have to pay a price" before the Korean war is over. It is, however, unlikely that there are many in the country who do not know that it was the little people—who paid the price—a high price—while big business got bloated with profits during the last war.

Dulles added that we "may have to cut down on our economic indulgence"—in spite of the fact that the 81st Congress, like the 80th, by failing to pass virtually any of the social legislation demanded by labor, has already done a good job of cutting down—and that "we shall not be afraid to live sacrificially."

The switchmen here used Truman's dilemma against his underling. Truman has not declared war officially—which would require action by Congress and would entail other consequences which the government is not yet ready to face. The "impartial" character of his Railway Mediation Board, however, is amply demonstrated by the speed of its chairman in

attempting to use the Korean fighting for strikebreaking purposes.

THE FUTURE'S PRICE More than that, it already indicates what "sacrificial living" would mean for labor under full wartime conditions—when, one has to gather from the reply of the switchmen's President Glover, he WOULD be willing to call off the strike. The strike would be broken from within, the railways would win, and only the railway workers would be on the short end.

We must remember that a "war emergency" atmosphere has NOT YET been whipped up. These developments of the first week after the start of hostilities in Korea are in large part still straws in the wind pointing the dangers of the future—possibly the immediate future. So also, for that matter, is the little news item about the Minute Men's patriotic July 4 rally in Madison Square Park, New York City. A pacifist organization, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, attempted to distribute leaflets there for their point of view. The police prevented them from doing so.

"We shall all of us have to pay a price," said Dulles. Why, even during World War II the wealthy suffered untold inconvenience from the necessity of getting their thick steaks on the black market instead of with ration tickets at the butcher store, from the encumbrances of government controls, etc! But for the working class, support of imperialist war for a third time is likely to mean an even higher price—in economic interests and in democracy—than the last.

SWITCHMEN SAY NO How far such pressure against the people's demand for a better life will go depends, of course, on the length and seriousness of

the Korean war and what it leads to. But already a lower official of the Truman government has tried to put some teeth into the plea for "sacrifice."

This was the chairman of the National Mediation Board, John Thad Scott, Jr., who made a stab at breaking the railway switchmen's strike by appealing to them to go back to work because of the "current critical developments." (He did not, in this appeal of July 1, ask the railway managements to screw up their own patriotism to the point of granting the union its legitimate demands, in order to get the trains rolling.)

This move, which may well have been Scott's own bright idea, was summarily rejected by the switchmen's president, Arthur J. Glover: "We regard your telegram as a most unusual document. You say the strike should be terminated because of certain 'current critical developments.' You fail to specify these developments.... The daily press contends that you have reference to the Korean situation. To the switchmen's union this seems unlikely inasmuch as President Truman's personal press secretary told newsmen 'there is no atmosphere of emergency.... And the president himself said only last week that the United States government is not at war....'"

The switchmen here used Truman's dilemma against his underling. Truman has not declared war officially—which would require action by Congress and would entail other consequences which the government is not yet ready to face. The "impartial" character of his Railway Mediation Board, however, is amply demonstrated by the speed of its chairman in

The First Week On the Home Front

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Patriotism, the saying goes, is the last refuge of a scoundrel. And the first week of the Korean war proved to be a busy week of reeducation for those characters of maximal verbalizing ability and minimal moral scruples that are mass-produced by our economy, along with so many other cheap commodities.

Governor Dewey, titular head of the Republican Party—who so recently, in an encouraging exhibition of personal hygiene, announced he was retiring from active politics—rushed to solidarize himself with Truman's decision to send United States troops into Korea—thereby once more proving the Marxist contention that whatever differences the capitalist parties have these differences can normally be easily compromised at the expense of other nations and the working class everywhere.

There were other joyful class reunions. The arms-aid bill and the draft extension bill, over which Republican and Democratic senators had been at daggers drawn for weeks, were passed, the one 66-0, the other 76-0. The daggers, it turns out, were only rubber after all, and the blood only Senate cafeteria catchup at best. Many who did not vote hastened to get themselves on record as being in favor of the bills, not wanting to be thought Stalinist agents at a time when fine distinctions are being priced out of the market.

LABOR LEADERS—AND OTHERS

Senator Karl E. Mundt, for whom hysteria plays the same role as does body metabolism for normal people, rushed around the Senate corridors trying to get action on his bill to curb the activity of Stalinists and others he considers subversives. "This is a serious business now, with a war on," he said. "We're not playing politics. We're trying to protect the country."

It was considered such a serious business, apparently, that only the notorious Stalinist, Marcantonio, made any extended—if hypocritical—attack on Truman's declaring war over the heads of Congress. (The remarks of Taff and a few others were nothing more than political sniping.) For most congressmen, we assume, this will serve only to prove once again that persons who champion civil liberties are of necessity "communists."

And where, in this crisis, were those who permit themselves to be called labor leaders?

We heard from a few of them. That old crustacean Matthew Woll was heard to creak that "the American people and especially organized labor in the United States realize that it is easier to stop the Communist aggressors in Korea than in California." Not much gets by Woll, one sees.

We heard from John Green, president of the CIO Marine and Shipping Workers Union. Baring his breast before merchant shipping he cried for a \$350,000,000 naval and merchant shipping program.

But what of The Younger Labor Statement? What of Walter P. Reuther, whose speeches against the Stalinist totalitarians used to set his regional directors on fire—and some others too. He's also for the war which began under such undemocratic auspices.

THEY SMELL THE FAT CONTRACTS AGAIN

We heard from the preachers, the priests, and the rabbis, and they're all for peace and knocking the hell out of the communists. This sentiment was elegantly expressed by Charles A. Eaton, Republican representative from New Jersey and ordained Baptist minister. The ambassador from God and New Jersey industry cried, "We've got a rattlesnake by the tail and the sooner we pound its damn head in the better."

Business is prepared to make the supreme sacrifice. According to the N. Y. Herald Tribune, despite the fact that the shortage of certain car models has caused bonus payments to crop up, discussions with some of "Detroit's" policy makers indicate a readiness and ability to shift a good part of production facilities to defense work in virtually no time at all. "The earth did not yawn, the heavens did not rain down fire, nor were other portents observed at the spirit of self-abnegation herein manifested."

Labor, specifically the switchmen's union, was asked to give up its strike because of the Korean crisis. The union countered by refusing but offering to move essential war goods. No reply was immediately forthcoming from the representatives of capital. It should surprise no one if all switchmen were shortly found to be "communists," or at the very best, disloyal.

In an article in the New York Post Sylvia Porter explained what lies in the immediate future should the war take on an extended character. She begins: "They will defy your imagination, even at its vivid and most gloomy—the controls which will be clamped on you and every other American man, woman, and child if war comes.... The blueprints for mobilizing every individual and every business were readied months ago by the National Security Resources Board headed by Stuart Symington...."

DIM OUTLOOK FOR FROLICKING

The controls would include: price fixing as of the hour war broke out, wage and rent freezing, the outlawing of strikes, extensive rationing, a labor draft, the closing of many retail stores, the cessation of the production of "inessential" consumption goods, taxes double or treble those of World War II, forced savings, the halting of home construction, and the abolition of installment credit.

"From the beginning," she concludes, "controls would be more drastic than at the peak of World War II, even in Britain."

As the holiday weekend arrived, said the New York Times, the "spontaneous gaiety of other post-war years was lacking.... Travelers with portable radios listened mostly to news broadcasts. They were the center of small gatherings, with many pessimistic vacationists indicating that this might be the last opportunity for a long time for unrestricted frolicking."

That was the first week of the Korean war, a week which gave a foretaste of the future.

