

Let's See ALL the Records of Secret Diplomacy!

Surely, but far too slowly, the truth of World War II is coming out. Inevitably, but in piecemeal fashion, the bitter and cynical truth about the world slaughter in which 12,000,000 died and an entire continent was virtually destroyed, is coming to public knowledge and understanding. But the entire truth of the war is still, like an iceberg, nine-tenths submerged in the icy waters of secret diplomacy that surround governmental archives.

We must not, we cannot, remain satisfied with what has been revealed up till now! For each document, report, secret treaty and protocol that has been published,

there are probably half a dozen still kept under the lock and key of "state secret." The publication of the documents dealing with the story of Russian-Nazi relations between the years 1939 and 1941 uncovers but one phase of the war. The war went through many other phases, both diplomatic, military and political. What about the material dealing with this period? The war lasted six years, from 1939 to 1945, not merely two years. The years of the German-Russian alliance were but the opening period of the war. We want to know the full story, the whole story—with nothing omitted from it, for "diplomatic" purposes or any other reason.

If the American State Department has hastily published the sensational material dealing with the Hitler-Stalin shy courtship, the subsequent period of tremulous marriage and its final annulment by force of arms, it is perfectly clear why this moment was picked. The action is but a hypocritical gesture, intended to speed up the propaganda phase of the "cold war" now being waged by Truman and his government in preparation for "hot war" III. Not that we are against the publication of these documents! Far from it. We welcome them as a full and final vindication of the position long advanced by LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party that

World War II was a reactionary deception, a futile slaughter of people based exclusively on imperialist and land-grabbing premises. What we insist upon is the publication of ALL documents dealing with the war—not just those involving the sinister role of Russia, yesterday's ally, tomorrow's enemy.

What else do we insist upon knowing about? It is not difficult to be specific and concrete in our demands. We want to have all the documents and reports relating to the conferences between Roosevelt and Churchill; Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin; Stalin and Churchill, (Continued on page 3 in editorial column)

**Work for a Workers World;
Join the Workers Party!**

FEBRUARY 2, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

LABOR ACTION

England Takes Lead To Form Anti-Stalin European War Bloc

By HENRY JUDD

In a historic announcement before the House of Commons, the Foreign Secretary of the British Labor Government, Ernest Bevin, proclaimed the intention of England to create an open "Western bloc" of European nations as an essential part of the struggle against Russian expansionism. This statement has been greeted enthusiastically by Winston Churchill, actually one of its originators and long its champion, and by the American State Department, which declared that "the United States heartily welcomes" the proposal.

Bevin's proposal that a "consolidation of Western Europe" in the form of the organization of a coalition, shaped by permanent and binding alliances with France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Portugal and Italy—all such alliances to be modeled after the existing Treaty of Dunkerque between France and Britain—marks the final end of so-called British insularity and continental

"balance of power" politics.

More significant, the step must be understood as part of a world policy urged upon England by the United States, as supplementary to the European Recovery Program. The Treaty of Dunkerque is an alliance calling for military and economic cooperation and consultation in case of war between any third power and England and France. The intent, therefore, to extend this treaty to all of Western Europe, is nothing less than the creation of a war bloc on a grand scale, aimed at the eventualities of war with Russian imperialism.

The bluntness of Bevin's speech further signified an end to prior British tendencies to act as "peace-maker" between America and Russia, and the decision definitively to subordinate British foreign policy to that of America. His denunciation of the Stalin regime was deliberate and intended to make this break clear to all.

(Cont. on p. 3 in World Politics col.)

Why U. S. Withheld Facts - - And Releases Them Now

By STANLEY GRAY

The temperature of the "cold war" is fast rising. The ideological preparations for the coming war between America and Russia are being intensified. By ideological preparations we mean the persistent and all-sided campaign by the agencies of government and capitalist propaganda to demonstrate that the enemy of the future war (ally of the last one) is nothing less than a scoundrel, gangster, liar, plunderer, menace, that is, a specimen of evil which all lovers of peace should want to exterminate. The publication of the documents baring the sordid details of the Nazi-Soviet entente during the first year of the war is a tremendous broadside in this campaign.

It is said that the best defense is an offense. This holds true in a war of propaganda as well. When the U. S. loses its blast against Russia it serves not only to portray the Russian monster but, in addition, by the force of its overwhelming and damning evidence, to shunt attention away from the role of the United States in the same or similar monstrous

dealings. The fact is that the American government, and the capitalist class which this government serves are guilty of the same type of criminal, imperialistic activities which these documents prove were the crimes of Stalin.

CRIME: Russia entered the pact with Nazism, cynically and selfishly, with no genuine concern for the ideals of democracy and freedom. The official coloration of the pact, that it was a shrewd maneuver calculated to gain time and ultimately bring about the Nazi defeat, is definitively exposed by the documents. Is this exposé accurate? Absolutely. We have said this more than once and we have been the only ones to have proclaimed it at all times, not only when it became politically expedient.

WHAT OF MUNICH?

But what of the U. S. and Britain and the rest of the capitalist world now officially horrified and horrifying on this point? Was it not this same capitalist world that engineered and approved the Munich pact, which gave Hitler chunks of Europe in exchange for a temporary peace and the hope of a Nazi-Russian war? It was. It was a deal of exactly the same type as the now exposed Russo-Nazi deal. Let it be remembered that the now pious capitalist world, the U. S. included, helped sustain the rise of Hitlerism in Germany and tacitly or openly applauded his successful shackling of the German working class. Let it be remembered that it was this capitalist world, FDR's government included, which cynically and brutally preserved an unneutral neutrality, while the Nazi-sponsored Franco mutilated and enslaved the Spanish people. Let it be remembered that only yesterday, in the midst of the supposed war against fascism, this same capitalist world made a Nazi-Russian type deal with the fascistic Vichy regime of France.

Is there a difference between the U. S. and Russia on this point? Of course there is, but the difference does not lie in their genuine opposition to the fascist regimes, but in the methods, specific goals and hypocritical camouflage which each used in its respective deals with fascist regimes. What the documents say about Russia is true. But it must not be forgotten, with changes of places, names and other details, the same type of deals were engaged in by our current moralists.