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write: ISL, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Has the Kremlin Already Won Political Victory over Korea?

By HENRY JUDD

The crucifixion of Korea's 28 million people, whose unpardonable crime was their desire to live in peace and develop their own independent national existence, is now proceeding rapidly. Caught in the "cold war" vise, their opportunity for survival and independence was never too bright; but now that their land has been transformed into a preliminary battleground for World War III, in the sense that both Russian and American imperialism are directly and immediately involved, the future of this colonial people who have known no freedom in a century is a gloomy one indeed.

Just how far the present limited war will go is, of course, impossible for anyone to say. By "anyone" we include the leaders on both sides, Stalin and Truman, who presumably would have us believe that they have command in the situation. Yet we know how these blunderers proceed from disaster to disaster; how Stalin struck, feeling sure that America would not respond to his blow; how Truman responded, feeling sure that a limited naval and air action would be the whole requirement, etc.

Whatever develops in the immediate situation—whether this war is contained within the peninsula or not—we should rid ourselves of the myth that our "leaders" are in command of events and can control them as they will. Much closer to the truth are the remarks of Hanson Baldwin, in the Times, who states that the results of the brutal Stalinist onslaught on Korea are "world-wide in their repercussions, but the ultimate consequences are still undiscernible."

Speaking in San Francisco in January, Secretary of State Acheson laid down a theoretical basis for America's Far Eastern policy. A practical example of this policy was Acheson's declaration that we would not defend the island of Formosa in any military sense. The argument behind these policy declarations was somewhat as follows:

The end of white man's imperialism in Asia is final and decisive; America should not attempt to resurrect the pre-war colonial system. Nationalism and unrest in Asia are based upon backwardness and hatred of foreign interference. Military intervention by America (carefully avoided up to this point) would arouse resentment and opposition among the colonial masses, which the Stalinists would cleverly exploit. This error must be avoided. America should seek support in Asia through good will, economic aid (Point 4 program) and, at most, the shipment of arms to regimes threatened by Stalinism. By implication, reactionary colonial compradors, such as Chiang Kai-shek, should be dumped and discarded; a progressive and liberal air must surround all American efforts in Asia.

Now this program is so much ancient history, blown to bits by the Stalinist intervention. Whatever may be the outcome of Korean events, Stalin has scored a victory here and he will play it to the utmost.

He has forced open and naked intervention, on the grand scale and in the old style, on the part of his enemy. He has made it impossible, for the present at least, for American imperialism to show its most favorable aspects and utilize its resources as desired. Instead, we see the armed divisions pouring into Korea, the bombing of cities and villages there; the patrolling of the entire Pacific coast by the American fleet; the speeding of means of destruction to other reactionary colonial rulers (Bao

Dai in Indo-China); the resurrection of the hated Chiang Kai-shek as a "leader"; etc.

Even if he is forced to withdraw in Korea, what a picture of American imperialism the sinister master of Moscow will now be able to present to the Asiatic masses! If he sacrifices 50,000 or 100,000 North Koreans in the process, what cares Stalin? The military consequences of American intervention are but the logical extension of the equally disastrous political consequences of American intervention in Korea since 1945. This has already been described in LABOR ACTION.

"VICTORY" WILL MEAN NOTHING

Anyone who doubts this should soberly contemplate the significance of the fact that the South Korean forces, based upon that sector of the country which includes 20 million of the population (as against the North, with a mere 8 million!), collapsed so quickly and totally after the attack. Evidently, they were demoralized forces, feebly held together by a government which only a few weeks before had been severely and overwhelmingly defeated in a popular election! Not even a total American victory could restore the prestige of that brutal old cynic, President Rhee.

We should point out, in passing, that a victory would signify very little in any case—it would merely restore the ante-bellum status of the country, leaving it as divided, demoralized and occupied as before.

All this explains the hesitation of other colonial lands, particularly India, to indicate support for America in its action, which superseded not only the American Constitution but the authority of the UN itself, inasmuch as the American intervention was endorsed by the UN only after it had been ordered by Truman. Cold comfort may be drawn from the fact that Pandit Nehru and his government finally gave a feeble endorsement to the UN intervention resolution. There will be no practical consequence to this endorsement which, in the very same resolution re-affirmed India's abstention from the world-wide "cold war."

If the motion of support was made at all it is because the Indian rulers, caught in a dilemma between their own unpopularity and the possibility of being themselves invaded, felt they had to indicate their disapproval of the Stalinist action. We note that the conservative rulers of other Asiatic nations (Indonesia, Burma, etc.) have all either abstained, or expressed their support in the same left-handed way as India did.

The truth is that not only has American imperialism suffered a severe blow, but it has been tricked and maneuvered into a position which it finds hardly advantageous. It appears as a military interventionist force, killing colonial peoples and destroying their homes and towns; whereas Stalinism, in both its Russian version and its national version, is still able (despite the imperialist character of its initial onslaught) to pose as a progressive, anti-white imperialist and pro-nationalist force. After all, Koreans—not Russians, are doing the dying for Stalin in the war, are they not? This is an incalculable advantage, and Stalin knows how to squeeze every propagandist drop out of it.

The fact is that America cannot play a progressive role in the colonial world, and the illusions of Acheson proved to be precisely that. Let those who think that the decisive steps of Truman have prevented a still greater disaster reflect on the matter a bit longer, in terms of consequences which are yet to be revealed fully to us.

THE MILITARY ANGLE— The End Is Not in Sight

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The defeats suffered by the South Korean army during the first week of the war were inevitable. It was poorly equipped. It had no fighter aircraft, no tanks, and no heavy artillery. Its anti-tank guns were obsolete types even during World War II. Its communication facilities were inadequate. Its leadership was inexperienced.

All reports indicate that its morale was miserable. Stalinist influence in its ranks was negligible in the past. Its table of organization, among other indications, shows that it was basically designed as a police force, more or less effective against guerrillas or the unarmed population, but useless against an even moderately well-equipped army.

This condition was due in part to the attitude of U. S. military leaders toward the arming of South Korean forces. Up to the most recent past South Korea was considered indefensible in any serious war. There was no disposition toward a lavish arming of this government—only to have the equipment fall into the hands of the Korean or Chinese Stalinists or the Russians themselves. The opinion of the military was overborne, however, by political considerations demanding a strengthening of United States prestige in the Orient.

The factors which caused the military to write off South Korea are nevertheless still operative. The South Korean divisions obviously cannot be relied upon—even if the reported heavy losses are grossly exaggerated.

Air and naval superiority by the United States forces is no cure-all, as was soon realized. Germany did not have either in the final phases

of World War II and yet put up an excellent fight against Allies comparably much superior to the present forces available in South Korea. The weather (the rainy season has just set in) and the rough terrain serve to minimize the possibilities.

It was therefore necessary for the U. S. to employ ground forces. Immediately available are four divisions in Japan. Two of these, however, will probably be retained in Japan for "security" reasons.

What the British, French, and others can and will want to offer is dubious under present conditions in the Orient. Chinese troops have not proved effective in the past—and the Allies, currently, at least, do not want to use them for fear of causing Stalinist China to commit her forces.

The nearest U. S. forces are those in the United States proper—twenty-four days away from Korea by boat. These probably number about eight divisions. At least six are under strength. Only the 82nd Airborne Division is fully trained and at combat strength.

DEBACLE POSSIBLE

Either from ignorance, sophomoric patriotism, or intention, little realistic analysis has appeared in the press. An editorial in Armed Forces is notable, therefore, for its realism:

"All of which leads inevitably back to the basic question whenever a show of strength is mentioned, as to what strength. The partially trained divisions in the United States presumed to be at or near combat readiness would scarcely outnumber, numerically speaking, the South Korean forces, the induction machinery would begin to run out the first

Interested? For information about the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

14-28 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW!

New York

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE SUMMER SCHOOL

Six sessions. Every Tuesday night for six weeks

Session 2 on Tuesday JULY 11

I THE THEORETICAL ROOTS OF MARXISM
7:30-9:00 p.m.

II THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION 1917-1923

Instructors: Max Shachtman and Hal Draper
9:00-10:30 p.m.

50 cents for each class or 10 cents for each session at

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14th Street, 3rd floor
New York City

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name _____ Address _____ City _____ Zone _____ State _____ Tel. _____



The Jim Crow Pattern Is Still Here

Increasing unemployment, typically, is hitting Negro workers first and hardest.

March figures of the Census Bureau show that while 7.4 per cent of white males are unemployed, 13.1 per cent of non-white males are jobless. For women, the figures are 6.5 per cent for whites and 11.1 per cent for non-whites.

Other figures show that 30.4 per cent of white families and individuals earn less than \$2,000, which is bad enough; but in this same bracket are 62.5 per cent of non-white families.

Do Without That Lollipop!

Add to the file on the capitalist mentality: The president of the National Property Owners League, testifying before a Congressional committee, told the people what they can do if they don't like high rents and rent-gouging in this land of private enterprise.

"If they cannot afford to pay for a lollipop," he said, "they have to do without it. Now I can hear some of our opponents say, 'You cannot do without shelter!' Let me suggest to you that the demand for shelter is more flexible and more easily adjusted than the demand for any other human need . . . just observe the small amount of space people are satisfied with when they are traveling on shipboard or on airplanes or on the railroad train."

No Patriotism in Dollars

Right during the war, the steel monopolists were using price-fixing agreements to boost profits out of the blood of the world-wide conflict. The Cellar committee of the House heard the evidence at the beginning of May.

One price-fixing pact dealt with a patent agreement which removed all competition from the sale of stainless steel. "Even" in bids for war work, said Assistant Attorney General Bergson, it was found that all companies offered exactly the same prices. The government brought an anti-trust suit in November 1944 and the following March eight companies and six individuals entered pleas of "no defense" and were fined a total of \$240,000—a cheap settlement compared with the profits involved.

Nathan L. Miller, chief counsel for U. S. Steel, claimed that "no defense" had been entered because officials were so busy with war work that they did not want to take time out to fight. But Bergson blew this fake patriotic pretext up by pointing out that the same companies also pleaded "no defense" in October 1948.

Wall Street Performs in Canada

Sparks of indignation were set off in Canada when a Wall Street banker, from the House of Morgan, came before a government body with a coolly arrogant performance. The Canadian National Railway, which is owned by the government, has asked the commission investigating transportation problems in the dominion to adopt a plan which would reduce its debt and annual charges. The tycoon came before the same body to oppose the plan. He argued that it might enable Canadians to get cheaper transportation and this would be bad for the Canadian Pacific, which is privately owned. The counsel for the CNR blasted the statement as "meddling in the affairs of the government system."

A brilliant study of the labor movement— A vivid insight into a great union—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

A Random House book \$3.00 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 14, No. 28 July 10, 1950 Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874. Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

THE BUILT-IN BIAS IN THE DAILY NEWSPAPER YOU READ. (Ammunition, June)

The UAW-CIO's monthly educational department magazine often carries interesting and useful articles on phases of American social and political life, well worth reading by others besides the union members. They are often research pieces and really "ammunition."

The article above does a good job in pointing out how and why the newspapers present biased and distorted accounts even when not deliberately dishonest. "Built-in bias" is the word.

"Newspaper publishers are the heads of large profit establishments (each of the Detroit papers, for example, is a ten-million dollar business, approximately). The publishers of these papers have the same attitude toward pensions, Taft-Hartley, strikes, seniority, and unions that the heads of other ten-million dollar establishments have. Newspapers reflect the same opinions you can expect in the literature your employer distributes with your paycheck . . . They employ hundreds of workers, who are usually organized in unions, which were resisted as strenuously by newspapers as your employer resisted your own organization."

That's the opening theme, which article concretizes well. In closing, 21 ways are presented by which the worker can try to guard against and nullify this "built-in bias." To them we would add a twenty-second which is missing and which could be more effective than any dozen of them: for the labor movement, or a progressive section of it, to launch its own daily newspaper, as the Typographical Union and other unions have proposed at various times!

THE VATICAN AND ISRAEL, by Paul Blanshard. (The Nation, July 1)

There is a "budding Rome-Islam alliance," says Blanshard, with the Vatican turning toward the Arab states for support of its aims in the Middle East. Is the objective "anti-Jewish"? "anti-Communist"? "clerical imperialism"?

Part of each, says The Nation's correspondent, now in Rome. He cites a series of straws in the wind on the first.

Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett of Israel is quoted in explanation of the Pope's hostility to his country: it is "a desire to seek revenge for an ancient sin and to settle an account of 19 centuries' standing." A more practical reason is that "since the days of the Crusader and the Latin Kingdom in the Holy Land, the Vatican's claim to territorial rule in this region has been dormant but not forgotten." And to combat Stalin's influence, the Vatican prefers to turn to the reactionary and traditional Moslem governments rather than to Israel.

Roman Catholic Church membership in the Middle East, as distinguished from its church area, is at an ebb but its "religious plant in the membership, is large. There are 50 buildings—schools, monasteries, missions, and the like—belonging to the Roman Catholic Patriarchate in the Jerusalem diocese alone, and more than 150 houses of world-wide religious orders. . . . The missionaries of the church have aggressively pushed its program of expansion, but they have failed to win any considerable number of converts."

WORLD POLITICS

Poland: Minc Falls from Grace; Kremlin Trying to Avoid Crisis

By A. RUZCENSKI

The "workers' and peasants' government" of Poland is faced with a degree of absenteeism among Polish workers unprecedented in the economic history of the country. On Easter Saturday more than 30 per cent of the Warsaw workers failed to report for work. Official statistics reveal that last January the government lost "through absenteeism on the part of the workers more than 4 million pre-war zlotys or almost one million dollars. Near the end of the holidays, scarcely 10 per cent of the masons and construction workers came to work. Infrequency of work in the mines is real plague."

The Social-Democratic press of the emigration ascribes this phenomenon to the fatigue of the workers, who have been debilitated by continuous pressure to speed up the production plans, exceed the norms, win prizes, etc. It is certain that the daily wage has almost lost economic significance in Poland. The worker who wants to earn a living by his work must do piecework, win prizes, be a Stakhanovist, etc. The Polish workers are indubitably tired; however, absenteeism appears to me as a new form of economic self-defense on the part of the proletariat to combat Stalinist exploitation.

The government imposes severe penalties—30 per cent of the wages for from one to three months, as well as judicial and police sanctions. Such is the paradise of the "people's democracy"! The end of this road we know already: forced labor camps for the slave laborers.

TRYING TO AVOID CRISIS

The fall from grace of Hilary Minc seems to be a fact which is confirmed by his disappearance from public life. No one speaks of Minc any longer, no daily newspaper comments on him or even mentions his name. The ex-dictator of Poland is in a "secure place," like his predecessor Gomulka. Minc was minister of industry and vice premier. But he had the misfortune to be too "independent" in his economic policy. He rejected "a Polish economic plan," which did not please Moscow.