CRIME: Russia divided up Europe with Germany, taking Eastern Europe for its share. Poland was cut in two, its independence wiped out over the

(Continued on page 4)

Sordid Hitler-Stalin War Ties Revealed!

REPRINTED FROM SOCIALIST APPEAL, OCTOBER, 1939



The publication of 260 documents, letters, reports and secret treaties describing the relations between Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany during the two-year period between 1939 and 1941 has not only shed full light on all the sordid details of this relationship, but has completely vindicated the analysis and condemnation of Stalinist Russia, its role in World War II and the imperialist character of its regime, offered by revolutionary socialists for many years now.

Russian-Reich relations were set in motion by the so-called non-aggression pact signed between the two powers in 1939. What a grim and sordid picture emerges from a study of the documents! All of them came from the Foreign Office of von Ribbentrop, the gentleman who was hung as a war criminal. He had been refused permission to present them in his defense during his trial in Nuremberg. At that moment, the Allied tribunal was only interested in hanging Nazis and Germans! The Russian criminals, who had participated side-by-side with the Nazis in the events described in the documents, were seated in the tribunal as judges, no less!

The revelations contained in these documents offer, too, final testimony against the charge of "alliance with Hitlerism," etc., levelled for years against Trotsky and his supporters of the Fourth International. The truth, long insisted upon by the world Trotskyist movement, that the reality was exactly the opposite, that it was Stalin and his fellow rulers in the Kremlin who had an outright political and military alliance with German imperialism, is now proved to the hilt.

What is the total picture painted by the series of documents? We urge everyone to read them for himself—

"Congrats"

Molotov summoned me this evening to his office and expressed the warmest congratulations of the Soviet Government on the splendid success of the German Armed Forces. Thereupon, Molotov informed me of the Soviet action against the Baltic states.

"Best Wishes"

Instruction carried out with Molotov today at 10:30 a.m., European time. Molotov declared that the Soviet government understood the measures which were forced upon Germany. The English had certainly gone much too far; they had disregarded completely the rights of neutral nations. In conclusion, Molotov said literally: "We wish Germany complete success in her defensive measures."

Schulenburg.

Stalinists Now Caught in Own Lies

In 1939 the Daily Worker Boasted: "The Soviet Union Makes No Secret Treaties"

By ARTHUR STEIN

Publication by the State Department of the captured Nazi documents relating to the Stalin-Hitler alliance has given the world, at last, documentary evidence of the imperialist nature of the Stalinist state, its secret diplomacy and its territorial ambitions.

As we shall show, none of the disclosures come as surprises to the Trotskyist movement. They verify, rather, the correctness of all of our previous analyses concerning those events.

RUSSIAN INVASION OF EASTERN POLAND

The most important of the secret documents now published is the protocol signed on August 23, 1939, as part of the non-aggression pact be-

tween the Hitler and Stalin governments. This document, which contains the original signatures of both Ribbentrop and Molotov, explicitly divided Poland between Germany and Russia—seven days before the war started. Other documents show that in September, 1939, Germany kept urging the Russians to speed their military intervention.

Let us see now what the Stalinists said at the time about this intervention.

Announcing the invasion to the Russian people, Molotov spoke as follows: "The Soviet government considers it to be its sacred duty to stretch out a helping hand to its brother Ukrainians and brother Byelo-Russians who inhabit Poland.... In the first days of September, when the partial mobilization of reservists to the Red Army took place in the Ukraine, Byelo-Russia and four other military districts, the situation in Poland was unclear. The calling up took place as a precautionary measure."

The international propaganda machine of the Stalinists was alerted along the same lines. An editorial in the October, 1939, issue of "The Communist International," then the official organ of the Communist International, ran as follows:

"On September 17, 1939, at the command of the Soviet government, the glorious workers' and peasants' Red Army crossed the border in order to protect the life and property of the population of Western Ukraine

and West Byelo-Russia." Similarly, a Daily Worker editorial of September 18, 1939, cynically declared that before the Russian invasion the Polish people "were left completely at the mercy of the Nazi invaders."

While the Russian propaganda machine thus tried to make the world believe that the Red Army came to liberate and to safeguard the peoples of Eastern Poland from the German armies, the documents reveal that on September 10, 1939, Molotov saw the German ambassador in Moscow to explain to him that this line was necessary to make Russian aggression "plausible to the masses." A day be-

fore, however, he had sent the ambassador the following message:

"I have received your communication regarding the entry of German troops into Warsaw. Please convey my congratulations and greetings to the German Reich government. Molotov."

RUSSIAN SECRET DIPLOMACY

At the time of the signing of the non-aggression pact between Germany and Russia in August of 1939, our socialist movement charged that there were secret clauses in the pact: "Unquestionably there are secret pledges attached to the pact which go far beyond the public document" (editorial, The New Internationalist, September, 1939).

The Trotskyist Socialist Appeal asked in an editorial of September 18, 1939: "What secret agreement for the partitioning of Poland was arrived at when the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed?" (This issue of the Appeal reached its subscribers about two days before the beginning of the Russian invasion.)

Replying to charges of this kind, Molotov had declared in his famous speech before the Supreme Soviet in August of that year:

"There are wisecracks who construe from the pact more than is written in it. (Laughter.) ... But all this merely speaks for the hopeless impotence of the enemies of the pact."

In the same vein, an editorial in the Stalinist Daily Worker declared on September 18, 1939, that "the for-

(Continued on page 4)



the book is available from the State Department—here we can only summarize the story.

The general period covered by the documents, the collaboration that began shortly after the Munich deal and ended with Hitler's attack on the USSR, is familiar. What the documents do is to cast new light on the nature of the collaboration, the motives and character of the governments and leaders involved. Talks (Continued on page 4)

"GREETINGS"

I have just received the following telephone message from Molotov: "I have received your communication regarding the entry of German troops into Warsaw. Please convey my congratulations and greetings to the German Reich government." Molotov."

Schulenburg.

Molotov expressed his agreement with the statements of the Fuehrer regarding the role of America and England. The participation of Russia in the Tripartite Pact appeared to him entirely acceptable in principle, provided that Russia was to cooperate as a partner and not be merely an object....

Schmidt.

Berlin, Nov. 16, 1940.



NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

UAW Seeks Loopholes in Taft-Hartley Law

The slave chains of the Taft-Hartley law have a weak link—and the UAW-CIO is launching an all-out drive to actually take advantage of this repressive anti-labor legislation to bolster its bargaining position in the approaching conflict with that industrial giant—General Motors.

In addition to the demands for a general wage increase, an equitable pension plan, and adequate medical and hospitalization care (all adding up to 30 cents an hour increase), the UAW is out to get what it has never achieved from General Motors—the union shop.

Many will recall that during the recent war years Congress included a provision in the Smith-Connally Act providing for a secret ballot "Yes" or "No" election on whether the workers in a plant desired to go out on strike at a given instance. This provision was supposed to show that strikes, instead of being a last-ditch mass protest of workers were really the acts of an "undisciplined, irresponsible, self-centered minority of union leaders."

Today, once again, the Congressional office boys of big business have been sucked in by their own propa-

ganda. Up and down the U. S. there were loud outcries by Congressmen, editorial writers and columnists against the "labor monopoly." Labor leaders were enslaying the workers, the individual workers were opposed to the closed shop and to the union shop, union security devices were merely means to assure the incomes of labor leaders, etc.

CLOSED SHOP BAN

Thus the Taft-Hartley law provides that in all future labor-management contracts the closed shop is banned and that before a union can negotiate for a union shop over 50 per cent of the workers employed in the bargaining units (not 50 per cent of those voting) must vote for the union shop in a secret ballot election to be held by the NLRB. (Ed. Note: A closed shop means all employees must be members of the union before being hired. A union shop provides that after a certain period of employment, usually 30 days, all employees must join the union as a term and condition of employment.) This provision of the Taft-Hartley law, in the minds of its proponents, was to put big business well on its way toward achieving the good old days of the open shop.

A conspiracy of silence on the part of the nation's newspapers has enveloped the failure of big business to achieve the open shop goal. Inconspicuous items in newspapers have shown that the union shop provision of the Taft-Hartley law has completely boomeranged. In instance after instance, literally almost without exception, where elections have been conducted for the union shop, the unions have triumphed. In the vast majority of cases the total in favor of the union shop has ranged from 80 to 98 per cent.

GARRETT ANALYZES WALLACE MOVE AT CLEVELAND WORKERS PARTY FORUM

The Henry A. Wallace third party movement is a hybrid of capitalism and Stalinism and falls far short of the need for a true independent third political party based upon strong union foundations, Emanuel Garrett, editor of LABOR ACTION, declared at a Workers Party meeting at the Slovenian Home, 6411 St. Clair Avenue N. E., Cleveland.

"We are against the Wallace movement because it does not in any way represent the Labor Party long envisioned by the socialist movement in this country," Garrett asserted. "On one hand it is nothing more than a third political party of capitalism because of its leadership by Wallace and the New Dealers around him, while on the other hand it is a creation of the Stalinists.

"It was invented by the Stalinists at this point without regard to mobilization of organized labor behind it, but solely for the purpose of applying pressure against the Marshall Plan for aid to Europe," he added.

Garrett, a veteran of more than 15 years in the radical movement in this country, said the Workers Party had no use for the argument that the Wallace movement would weaken either of the other political parties and pave the way for the building of a strong third party.

"In our view," he said, "the most important need today is the development of a Labor Party based on unions along independent lines and against the other two capitalist parties, Democrat and Republican."

The drive of the General Motors workers will undoubtedly focus nationwide attention on the union shop issue. From February 9 to March 21 an intensive drive will be conducted by the UAW in all GM plants. Its three objectives are (1) to sign up the 40,000, on a conservative estimate, unorganized GM workers within the present bargaining unit, (2) to get the necessary 30 per cent of the workers to sign cards petitioning for the holding of the union shop election, and (3) to simultaneously have the organized GM workers sign cards authorizing the check-off of union dues.

During that period the No. 1 item of UAW activity will be the GM organizing drive. All regional directors

will give it their personal attention, all available international representatives will be assigned to this activity, the Educational Department will put out streams of literature, and money will be donated by the international and local unions to provide prizes to be distributed through drawings to lucky members who sign check-off and election petition cards. The election will undoubtedly result in a great victory for the union.

However, victory at the polls does not in itself guarantee the achievement in the contract of the union shop. The union is then only legally able to bargain for the union shop. After a smashing victory in such an election all bargaining weapons are on the side of the union.

Finally, it should be noted that the signing of the Taft-Hartley non-communist affidavits is a precondition to petitioning for the union-shop election. This fact also explains the drive of the UAW administration to get these affidavits signed since there is at least a two months' waiting period between petitioning for the election and the actual election. Most of the major UAW contracts expire in April. Though the Ford contract today has a union shop provision, it will be necessary for it also to go through the same process in order to retain that provision. The signing of the affidavits, in the given instance, is necessary in order to make use of this provision in the anti-labor law for the advantage of labor.

Trust GM Pension Plan - - And You'll Lose Your Shirt!

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND—Following a barrage of posters, billboard-size wall spreads, letters to the home, bulletin board notices and chats with the foremen, General Motors Corporation has presented its latest "gift" to its workers—a new group insurance plan. The GM propaganda machine is out to sell this "present" to the workers, but a careful analysis of the plan reveals something less than the philanthropic motives the corporation wishes to be known for.

Before going into the details of the plan, let's look at the timing and the method by which it is offered to the workers. "Better Protection" was offered on January 1 and is to go into effect February 1. The GM contract with the UAW-CIO expires April 28 and negotiations will start early in March. Close timing!

Everyone knows that the UAW is pushing for pensions and greater security for its members. In an effort to avoid negotiating such matters with the elected representatives of the workers in the shops, GM wants to effect its own security plan. Hoping to present the union with an accomplished fact—a security plan adopted by most of the workers—GM is pushing hard to sell this plan. Many men and women are falling for the line: Well, it's better than what we have now. This may be true, but it isn't better than what the union will ask for and what the workers need and deserve. In a similar manner, we may expect a company offer of a five or ten-cent raise, when the rise in the cost of living warrants a 25 to 35 per cent increase.