Furthermore, Minc was opposed to stepped-up collectivization. His visit to Moscow the preceding year to "clarify problems" appeared to result in a bureaucratic promotion with his being named vice premier. But the "great Stalin" knows how to do things. Sometimes a promotion signifies a demotion, as in the case of Minc. His project of building a gigantic new foundry in Gliwice, formerly German Silesia, was not approved. The foundry was to be built near Cracow, historical Polish capital. Would this signify a preparation for the revision of the western frontier of Poland, despite the "agreement" between the Warsaw and Berlin governments? Everything is possible within the Stalinist empire.

At any rate, Minc has been gone for several months; he does not make speeches; he does not appear in parliament; he makes no declarations; he is not in his office and no one can see him. His place is being filled by "General" A. Zawadzki (of the GPU), a stupid bureaucrat whose little miserable soul belongs to the Kremlin, a Stalinist type with neither

brain nor will of his own.

Persecution of the church is a necessary condition for the total Russification of the country, the latter being undertaken step by step, in the schools, cultural life, the press, factories and villages. Nevertheless, in spite of the importation of Rokossovsky, Moscow seems hesitant in tightening the vise; she is running the peasants with absurd taxes, but there is not yet a war against the peasants, nor collectivization in the Ukrainian style. Moscow fears to provoke the Poles, well remembering the Polish insurrections against the czar. An uprising now in Poland might signify a terrible crisis in the satellite dominions. Stalin tries to avoid this above all.

NO ROASTED PIGEONS

The confirmation of the western frontier with Germany by Moscow in an agreement between the respective puppet regimes shows that Stalin wishes above all to win the sympathies of the Poles and to keep them quiet. It would seem that Poland and all the satellite countries have greater significance for Moscow than a truncated Germany. In spite of the constant, systematic pressure against the Polish people, the regime is relatively more suave than in Czechoslovakia, Rumania or Hungary. The frontier policy does not mean a definitive solution. Stalin is playing for time. If the interests of Russian imperialism require a change, the Warsaw government will "voluntarily" cede Silesia and Pomerania to the Germans.

We do not therefore concur in the optimism of Walter Lippman, who believes that Stalin, by recognizing as "definitive" the Polish western frontier, thereby loses German favor. A scoundrel and a liar never plays clean. It is the favorite "hobby" of Lippman to wish for an evacuation of Germany by the Russians. But this will never be accomplished peacefully save in the case of a military ultimatum at a time when it will not suit Stalin to go to war. The case of Korea demonstrates the contrary, that Russia does not intend to evacuate the conquered territories but rather desires and prepares for new conquests.

On the other hand, the fond wishes of Lippman and Paul Hoffman that the crisis in the satellite countries can break out and open the road to American expansion into Eastern Europe are not being accomplished. The peoples of Eastern Europe who were handed over by the Western powers to Stalin find it difficult to risk genocide and total, cruel and thorough extermination at the hands of the GPU.

So the Americans' romantic dreams tumble. Roasted pigeons will not fall from heaven into their open mouths. Nobody will fight for the fond desires of the dreamers.

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the ISL sends food and clothing packages to needy workers in Europe. You can help! Send your aid—especially clothing for school-age children—to the New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11.



Albert Einstein as Scientist and Socialist

By CARL DARTON

If your school-age son is somewhat better than clever in any field of science, you may have heard the expression: "He's an Einstein." It is indeed unprecedented that the name of a scientist working in highly specialized mathematical physics has become a by-word in the homes of his adopted land. This unique status of Albert Einstein rests not only on his scientific pre-eminence but also upon his keen interest in social and political affairs.

Dr. Einstein's great scientific works—the Special Theory of Relativity (1905), The General Theory of Relativity (1915-20), and the extension of the General Theory to cover electromagnetic phenomena (1950)—can be understood only with the aid of tensor calculus. Obviously, only those versed in higher mathematics can begin to understand the technical phases of Einstein's theories. But there are different levels of understanding in science and it is perfectly possible to those with no special mathematical training. Einstein himself has done an excellent job of "popularizing" in his Relativity, The Special and General Theory. Also recommended is Leopold Infeld's Albert Einstein, His Work and Influence on our World (Charles Scribner, N. Y., 1950, \$2.00).

On Capitalism and Jewish Nationalism

Einstein has become almost as noted a philosopher as a scientist. His views appear to spring from these fundamental beliefs:

(1) "I believe . . . in . . . God who reveals himself in the harmony of all being, not in a God who concerns himself with the fate and actions of men."

(2) There is a spontaneous activity of the mind, altogether apart from experience, which can make contributions of the utmost value to natural philosophy.

(3) The simplest equations are most likely to be true, and "The aim of science is . . . a comprehension as complete as possible . . . and on the other hand the accomplishment of this aim by the use of a minimum of primary concepts and relations."

Just as Einstein's belief in "harmony of all being" leads him away from simple experience, deduction, and abstraction in scientific endeavor, so it also leads him toward a cooperative society. However, there is no General Theory dealing with social relations. In Why Socialism? (a chapter in his Out of My Later Years) Dr. Einstein investigates the difficulty of making general formulations of social phenomena.

He does indicate the "essence of the crisis of our time": "The individual has become more conscious than ever of his dependence upon society. But he does not experience this dependence as a positive asset . . . but rather as a threat to his natural rights, or even his economic existence. . . . Man can find meaning in life, short and perilous as it is, only through devoting himself to society." Further in this essay, written in 1949, Einstein assails capitalist production "for profit, not for use," unemployment, inadequate wages, and the worship of acquisitive success.

Dr. Einstein has been active in recent years in two political movements; Zionism and One World. Although he grew up in a non-observant Jewish home and early rejected the concept of a personal God, he has accepted and retained the ethical teachings of Judaism. He supported the opening of Palestine to the dispersed Jews of Europe. On the issue of partition he stated: "It should much rather see reasonable agreement with the Arabs on the basis of living together in peace than in the creation of a Jewish state. Apart from practical considerations, my awareness of the essential nature of Judaism resists the idea of a Jewish state with borders, an army, and a measure of temporal power . . . I am afraid . . . of . . . the development of a narrow nationalism within our own ranks."

The threat of another war concerns Albert Einstein constantly. His road to peace lies in "One World"—a supra-national government having the sole function of military security. National troops are to be replaced by international police and offensive weapons are to be outlawed. Einstein now advocates that the Western powers take the lead in the formation of this world government, leaving the door, open at all times for Russia to join.

Is He Breaking with Russian Illusion?

These proposals for One World exposed Einstein to attack by four famous Russian scientists in November 1947. These Stalinist spokesmen rationalized their nationalist ambitions and denounced Einstein as a "virtual supporter of the schemes and ambitions of the bitterest foes of peace and international cooperation." This attack brought to an end a period during which Dr. Einstein was noticeably non-critical of Stalinism and was used by their front movements.

Perhaps nothing shows more clearly the essentially utopian nature of Einstein's socialism than does this experience with Stalinism. The utopianism is rooted in the belief that planning is equivalent to socialism and not in the failure to recognize the economic factors underlying capitalist society. There are evidences, however, that this weakness is being corrected, since in the conclusion of Why Socialism? we read: "Nevertheless . . . it is necessary to remember that a planned economy is not yet socialism. A planned economy as such may be accompanied by the complete enslavement of the individual. The achievement of socialism requires some extremely difficult socio-political problems." Einstein has no answer for the further question: "How can the rights of the individual be protected and therewith a democratic counterweight to the power of bureaucracy be assured?"

Edmund Whittaker, a reviewer of the book Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist, writes: "Some of the observational confirmations [to the General Theory of Relativity] do not appear to be so secure as they were thought to be a few years ago." It is possible that Einstein may share the fate of other scientists of our era and outlive his most famous works. Already it has been questioned as to whether Einstein is one of the three men who understand Einstein best.