BY-PASSING UNION Equally important is the fact that the company is completely by-passing the union in a matter which rightly belongs to union-company negotiations. The locals should bring this to the attention of their members and should urge the workers to reject the plan. If GM succeeds in putting across other changes in working conditions and pay on the basis of a direct offer by the company to the individual shop workers—"take it or leave it"—collective bargaining will be lost.

Now let's look at the details of this new group insurance plan. Under the old plan, the amount of life insurance

was the same for everyone—\$2,000. The new plan provides for \$2,000 to \$4,000 insurance, depending on hourly rate earned. As GM explains, this is meant to be equivalent to a full year's pay. It sounds reasonable, but as in any ordinary policy, you pay more in premiums to get more insurance. All the new benefits are scaled according to rate of pay and so are the premiums paid by the workers.

Then there are a lot of figures to work out, to compute what your insurance is after age 65. If you have 10 years or more in the GM plan and if you work until you are 65, then you get continuing life insurance (this means you stop paying premiums) for an amount ranging from \$500 to \$1,200. However, the conditions are such that for every ten who can possibly qualify for this, about nine will get the minimum \$500 insurance. Thus you will be insured for a higher amount while younger, but at 65, when your chances of dying are higher, you are insured for less. That makes sense for the plan, but not for you.

Next come sickness and accident benefits. These benefits are more than under the old plan. They are now \$14 to \$23 a week for a maximum of 26 weeks a year, depending again on hourly rate. As in the previous plan, there is a one-week waiting period. To be brief, we can say that the benefit for the average worker (\$21 or under) is inadequate to meet today's cost of living, let alone doctors' bills and medicine; and there is no reason why a sick or injured man should have to wait a full week before becoming eligible to collect. In actual practice, the one-week waiting period (which must be repeated for each unrelated sickness or accident) means that the average worker will not collect any benefit at all.

Then GM boasts a new total and permanent disability clause. But watch the "ifs." If you have 15 years in the plan, and if you are under 60, and if you become totally AND permanently disabled, THEN you get 50 monthly payments ranging from \$40 to \$80 each. Suppose you have less than 15 years in the plan, or are over 60, or are totally but not permanently disabled? Then you have the privilege of keeping up your policy; just pay the usual premium. In case you are disabled, even this privilege is limited to one year from last day worked!

Who pays for all this? You do! Or at least, you know you pay 40 to 80 cents a week for this plan. GM says it pays all the costs above what you pay. But WHAT does GM pay? That is a deep, dark secret. Just be satisfied at the benevolence of the company. They may pay a sizable amount, but they probably don't, or they wouldn't be so secretive about their contribution. Nor is this all you pay for your "security." If you have hospitalization and surgical insurance, that is so much extra.

Now perhaps you may begin to think: who is in a better position to pay for this security, no matter how inadequate it may be, the worker who is squeezed by high prices on one side and irregular work weeks on the other, and who is forced to dig into whatever savings he has; or an employer who made more profit than ever before during this past year?

Finally, as in all such things, it is necessary to read the fine print. We find it reads as follows: "General Motors believes wholeheartedly in this new insurance plan for GM men and women, and expects to continue the plan indefinitely. However, it reserves the right to modify, revoke, suspend, terminate or change the plan, in whole or in part, at any time, subject to the provisions of the group policy and any applicable federal or state laws." (From "Better Protection," published by General Motors Corp., January, 1948.)

TRUST GM In other words, trust General Motors! Trust a company so petty as to lay off workers on the second and third shifts this past Christmas Eve, rather than give them a chance to work half a day at time and a half as in three previous years. Trust a company which called in workers just previous to the 1945 strike, so as to disqualify them deliberately for unemployment insurance. Trust a company which sends men home for six or twelve minutes, let alone days at a time, in order to save a few dollars. Trust a company which refuses to sit down and bargain with the union representing its employees on security and pension plans. Trust them, and lose your shirt!

lege is limited to one year from last day worked!

Who pays for all this? You do! Or at least, you know you pay 40 to 80 cents a week for this plan. GM says it pays all the costs above what you pay. But WHAT does GM pay? That is a deep, dark secret. Just be satisfied at the benevolence of the company. They may pay a sizable amount, but they probably don't, or they wouldn't be so secretive about their contribution. Nor is this all you pay for your "security." If you have hospitalization and surgical insurance, that is so much extra.

Now perhaps you may begin to think: who is in a better position to pay for this security, no matter how inadequate it may be, the worker who is squeezed by high prices on one side and irregular work weeks on the other, and who is forced to dig into whatever savings he has; or an employer who made more profit than ever before during this past year?

Finally, as in all such things, it is necessary to read the fine print. We find it reads as follows: "General Motors believes wholeheartedly in this new insurance plan for GM men and women, and expects to continue the plan indefinitely. However, it reserves the right to modify, revoke, suspend, terminate or change the plan, in whole or in part, at any time, subject to the provisions of the group policy and any applicable federal or state laws." (From "Better Protection," published by General Motors Corp., January, 1948.)

TRUST GM

In other words, trust General Motors! Trust a company so petty as to lay off workers on the second and third shifts this past Christmas Eve, rather than give them a chance to work half a day at time and a half as in three previous years. Trust a company which called in workers just previous to the 1945 strike, so as to disqualify them deliberately for unemployment insurance. Trust a company which sends men home for six or twelve minutes, let alone days at a time, in order to save a few dollars. Trust a company which refuses to sit down and bargain with the union representing its employees on security and pension plans. Trust them, and lose your shirt!

Notes on West Coast Labor Movement...

By WILLIAM BARTON

Workers on two privately owned San Francisco cable car lines, members of the AFL Carmen's Union, Local 1360, have voted to go on strike if threatened wage cuts are instituted next week. The owners claim they are now operating at a loss. The union states that it was never consulted regarding wage raises during profitable years; therefore, it sees no reason to cooperate with the company in bringing wages down below prevailing rates now that the companies are making less money. The strike vote was almost unanimous.

This is true only in a limited sense. There are fewer sections that can be classified as slums in the traditional sense, apparently fewer homes without running water and toilet facilities (though recent surveys have shown that there are some criminal lacks in these essentials, too). But, whatever advantage this may produce is balanced by the poor heating and refrigeration provisions, justified by the myth that the city is never too cold or too warm. Even more significant is the amount of overcrowding and the large number of people living in ramshackle, "temporary" dwellings. They are a fundamental feature of living in the boom towns of the East Bay Area.

One CIO union in the Bay Area has just won a lawsuit involving supposed Taft-Hartley Act violations and another very significant case is now pending. The first involved the charge by the Sunset Line & Twine Co. of Petaluma that officials of Local 6 of the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union, representing its striking employees, were responsible for any illegal acts committed by anyone in the picketing area. The company's "case" was so fantastic (one of the charges was that the union was automatically guilty of putting tacks in a driveway because some tacks were found in the night watchman's tires) that NLRB Trial Examiner C. W. Whitmore recommended immediate dismissal. He also pointed out that there were no legal restraints against pickets calling scabs any name they please, an item which many employers had hoped to use as part of their union-busting arsenal.

The other case concerns the suits of Matson Navigation Company against the National Union of Marine Cooks & Stewards for some \$27,000 in damages growing out of the refusal of members to work on two ships that were refusing overtime pay. The company charges that this action constituted a strike in violation of contract. The union contends that it was merely an act of individual workers. Matson does not deny that the men worked overtime, but claims it was ordered not to pay overtime claims by the Pacific American Shipowners Association. The Association, in turn, denies that it opposed the overtime payments. The union is not only testing the constitutionality of the "punitive" sections of the Taft-Hartley Act, but is considering counter-attacks of contract suits against Matson.

A special California State Senate committee has been informed by a representative of the Associated Homebuilders Council of California that 200,000 homes, an apparently impressive figure of 20 per cent of those planned for the entire country, is to be built next year in the state. He admitted that only one in five will be for rent and these will cost \$70 a month. He did not mention what the sale price of the others would be.

Most observers seriously doubt the above figures. Langdon Post, former regional public housing administrator and one-time housing commissioner of New York City, disputed, in testimony before the legislative committee, the contractors' figure of 187,000 California homes built last year. He insisted that they built no more than 85,000 and asserted that the "housing situation is getting worse instead of better."

This column has several times said that much of California, particularly San Francisco, actually appears better housed than many other areas.

At a meeting attended by 4,000 members of Local 10, CIO, San Francisco Longshoremen overwhelmingly voted to reject a proposed layoff of 500 members. Pressured by a small group of reactionaries within the local, President James Kearney presented a resolution which provided that the union lay off 500 men. This clique, motivated primarily by its anti-Negro feeling, tried to capitalize on a seasonal slow-down of work to dump 530 members, mostly Negroes, out of the union.

More than 25 rank and filers spoke against the proposal. The argument of those opposing the layoff was: (1) It is wrong to gain higher wages at the expense of fellow workers. (2) It is wrong for the union to do the employers' dirty work. (3) The short hours resulting from the seasonal slump would be acceptable if wages were increased sufficiently. (4) Demands for a shorter shift at a higher hourly rate must be presented to the employers. (5) Within the union the insecurity of the slack season must be minimized by revisions in the dispatching system. All work must be shared more equally than in the past.

Less than 100 members voted for the layoff. In its place a proposal designed to share the work more equally was passed by the same smashing majority which rejected the layoff.

The known Stalinist members of the local, in opposition to Kearney but closely allied with the international leadership of Harry Bridges, straddled the issue until the meeting itself, when their spokesmen hopped on the opposition bandwagon.

What was to have been an offensive against the new men generally and the Negroes specifically boomeranged into an expression of unity and solidarity between Negro and white longshoremen.

SHACHTMAN TRACES WAR DANGER

LOS ANGELES, Calif., Jan. 23—Characterized by its own spokesman as inevitably leading to, in the not distant future, a third world war, capitalism today is not only a brutal exploiter and a brake upon progress but a threat to the continued existence of civilization itself. American labor, the mightiest organized force in the world, can, through independent political action, become the government of the nation.

These ideas formed the core of an address delivered in Embassy Auditorium tonight to 125 members and friends of the Workers Party by Max Shachtman, the party's national chairman, who is concluding a tour of the West Coast.

With the Workers Party

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, class lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the WORKERS PARTY. For information of WORKERS PARTY activities in cities not listed below, write to WORKERS PARTY, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

- AKRON: Write to Box 221. BALTIMORE: International Fellowship House, 21 West Preston St., 2nd floor. Public forums every second Friday of each month. Socialist Youth League meets every Monday at 8:00 p.m. BUFFALO: 639 Main St., 2nd floor. Office hours, 11 a.m.-2 p.m., Monday through Friday. Open meetings Sunday evenings. Discussion groups Thursday evenings. CHICAGO: 1501 W. Madison Ave., 2nd floor, Chicago 7. Tel.: CHEASPEAKE 5798. Office hours, 3:00-5:30 p.m. daily. Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. CLEVELAND: WP Branch meets Sundays, 8:00 p.m., in Room 4, Slovenian Hall, 6409 St. Clair Ave. Write to Bernard Douglas, Box 1139, Cleveland 3, Ohio. DETROIT: 6341 Gratiot, Room 10. Telephone: PLAZA 5559. Open on Tuesdays and Fridays, 1 to 5 p.m. LOS ANGELES: 3214 So. Grand, Los Angeles 7. Tel.: RICHMOND 7-2330 (if no answer, phone AX-2-9667). Office hours, 2 to 5 p.m. daily. NEWARK: 248 Market St., Newark 2. Open house Friday evenings. NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. Open every day from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday until 10:30 p.m. Tel.: WATKINS 4-4222. HARLEM BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at Workers Party Headquarters, 2143 Seventh Ave. (near 126th St.), Room 9.

Attention, Philadelphia Readers: Attend Dinner in Celebration of 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Modern Socialism Saturday, February 7, 6:30 P. M. LABOR ACTION HALL 1139 West Girard Ave. (12th and Girard) Address by EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor of Labor Action \$1.00 DONATION COVERS COST OF SPAGHETTI DINNER Please Make Reservations by Writing Labor Action Hall Before Feb. 4

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Socialist Party Youth Revolt

Dear Editor:

A revolt against Socialist Party reformism and servility to American imperialism rocks the Young People's Socialist League, SP youth section. Rising from its customary apathy, the Socialist Party officialdom has mustered strength to crush an attempt to give the League and Party a left socialist character.