Nevertheless, it may well be his greatest contribution that he has foreshadowed the ideal citizen of the socialist tomorrow—a specialist in his vocational sphere, where there is no room for amateurs; and a serious participant in political life, where there should be no professionals in the sense that special interests and privileges are accrued.

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Not in the Headlines

New New Deal

The government—reports U. S. News & World Report for June 16—looks on war preparation as insurance against depression. Specifically the necessity of defense against atomic attack is planned as the brave-new-world version of WPA and PWA.

"They figure that they have hold of a program that, in years just ahead, can serve as a vast pump-priming enterprise in the event armament, foreign aid and other government activities are not big enough to keep business at a high level."

This is the enterprise, the magazine explains, of building underground shelters, decentralized hospitals, special highways, fire-fighting equipment, subsidies for underground plants, etc. "What is sure is that, in the event of a business slump, the planners will have a pump-priming program ready that will far exceed anything ever conceived in the days of 'big' New Deal projects, a program geared to defense in the atomic age." No plans are reported to insure against depression if peace breaks out. . . .

Foreign Ideology

Canada too has the problem of combating the infiltration of "foreign ideology"—from the United States. Said Leslie Mitch, Liberal member of parliament, about social security demands:

"It is not a native Canadian development. It has seeped in from both the United Kingdom and the United States. In Canada it is an ill-fitting garment that hampers our development and could strangle us."

Case in Point

The Detroit Free Press recently featured a page one story about Harold Coppens, a school bus driver. Coppens was holding down three jobs and working 75 hours a week in order to pay \$31 a day for a hospital incubator for his baby son and baby daughter who were born prematurely. At his regular job his whole year's salary wouldn't keep the twins in the hospital for more than 80 days.

In the same issue the paper continued its campaign against national health insurance.

Pot-and-Kettle Note

The London Socialist Leader, ILP weekly, points out, to those Allied officials who were officially horrified when a German meeting sang "Deutschland Uber Alles":

"What could be more offensive to other nationalities than the words of [the British patriotic song] 'Land of Hope and Glory'?" and it quotes:

"Wider still, and wider still shall thy bounds be set, God who made thee mighty, make thee mightier yet."

Readers Take the Floor . . .

From Berlin

To the Editor:

No doubt many readers of LABOR ACTION have participated in recent years in sending food to the victims of German fascism. I decided to look up some of those families during my stay in Berlin. I received the first shock when I discovered that the well-known anti-fascist Oscar Hippe had disappeared after a journey through the Russian zone in 1948, and only in February of this year did his wife receive the information that he was sentenced to a forced-labor camp for TWENTY-FIVE YEARS. He was charged with having "formed an underground movement" and of "anti-Soviet activities."

Hippe was arrested in 1919, and three times by the Nazis, who brutally maltreated him. After his fourth arrest the Nazis gave him a two-year prison sentence. It appears that the "Socialist Mother-

land" has now succeeded in completely liquidating this consistent fighter.

Food parcel recipient No. 2 was arrested in the Eastern sector of Berlin last year, and is now a prisoner in a labor camp too. Walter Hass previously was imprisoned by the Nazis.

This is the real face of Russia. No explanation of the "historical progressiveness" of Russia (Stalinism) or the excesses of capitalism can in the least help to minimize the totalitarian nature of Stalinism. High-ranking Nazis and militarists are occupying leading positions in the Soviet zone of Germany. They see eye to eye with their new masters. However socialist militants are persecuted, arrested, tortured and liquidated. All those that believe in genuine democratic rights must protest and publicize victims of Stalinist terror. Berlin, Germany. R.

Summer Camp-School Coming!

The Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League are planning a camp and school between September 7 and 17 at Genoa City, Wis.

The camp will combine all the splendid features of last year's SYL camp with an even better series of lectures and classes. Sports of all kinds, relaxation, fine food, socialist education, a good time for all, are promised by the camp committee.

Reservations should be sent in at once to the Socialist Youth League, P. O. Box 8112, Chicago, Illinois. A \$5.00 deposit must accompany all reservations. Contribution for the ten days is \$40 per person. For seven days or less \$5.00 per day; for more than seven days, \$4.00 per day.

Send in your reservations now. First come, first served.

Note the new address to which reservations should be mailed: P. O. Box 8112, Chicago, Ill.

Make checks and money orders payable to: Socialist Youth League OR Jack Carter

What's the BLP's Dilemma?

The Contradiction of "Controlled Economy" in a "Free World Market"

By SAM FELIX

The statement by the Executive Committee of the British Labor Party on "European Unity" gave away more than its reasons for rejecting the Schuman Plan or any similar scheme for the unification of Western Europe either by socialist or capitalist governments. It indicated at the same time the meaning of reformism in power and its inability to break out of the framework of capitalist politics and economics.

To say that the Labor Party is at a decisive juncture in its history would be somewhat of an understatement. Domestically, it was returned to office last March by the narrowest of parliamentary margins while internationally it is on the dole of American capitalism. The Marshall Plan, which was to close the dollar gap, is now an admitted failure. And what does the Labor Party have to propose to extricate itself and Western Europe from this crisis? Unfortunately, nothing that represents a real alternative.

The Labor Party's refusal to join in the presently conceived Schuman Plan has been met with a tirade of abuse in the American capitalist press. "Isolationist" and "insular" were the most commonly hurled invectives. But this "internationalist" approach extends only as far as advising what someone else should do. If, however, the proposal were made that American industry be pooled under a "high authority," howls of indignation would be rapidly forthcoming from all sections of American capitalism against such a European plot to destroy American "free enterprise."

In rejecting the Schuman Plan and other schemes for unification, the Labor Party offered two main reasons: its "socialist principles" which "could never accept any commitments which limited its own or others' freedom to pursue democratic socialism, and to apply the economic controls necessary to achieve it," and its economic and political ties with its Commonwealth. When a closer look is taken at these "socialist principles," a relationship exists between the two main reasons that is not immediately apparent. In fact these two reasons become interdependent.

Essence of Reformist Theory

In a more elaborate section dealing with these "socialist principles," the statement points out: "Socialist believe that an uncontrolled capitalist economy can function only at the cost of conflicts between nations and classes which may be fatal to civilization in the atomic age. In the international no less than in the national field, society must be so organized as to offer all its members equality of opportunity, responsibility and sacrifice. . . . They cannot be maintained in a free market economy unless the state deliberately intervenes to correct the harmful tendencies and stimulate the beneficial. Without such intervention, adjustments are made at the expense of the working population and a schism is created in society which may destroy society." [My emphasis—S. F.]

Here is set forth the essence of the Labor government's economic policy: "Control" of the domestic economy in a "free market economy" with the state "intervening to correct the harmful tendencies and stimulate the beneficial."

What is meant by "controls" was explained by Sir Stafford Cripps, chancellor of the exchequer, on April 18. Referring to the end of rationing in certain fields, he said: "But we believe—most firmly believe—in the essential key controls. The community must control the balance of trade, the national credit, capital investment, the location of industry, the broad distribution of national income." However, while Sir Stafford Cripps excluded control of the industries and the LP statement included governmental control of the basic industries, these controls apply only to the domestic economy.

The illusory character of the LP conception is seen by the position that Britain occupies in world economy, where in 1949 Britain's imports amounted to the equivalent of 24 per cent of its national income while in 1938 it was 20 per cent. Correspondingly a similar figure is needed to approach overall balance in payment

for these imports. In addition there is the dollar gap, much of which is financed by the Marshall Plan.