Alarmed by repeated reactionary policies of the Norman Thomas party, the left wing crystallized under the banner of the Libertarian faction, led by Jim Dinsmoor and Robert Bone. The Libertarians attack the party's official support of the Marshall Plan, its negotiations for unity with the Social - Democratic Federation, its support of anti-working class measures taken by the British Labor Party and its bureaucratic handling of internal disputes.

Unfortunately, not all of Libertarian politics is commendable. They are characterized by a healthy aversion to bureaucratism and totalitarianism. On the positive side, their politics are haz. Handicapped by the anti-Bolshevik bias in SP circles, the Libertarians have been unable to analyze the history of the socialist movement objectively. It is apparent to them that the SP cannot provide the working class with sound revolutionary leadership. Unwilling, however,

seriously to consider the Bolshevik program, the Libertarians have drifted into a position close to anarchism, near Macdonald.

Despite many months of activity in which the Libertarians proved themselves to be the most vital force within the YPSL, leading the League in recruiting, the latest national convention deposed the left-wing national secretary. Under the guidance of the party, many genuinely socialist resolutions were defeated. It is charged that the left wing was reduced to an inferior organizational status by party maneuvers violating the League constitution. Nevertheless, the defeated faction is now the only active segment in the YPSL.

With the right wing in the driver's seat, the organization has all but ceased to function. Only the Educational Committee is operating, and the Libertarians charge that under rightist pressure even this work is being hampered. A key point in the leftist struggle for internal democracy was the program for regular publication of YSR, the Ypsel internal discussion bulletin. YSR has not been printed since before the July convention. In order to contact the membership, the Libertarian group has been forced to issue its own publication.

MORIBUND REFORMISTS

In striking contrast to the reformists, leftist activity intensified recent-

ly. A group of Libertarians, recognizing that any successful socialist movement must be rooted among industrial workers, moved to Flint, Mich., to work and integrate themselves in the automobile industry. This labor team led a significant struggle against Flint Jim Crow. Characteristically, the articles on Ypsel activities in The Call, SP organ, make no mention of the Libertarian efforts.

An indication of the intellectual sterility of the present YPSL leadership is given by the Socialist Youth League, WP youth section. Several months ago the SYL invited the YPSL to participate in an inter-League discussion or debate. The letter was never acknowledged.

Conceding political differences between the SYL and the Ypsel Libertarians, the SYL is nevertheless confident that growing disgust toward Socialist Party leadership will encourage the left wingers to examine their prejudices toward the WP. It is hoped that collaboration between these two youth groups on common programmatic points may soon be established.

F. J.

Read and Subscribe to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Opinion on Petrillo Ban

Dear Editor:

On December 31, 1947, all phonograph recording companies stopped cutting new discs because the American Federation of Musicians had come to the democratic decision that its members could no longer accept recording contracts. It is pretty thoroughly understood by this time that the action of the union was not brought about by the recording firms. The specific issue over which the ban was decreed involved the cessation of royalty payments to the union. This payment was blocked by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill: The recording firms are willing and prepared to continue royalty payments to the union.

The fact is, however, that James C. Petrillo and his organization have been eager for a pretext on which to ban recordings for years—and for a very simple and legitimate reason. That reason is that it's impossible for union members to profit by their recording activities. First, a musician's scale for a record date was \$41 for a three-hour session, in which he was permitted by union regulation to make four master records (two two-sided commercial platters). Thereafter he received no royalties or other payment. Of course, only a handful of musicians were recognized sufficiently to be kept in steady re-

ording work. Furthermore, local radio stations all over the country take up a vast amount of program time in disc-jockey shows. These shows offer recorded music in huge quantities, in most cases eliminating the necessity for live music in the station. It is estimated that with recorded music off the air, radio stations of the nation will eventually be forced to employ regularly 40,000 musicians in addition to those now in radio work.

Hundreds of the larger tap rooms and clubs which actually need musical entertainment of some sort to maintain patronage have been able to rely on the juke box as a cheap way to meet the demand. With the elimination of popular records, these places will, in the ordinary course of competition, have to supply some kind of live music. It is estimated that close to 5,000 musicians will find their way into these opportunities.

It's true, of course, that the big names in popular music will feel the effects of the ban. The name band leaders, for example, will feel a sharp decline in their bank accounts when the royalties stop flowing—but that only means that the big boys will have to get out and hustle to live up the deficit by playing more live dates than they've been inclined to, thereby giving the public more opportunity to see their favorites in person rather than via radio and recording.

Anti-Juke Box.

Editorials

Secret Records

(Continued from page 1)

etc. We want to know what the Big Three said when they sat around to discuss the carving up of their world, not Hitler's world. We want to know all the details, including the secret protocols and treaties, agreed upon at the Casablanca, Yalta and Potsdam conferences. We want to know how it was agreed to split up Korea, divide Germany into four sections, hand over Eastern Europe to Stalin, etc. In a word, we want the records from 1941 to 1945 opened up and made public in the same manner that the records of the previous two years of the war have been revealed.

What a fascinating story this will make! Stalin, in complete and convincing fashion, has been revealed as an utterly rotten, cynical and corrupt imperialist scoundrel on a level neither lower nor higher than Hitler. That's the purpose of these documents, is it not, gentlemen of the State Department? Yet for four complete years, Roosevelt and Churchill sat down next to this man, worked hand in glove with him against his erstwhile ally, and, above all, arranged the terms of the post-war "peace" with him! Are we to believe that Stalin has changed by this association? Or, could the truth be what we strongly suspect?

That Stalin merely changed sides and found himself still in company quite to his style and keeping; that his new associates spoke a language little different from that of the Fuehrer—carving up nations, countries, sub-continents and continents; thwarting democratic movements and open expressions of popular opinion and solving each problem strictly in terms of the power issues involved. If our charges are not true, then why the hesitation to publish the documents dealing with these years? We freely predict that their publication (and it will eventually come, despite resistance and common assent by the Big Three against their revelation) will tell us the same story for "the other side." If the Nazi-Stalin alliance was imperialist, the Allied-Stalin alliance was not one whit less so.