The British economy is therefore one that is greatly dependent upon the world market. With the rise and fall of the fluctuating market goes a rise and fall in the British economy. Therefore, while the LP may be ready to control the domestic economy, which it does to a greater or lesser extent, what can it do about the world-market economy? Any economy which is dependent to this degree upon the world market for such a great proportion of its needs finds whatever is done domestically in the form of progressive social legislation is decisively conditioned for success upon the developments of this "free market economy."

Market Economy Is Decisive

In the 19th century, it was this "free market economy" that was the basis for Britain's position of leadership in the capitalist world. Britain threw her home markets open to cheap imports and exported highly manufactured and specialized goods. This accounted for the increasing world-wide division of labor and the growth of free multilateral trade, from which Britain was the main benefactor.

However, this system of free multilateral trade finally broke down in 1931 with the growth of competitors in Western Europe and the U. S., the inability of the capitalist market to increase in order to absorb the increasing amounts of manufactured goods, and the development of former customers into competitors as industrialization proceeded throughout the world.

Britain today is left with the heritage of her former leadership of the "free market economy," a more or less technically backward industry compared to other advanced capitalist nations, and a highly specialized economy. In addition there is the special problem of having to import in order to live and to export. It is with this inheritance that the Labor Party has to work, and it demands that the LP have a correct approach to the international scene.

The Laborites believe that they can maintain their position in this "free market economy" with the state intervening to offset "the harmful tendencies" so that the working class does not bear the brunt of "adjustments." But no matter how fairly the LP is going to distribute the shares, it will be the "free market economy" that is going to determine what there is available to distribute. This is adequately demonstrated by the events of the past year.

Tied to U. S. Ops-and-Downs

At the present time the financial stability of Britain is extremely dependent upon the level of business activity in the U. S. The level of U. S. imports from the Commonwealth determines its ability to pay for the necessary U. S. exports.

In mid-1949, the U. S. economy experienced a slight recession of about 10 per cent in national production. The effect was to curtail greatly not only British exports to the U. S. but also exports from the Commonwealth upon which the sterling area is decisively dependent for its dollar supply. This in turn started to drain the dollar and gold reserves of the sterling area and threatened its collapse. Devaluation was the result. Today Britain and the Commonwealth are riding on the crest of a slight boom, once more dependent upon the recent upswing of business activity in the U. S.

It is the level of business activity in Britain's markets that will influence decisively the activity of the British economy. But the reformist ideology believes that it can "control" the capitalist economy and the capitalist market. However, because the LP is among the first to recognize this dependence on the "free market economy," its solution to this situation is one that is in accordance with the traditional ties of the British economy—the Empire, now the Commonwealth. These ties were strengthened with the collapse of free multilateral trading in 1931 when Britain went off the gold standard and the imperial-preference system was established.

It is the lack of a revolutionary perspective that necessitates their present course of action. The LP statement says that "if the whole of Europe followed the same policy [of full employment and fair shares] many of its problems would be solved." That is a pleasant thought in these difficult times, but as a program it would demand concrete action. Specifically it would mean coming into conflict with the present governments of Western Europe which do not follow this policy. It would mean taking the leadership of the widespread sentiment for a united Europe. However, since the LP "fundamentally rejects" any course of action that would cause economic disturbance and political tensions (i.e., class conflict), because this "would throw Europe open to Communism," it has to look elsewhere.

Their Alternative

Nor is the LP ready to take a course of action that would seriously challenge the U. S. Rather it looks upon New and Fair Deals as among the most progressive governments in the world today. It even goes further and proposes that the U. S. be really integrated with the entire "non-Communist" world. It is this explicit tie-up with the American war bloc that prevents it from taking the leadership in challenging capitalism and offering the concept of building a truly socialist society.

Therefore the Labor Party turns to the place where it can find a measure of security, in an economic sense—the remnants of the British Empire. True, this may not offer what it did 50 years ago, but given the reformist outlook and the cold-war obligations, this remains their alternative.

A further indication of the LP's imperialist perspective is seen in this statement. After rejecting European unity as an "overriding end in itself," it adds: "The Commonwealth now represents the nucleus of a potential world society based on free cooperation." Only a socialist group with strong nationalist tendencies could assert that an area in which one nation—England—is dominant "represents the nucleus of a potential world society based on free cooperation."

This Commonwealth perspective is a continuation of the policy carried out by all the leading capitalist powers during the crisis of the '30s. Each attempted to build up an economic and political bloc in which it was the dominant power and which it could exploit to the relative exclusion of the rest. It was their answer to the depression and it in turn increased the economic warfare which ultimately led to the Second World War. The inability of the world market to expand to satiate the carnivorous appetites of the rival powers led each power to arrive at a "solution" nationalist in essence and based on domination of a larger area.

Can't Control on National Basis

It is the counterposing of a nationalist perspective to a program for international leadership in the struggle against capitalism and Stalinism that perhaps constitutes the greatest fault of the Labor Party's statement. It rules out an economic and political union in Western Europe "even if their Parliaments had a socialist majority," because of the necessity for "uniformity" which would be prevented by "civic and administrative traditions."

Along with this nationalist conception, there is the failure to see the problem today as being primarily a political one. The Labor Party sees the problem primarily from the need to close the "dollar gap," which it believes it can do if it gets some cooperation by the U. S. and if it can expand its program for colonial investment in Africa. But this problem of the dollar gap has little relationship to their argument of planning for full employment, for the dollar gap exists because of the destruction of the last war, the division of the world into two major spheres of influence and the decline of Western Europe within the "free market economy" in relation to the U. S.

The problem is political because, operating in

(Continued on page 7)

The American Communist Party Takes Stock of Its PP Line — CP = Wallaceite Marriage Headed for Rocks

By DANIEL WELSH

The increasing isolation of the American Communist Party and the difficulties which it faces as the result of the witchhunt and cold-war developments are reflected in the relationship of the CP to the Progressive Party and other political forces. These in turn have produced an interesting change in its own understanding of its role and how it is attempting to fulfill it.

The split between the Stalinist and the Wallace-liberal forces in the Progressive Party, especially following the sharpening of the Tito question, is having serious effects on the functioning of the PP. In many local areas there has been considerable resistance to the PP embarking on independent electoral campaigns from those elements within the PP which have ties with or seek to ally themselves with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

In the last New York State senatorial election it was Wallace himself who refused to run for senator, in order not to endanger the chances of the DP candidate Lehman. And in the recent California primary the PP "abstained" from contesting or supporting the candidacy of Helen Douglas Gahagan, a liberal of the ADA stripe, in spite of the fact that the Stalinists would have liked to oppose her.

Now if anything is certain, it is that the Wallace-liberals do not hold the reins of power in deciding PP policy. However, given the present situation, the Stalinists are forced to yield to them on many points, simply to keep them within the Progressive Party. It is necessary for the CP to have some kind of organization through which it can function.

Pointing to Dems Again

This is especially the case in smaller towns and cities where the open functioning of the CP has become impossible and it finds it necessary to take on the coloration of a branch of the Wallace party. Thus the National Guardian, the unofficial organ of the Progressive Party, has undertaken to build up "readers' clubs" which can only be the equivalent of reconstituted Stalinist party branches.

In many cases, however, these branches, particularly in the hinterlands, contain a certain number of members who are not Stalinists but variegated kinds of vague radicals, former members of agrarian protest movements, etc. The "Letters to the Editor" column of the Guardian reveals a motley array of old Single-Taxers, Ham-and-Eggers, Debsian socialists, Townsends, vegetarians, disarmament advocates, etc., all in addition to the strictly Stalinist Party-liners.

While a broad organization is highly desirable from the point of view of the Stalinists, it

imposes certain limitations on them, especially in their relationships to other elements in the PP. Furthermore, the concentration of all efforts on building the PP has been one of the main contributing factors in furthering the process of their isolation and alienation.

Thus in their current "peace" campaign, they have found it necessary to de-emphasize the importance of independent electoral activity in order not to lose the sympathies and aid of the middle-class religious groups with which they are working. Also, their "independent" status has helped them as a pressure group within important sections of the Democratic Party.

Realization of this has caused the Stalinists to re-evaluate the Wallace adventure to the point where they are now prepared to re-enter the arena of major party politics. One of the CP leaders has stated the necessity to give "critical and qualified support" to "certain major party candidates who will fight to any degree for peace. . . ." At the same time, they plan to retain the PP as an electoral vehicle and front organization wherever that is necessary.

"Go Easy," Says Dennis

Yet in the future, it is likely to receive a greatly decreased emphasis. As the Stalinists themselves admit, "the Progressive Party does not have a substantial labor base, or great organized strength among the Negro people," and participation in the PP only helps to isolate their union leaders from the rank and file.

All of the signs of weakness which we have listed are available to the Stalinists themselves and are understood by them. While to their membership the CP leaders whistle in the dark, at the same time they realize that they are on the political defensive, and they are out to win allies in their struggle for existence. In the past

What's the British LP's Dilemma? —

(Continued from page 6)

the "free market economy" in cooperation with and in competition against the rest of the capitalist world, Britain and Western Europe will be unable to prevent those "economic disturbances" which it says benefit Stalinism. Not because they do not try to plan at home but because they cannot control the "free market economy."

The problem is also political because of the fact, which it is necessary to understand, that the appeal of Stalinism is its anti-capitalism: But the Labor Party makes clear that it is tying its policy to the "non-Communist world" and directs its appeals to the existing capitalist governments of Western Europe and the U. S. to change their policy and plan for full employment. For the Labor Party to take up a program that is capa-

ble of politically defeating Stalinism means that it would be at the same time coming into conflict with the main stronghold of the capitalist world, the United States.

The appeal of Stalinism is politically based upon the inability of capitalism to meet the needs of the peoples of the world. For the Labor Party to believe that it can reform the structure of capitalism or that it can find security within its framework is suicidal in this day and age. There can be no quarrel with the attempt of the Labor Party to plan full employment, but to adapt this present perspective in the existing "free market economy" during the period of the cold war indicates an ideology that can at best be called self-defeating.

Fire Damages ISL Offices: We Need Your Help!

On Saturday, July 1, a fire destroyed part of the building at 4 Court Square, Long Island City, which houses the headquarters of the Independent Socialist League and LABOR ACTION.

These offices are on the fourth (top) floor of the building. The greatest damage was done to the second floor, where the fire started, but the ISL headquarters did not escape unscathed by the flames. A desk in one corner of the LABOR ACTION business office (which was directly above the center of the fire) was entirely burned, and part of the book stock was damaged by water.

That half of the floor occupied by the ISL rather than by LABOR ACTION was not directly affected by the flames, but many windows in all offices were broken in the course of putting out the fire.

The damage sustained by the building, however, means that the ISL and LABOR ACTION will have to move to new offices as soon as possible.

In addition to losses directly due to the fire, we are therefore faced with the necessity of an unexpected and immediate financial outlay for moving, obtaining

new headquarters and refitting the new space for our needs.

We ask our readers and well-wishers to help us over the unanticipated financial hump. Contributions of five dollars and up (or even only one dollar, if you are that hard up) will help a lot. (Checks and money orders can be made out to: Yetta Barsh.)

A helping hand is needed right now. Kick in!

NOTICE

If you sent in a subscription or resubscription to The New International during the month of June, please send your name and address immediately to the business manager, L. G. Smith, at 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y., together with a note on what moneys were remitted with your subscription.

Part of these records were damaged during the fire in the Court Square building on July 1. Other records will permit a partial check on the information you send, but be sure to act now in order to make sure that your subscription will be honored.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Sq., L. I. C. 1, New York

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

By LEON TROTSKY

Marxism in the United States

35 Cents Order from
Independent Socialist Press
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

BOOKS and Ideas

L. L. Whyte's "The Next Development in Man"

THE NEXT DEVELOPMENT IN MAN. by L. L. Whyte. A Mentor book, The New American Library, 255 pages, 35 cents. A pocket-size reprint, 1950.

Reviewed by **FRANK HARPER**

The next development of man is the "development and application of a unitary method of thought in all fields, from physics and biology to sociology and social and political thought." Since socialists are vitally concerned with examinations of natural, social and political science, it is well to attempt to digest the varied and meaty fare offered in Whyte's philosophical treatise.

In addition to his publicized "wide experience in physics, banking and philosophy," the author has at least dabbled extensively in Marxism. The reader is warned, however, not to be too easily misled by the author's repeated assertion that "Marxism was a premature and limited form of unitary process thought," for his extensive observations on socialism are not always accurate, though usually challenging.

The term "unitary" is used for a system of thought which:

(1) emphasizes process, development and transformation—that this is a perpetually changing

universe in which concepts of unchanging permanence must play no role;

(2) is capable of bringing all facts into relation with one another, recognizing no absolute dualism such as mind and/or body. "Dualisms" are, in unitary terms, "pairs of aspects of one underlying phenomenon";

(3) recognizes a universal formative process in nature. Nature is not a chaos of particles but a process which consists of development and transformation of patterns. Marxists will here perceive similarities to some of the concepts of dialectical materialism.

FOUR PERIODS

Before examining Whyte's remarks on socialism and the political aspects of his charted course for the future, it is necessary to summarize briefly his exposition of social history. Four distinct periods of man's development have already taken place. The first deals with primitive and savage man prior to 8000 B.C. The second runs to 100 B.C., while the period of European Man extends from 100 B.C. to 1600 A.D. The period of Western Man, out of which the new development will evolve, dates from 1600 A.D. to the present time.

This is the age of "quantitative

technique," of increasing differentiation in thought and of reckless development of industrialization. Marx was one of the few listed by the author, from this period, who believed "in the power of the enlightened mind to control human fate."

Each of these periods is also marked by a dominant hierarchy. In the earliest period, the hierarchy was the family; in the second, it was organized religion. From 100 B.C. to 1600 A.D., dominance passed over to political leaders, i.e., kings, emperors and feudal lords, while in the present era dominance goes to those in economic control.

The author further states that the hierarchy in the Unitary Thought period will be composed of those who possess "unitary skills"—"a new type of leader, not speaking for a particular nation on all matters, as do contemporary political figures, but specializing on particular aspects of social life and speaking on them for the whole of mankind."

SEES "DUALISM" IN MARX

Whyte says essentially the following in praise of Karl Marx and Marxism:

(1) Marx replaced "the illusions of idealism," by "a broader view of the historical process."

He transformed "the Hegelian dialectic of consciousness into a more general dialectic of natural process."

(2) "Marx and Engels repeatedly asserted that the productive relations are only one component of a total system in process of transformation, in which everything influences everything else."

(3) "It was through Marx that the European dissociated tradition suffered its first systematic attack." Marxism showed "that the forms of consciousness, the nature of man's ideals, and his actual behavior were all components of a social process through which alone they could be understood."

Whyte believes that Marxism has failed because it has not been able to cast off the "dualist" concepts of our outmoded present era of history. Marx was divided between "the magnificent dialectical interpretation" and "a passionate sense of justice which led him to identify his entire being with the struggles of the poor." Another fatal duality arose because "Marxism distorted process thought by forcing it to provide a gospel for militant socialism."