Meanwhile, everything possible must be done to tear these documents out of the secret files and spread them before the public. The demand of socialists, the labor movement, liberals and anti-war people everywhere should be of such power as to force a reluctant State Department to halt its conspiracy against the whole truth about World War II. Open the books of secret diplomacy and let the story about wars under capitalism come out! The struggle for publication of the secret treaties and negotiations is a basic part of the living struggle against a repetition of the last war!

An end to secret diplomacy!
An end to the silence conspiracy about Roosevelt's and Churchill's parts in World War II! For the publication of all wartime documents!

The HC of L

The latest figures released by the Bureau of Statistics section of the Labor Department reveals that the average earnings of a factory worker now amount to \$62.50 per week, or over \$2,500 per year—higher than previous records. But this is only part of the picture, since it covers only dollar wages, not real wages.

The same report of the Bureau of Statistics indicates that a factory worker with a wife and two school-age children now needs about \$3,500 per year for a "modest but adequate" standard of living. This is for a worker's family in New York, while a family in a city where standards are lower—New Orleans, for example—would require \$3,000 per year for the same size family. So the worker and his family are, at present wages, about \$1,000 shy yearly of a "modest but adequate" standard! To meet this standard, he would have to earn about \$20 more each week—an increase of 33 per cent of his weekly wage, or about 45 cents more per hour.

How modest then, in the light of these government statistics, is the demand for 30 cents more per hour requested of General Motors by the UAW! We're heartily in favor of the American labor movement closing up as rapidly as possible the gap between existing monetary wages and the "modest but adequate" wage standards used by the Labor Department in preparing its statistics.

CIO and Wallace

The National Council of the CIO at its recent session has rejected any support to Henry Wallace or the idea of organizing a third party in '48. With the exception of the well-known Stalinist members of the council, who announced their intention to support Wallace regardless, the rejection was sharp and pointed.

As is known to our readers, LABOR ACTION also rejects Wallace and his phony Stalinist-inspired campaign. We have no quarrel with the CIO leadership on this score. But we disagree, emphatically and unconditionally, with every single reason and explanation advanced by the CIO Council for rejecting support to Wallace. Their motivation rests upon the spurious argument of the "lesser evil," the bane and curse of the American labor movement since way back.

Murray and associates reject Wallace because his movement appears to be the organization of a "third party," which will tend to split that vague and mysterious thing known as "the progressive vote," thus enabling Republican and other reactionaries to get into office. The thing to do, therefore, is to cling like crazy to the Democratic Party (that's the "lesser evil"), put back good Democrats, with Truman at their head. That's the sum and substance of the argument.

Its political meaning is obvious enough. Labor, the heart and soul of our nation, shall always

subordinate its own interests to those of the capitalist parties—to be sure, picking the least "evil" of the two. We're against Wallace and his party because it's a fake third party, having no genuine labor roots. The CIO bureaucracy is against it because it has the faintest threat of setting into motion a movement for essential independent action in this country. What would Murray have to say if there existed a powerful, grass-roots labor trend for an independent Labor Party? How long will these men tie labor to voting an "evil," even a lesser one, when the possibility of voting for a "good," labor's own good, could so easily be created?

Yes, LABOR ACTION rejects support to Wallace, but not for a single one of the CIO leadership's reasons. In what way are they better than the treacherous behavior of aged A. F. Whitney, railway workers' leader, who (without blushing) has informed us that he will support "Strike-Breaker" Truman for re-election? The "program" offered to American labor by the CIO in '48 is worthless, meaningless and without any object. It will inspire no one.

Miners' Pension

The United Mine Workers' latest demand on the coal operators—a pension plan—is a MUST for coal miners. The putting forward of the demand, and its immediate rejection by the operators, greatly increases the possibility of a coal strike this year.

The plan proposed to the operators calls for the pension money to come from the health and welfare fund now raised by a levy on each ton of coal mined. Miners who reach the age of 60 with 20 years' service would get \$100 a month under the plan. The operators say that this additional outlay would be "exorbitant."

Certainly no one is more entitled to retirement than a veteran of the mines. Every year, about 12 per cent are killed or injured at work. The death rate from accidents is about 700 per cent above that of industry as a whole. The tuberculosis rate among miners is 68 per cent above the industrial average. A man who can go through twenty years of that more than deserves to live decently and securely in his old age.

The operators are certainly in a position to pay the pension. Coal production is at a peace-time high and demand promises to continue. Mechanization, which is taking place very rapidly in the coal industry with more efficient machines constantly being introduced, is piling up profits.

There is an additional reason why a militant strike for a pension plan, higher wages and improved safety conditions would make the coal barons think twice about being stubborn. Young men in the mine areas have no inducement to enter the mines. The average age of miners is now a dangerously high fifty-one years. You can't dig coal without miners. The operators had better think about this.

Pat on the Back

The New Internationalist has changed its face, but not its ideas! The January issue has a new cover which strikingly improves its appearance and is intended to make it stand out on the newsstands. It has changed its face but its contents contain the same interesting and important material which has long made it recognized as the outstanding Marxist journal of opinion. No informed political person interested in labor and world politics can afford to miss a single issue. The January issue has the following varied articles:

Notes of the Month discusses "Why Is Wallace Running?" and also "The Politics of Anti-Inflation," "Compulsory Free Trade at Havana" and introduces a new feature, Editorial Shorts, on "Altgeld and Amesty," "Three Partitions" and "Third Force."

The most recent events in strife-torn Palestine and India are discussed by Albert Findley in "What's Ahead for Partitioned Palestine?" and "Toward the Re-Unification of India," by Henry Judd.

The new type of Stalinist observed for years by many is analyzed in an article by Hal Draper and in two book reviews by J. M. Fenwick and Irving Howe. This is discussed under the heading "The Neo-Stalinist Type—Notes on a New Political Ideology."

Part II of a series by James T. Farrell on "James Connolly—Nationalist and Internationalist" is continued in this issue.

No other Marxist journal has been carrying so much material on South American politics, economics and the labor movement as The New Internationalist. This issue contains another fine article by Luis Velasco on "Peron: Nationalist Revolutionary or Imperialist Agent?"