A quotation from Marx on "concept" and "reality" is given to substantiate the author's charge of inherent dualism in the man and his thought. The author claims that, despite our previously cited quotation on "productive relations" that Marx really proceeded on the basis that "economic production is a separable and permanently dominant element in society."

SNARED BY RUSSIA

Whyte further claims that Marx did not perceive "the perpetual interplay of special privilege and general development" in the historical process. This charge appears to embody his essential disagreement with Marxism but it will not hold water. Marx certainly did study "the interplay of special privilege and general development" and reached the conclusion that, with the existing productive techniques, the continuation of special privileges of any sort limited the general development of society. Because of these observations and

conclusions Marx proposed that special privileges, in all of their manifestations, should be abolished so that mankind could move forward.

The author seems to be either charging Marx with failure to examine these issues (a charge which is false) or with failure to arrive at Whyte's conclusion, which apparently is that the general development of society is advanced by the existence of the proper sort of special privileges.

Consistent with this interpretation of Whyte's social philosophy is his description of Russia as a state in which "little change is necessary to enable her to maintain her role within the unitary world"; and consistent also is the absence of any consideration by him of the democratic functioning of society—a subject which would seem to be made of order for description in terms of processes, unitary action, and interrelated development.

TENDS TO UTOPIANISM

In its overzealousness to obtain acceptance for the ideas of unitary thought, the book in places assumes the tone of a Rosicrucian tract; its treatment of future society seems utopian because very great faith is placed on the power of an idea—despite the author's closing explanation: "One who does not fully partake in the life of the many may find himself forming in thought what they are occupied in developing in their daily lives. His idea will then facilitate their actions. The behavior of the many will seem to have been caused by an idea, which thereby acquires the semblance of power."

Despite the limitations indicated and others, *The New Development in Man* does, in the opinion of the reviewer, strongly remind socialists that they should view the world and society as ever changing, to consider such relationships as "ends and means," and "causes and effects" as varied manifestations of developing processes, and to avoid the mechanistic formulations and stereotyped jargon which so clearly mark the subversion of Marxist theory by the Stalinists.

Philly UE Strikes Westinghouse To Protect Grievance Machinery

By **FRANK HARPER**

PHILADELPHIA, July 1—The large South Philadelphia works of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation was closed this week by a work stoppage called by Local 107 of the United Electrical Workers Union (UE). Pickets barred the gates on Tuesday morning, June 27, on charges that the company refused to recognize the grievance machinery, and the 6,000 non-supervisory workers have been idle since.

It appears that Westinghouse, in addition to hamstringing effective handling of grievances, also is attempting to speed up and to cut time values. Moreover, national negotiations for a new contract between the corporation and both the Stalinist-led UE and the larger International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) have been quite unsatisfactory. Thus the local stoppage may lengthen into a strike of several weeks' duration.

The local had recently carried out an apparently successful sit-down (May 19 to 24) on this same

issue of grievance machinery. Originally the company tried to eliminate the steward system and to refer all grievances to a general bargaining committee. The May protest re-established the steward system but the agreement then reached limited stewards' activity to "the area the steward represents."

The general committee's activity was also limited by a provision which stated: "The bargaining committee and the business representatives will be granted permission to enter the plant [only] to attend these [grievance] meetings." The literal enforcement of this latter provision was the direct cause of the present stoppage.

SAME ERRORS

In a letter sent out to its employees on June 28 the company defended its actions by charging that previously "these representatives have roamed the shop at will on all sorts of pretexts, devoting their time to activities which made little contribution to the welfare of the people they represent. Cer-

tain stewards have entered the plant, put their check on the board and spent days without doing any work..." The letter concluded by branding the walkout as "a completely unnecessary and futile hardship."

There is some truth in Westinghouse's statement. Certain petty union bureaucrats have for years ridden the "gravy train" and certain portions of the union membership have recognized this problem. However, the company now drags in these irrelevances to cover its own denial of the union's right to investigate grievances immediately, when and wherever they occur.

In the current stoppage, Local 107 leaders are again committing the chronic error of inadequately informing the membership of the issues and progress of the dispute. In addition they have also seriously weakened union morale by expelling 39 officers and members on June 28, the first day of the stoppage. The 39 had actively campaigned for the IUE-CIO prior to the National Labor Relations Board election on April 27 and were charged with "raiding and secession" almost two months ago. These expulsions were unwarranted and are likely to be costly to the union membership in the critical period that lies ahead.

The fight of Local 107 for a satisfactory grievance procedure is worthy of support despite the fact that the curious combination of local "piccards" and national union Stalinist leaders will be using the stoppage for their own selfish ends. If the stoppage lasts for a considerable time and the workers suffer serious economic losses there will be a strong feeling that "we bet on the wrong horse in the NLRB elections."

Those leaders who campaigned for the UE on the cry that "the CIO will lead you into a three-month strike as it did at Chrysler" are slated to suffer for their crimes.

In general, Westinghouse is out to do a job on both the UE and the IUE-CIO, and particularly it is aiming at the once strong, democratic and militant Local 107. Local blunders and Stalinist tricksters are helping it along.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

Attorney General Uses Korea To Put Across Loyalty Oaths

By **JOE HAUSER**

CLEVELAND, July 2—With American military forces in Korea, it is not too surprising to find some superpatriotic politicians at home willing to do their bit to further the cause of "democracy." Ohio's attorney general, Herbert S. Duffy, contributed his best by demanding that all members of his staff immediately sign non-Communist affidavits.

He also wrote the governor a letter asking that all other state employees do likewise. This action, of course, will prove once again that the U. S. has nothing but the interests of freedom at heart—for those who toe the line.

Ohio's Governor Lausche, a Democrat, caused considerable stir by his statement indicating that he might vote for either Republican Senator Taft or his challenger, Democratic and labor-union-backed Ferguson, in the coming senatorial contest. Lausche was condemned by William Green of the AFL and Jack Kroll of the CIO-PAC for this statement.

However, there has been little good will exchanged between Lausche and the labor movement in recent years. In the last state elections, PAC made no choice between the Democratic and Republican contenders for the governor's office.

POSTAL WORKER CLEARED

The first real break in the case of the Cleveland postal workers came when one of their number was ordered reinstated by the civil-service Loyalty Review Board, which cleared him of any suspicion of disloyalty. He was one of twenty, almost all Negroes and Jews, who were suspended without pay about 17 months ago. This hearing was the final appeal, outside the courts, for the suspended workers. The decisions concerning the other 19 have not yet been made public.

GM PATTERN

The first local contract patterned after the new UAW-GM agreement was just signed in Cleveland. Involved were the UAW and the Ohio Crankshaft Company, employing about 1,000 workers.

Included in the agreement were the annual four-cents-an-hour wage boost, the five-year term, the escalator clause, non-contributory \$100 pensions (to increase if federal social security goes up), liberalized group insurance, accident and sickness benefits up to \$45.50 a week for 26 weeks, and adjustment of certain wage inequities. Newspapers reports stated that the escalator clause in this contract could result, up and not downward pay adjustments.

Read About Socialism!

- THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM**page \$1.00
by Max Shachtman cloth 2.00
- SOCIALISM: The Hope of Humanity** 10¢
by Max Shachtman
- MARXISM IN THE U. S.** 35¢
by Leon Trotsky
- PLENTY FOR ALL: The Meaning of Socialism**..... 25¢
by Ernest Erber
- THE ROLE OF THE PARTY in the Fight for Socialism (mimeo'd)** 25¢
- THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS: Economic Role under Capitalism (mimeo'd)** 25¢
(Both mimeo'd pamphlets for 40¢)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.