Books and Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

- The New Course (with an introduction, "The Struggle for the New Course," by Max Shachtman) 265 pp. Cloth \$2.00 Paper 1.50
- Stalin 516 pp. Cloth 5.00
- Living Thoughts of Karl Marx 184 pp. Cloth 1.50
- The First Years of the Communist International, Vol. I 384 pp. Cloth 2.50
- The Revolution Betrayed 308 pp. Cloth 2.00 Paper 1.00
- Marxism in the United States 44 pp. .35
- Their Morals and Ours 48 pp. .20
- Stalinism and Bolshevism 32 pp. .10
- Leon Sedoff 32 pp. .10
- The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International 64 pp. .25
- The Suppressed Testament of Lenin 48 pp. .25
- Fascism—What It Is—How to Fight It 48 pp. .15

Order from:
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.
All orders must be prepaid. Orders of \$25 or more receive 10 per cent discount. Make checks payable to LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE.

WORLD POLITICS

Marshall Plan and Western Bloc

(Continued from page 1)

Although Britain is the formal spokesman in launching this planned Western bloc, the voice of American imperialism and the State Department speaks loudly and clearly through the lips of Bevin. This does not mean that American pressure has forced a reluctant England to present his stand—in fact, the interests of British imperialism coincide with the creation of such a bloc. But the true driving force behind the plan is unquestionably America, the leader of the anti-Russian world bloc. At a later stage, revived Italy, the Mediterranean countries of Turkey and Greece, as well as certain Scandinavian nations will be brought into the bloc.

The British plan is a logical and expected extension of the American Marshall Plan. It can only be understood in this sense, and assumes a striking similarity to the series of treaties and alliances now being signed, under Russian supervision, by the Balkan nations. The two great world blocs of rival American and Russian imperialism, embracing to one or another degree every last country of our planet, both have lesser blocs within their framework. Stalin is building his Balkan-Eastern Europe bloc as feverishly as Truman builds his Western Europe one. For what purposes? War, surely and inevitably—no one doubts this any longer.

THE ELDER STATESMAN

Now, why is the Western Europe entente conception a consistent extension of the Marshall Plan? Why did the American State Department so spontaneously give its blank check endorsement to the plan of the British Foreign Office? Why did Secretary of State Marshall announce his approval after its consideration by the Truman cabinet?

In part, the answer to these questions has already been given. Any plan whose objective is the "creation of a Western European bloc solidly across the path of the Soviet Union" (PM, January 25) cannot but have the enthusiastic support of American imperialism. Yet there is more involved, and for this we must examine the testimony of Bernard Baruch, the 77-year-old American "elder statesman," who—in his own way—comes as close to presenting the broadest and clearest description of the historic destiny American imperialism has set for itself as any individual we know. To realize this, it is only necessary to contrast the sweep and scope of his conceptions with the penny-pinching and narrow-minded ideas of Herbert Hoover, whose imperialist horizon is strapped tight to dollars and

taxes. Socialist thought respects the measure of a true opponent, of the Baruch type, but can only have contempt for a Hoover. Let us see what financier-banker Baruch suggests. In the long run, imperialism will tend to follow his plan and reject that of a Hoover.

We are concerned here only with his international program, not his domestic plans, important and bound-up with his other ideas as they undoubtedly are. Baruch speaks out fully for ERP, but realizes that it cannot be held to a narrow economic base but must fit into a much wider strategic conception. It must be broadened out into a far-reaching political and military alliance of America and Western Europe. The United States, said Baruch, must guarantee to buy up all excess raw materials throughout the world and, with this vast warehouse under its lock and key, take the lead in forming the nations of Europe into a "political, economic and defense union," whose preservation is to be guaranteed by America. In their concreteness, Baruch's proposals went far beyond the rather vague statements of Bevin at London. As an "elder statesman," without direct responsibility, his position permits him to concretize what is implied by others. The two speeches must thus be considered together.

"PROMISE TO GO TO WAR"

Baruch lifted the discussion on the Marshall Plan to the heights of international strategy. ERP is but an economic beginning, in his eyes, of a long-range program which must aim at the total reorganization of Europe under American hegemony. "We must develop a global strategy for American peace-making." The European union under American leadership shall be guaranteed up to the point of "a firm promise to go to war in joint defense if any of them are attacked." War with Russia, of course, is meant. The Marshall Plan "must be fitted into a larger structure of foreign and domestic policy, rugged enough for the uncertainties ahead." Baruch advocated the creation, under Truman, of a general staff to supervise the working out of his international strategy.

In outline form, the Baruch plan presents the goals set by American imperialism over the next decades. European unification under American rationing; global strategy aimed primarily at capturing control of all raw material resources; and preparation for war against rival Russian imperialism. This is a broad program, hardly realizable over a short time. In offering itself as the organizer of the Western Europe bloc of nations, British imperialism takes its place in the schema laid down at Washington. The unfolding debates on the Marshall Plan continue to serve the function of revealing the theory and practice of imperialism.



CHRIST STOPPED AT EBOLI, by Carlo Levi. Progressive Book Club, \$2.00 for members.

Though it hardly justifies the lavish praise bestowed on it by critics who inspire the suspicion that they were animated in great measure by the weak, futile political conclusions of the book, Carlo Levi's account of a year spent in a remote village in Southern Italy is nevertheless exceptionally interesting. Doctor and painter, Carlo Levi was exiled to Eboli by the Mussolini dictatorship because of his opposition to the Ethiopian War. He found a village so poverty-stricken, so desolate, so removed from even the miserable civilization of oppressed peasant Italy that, according to peasant folklore, Christ stopped BEFORE entering it.

Written with moving simplicity and a genuine love for the peasants who eke out a bare existence cultivating non-arable land and raising starved goats, Levi's book is a captivating description of a section of Italy (and its people) where magic and primitive incantation maintain an edge over official and organized religion. At the same time it reduces with superb literary precision, the cruelty and stupidity of fascism to its basest common denominator. The book is definitely worth reading and the Progressive Book Club is to be commended for adding it to its list. (Merely parenthetically—so much has been made of Carlo Levi's anti-fascism in the tremendous publicity attending the book, that we are led to inquire as a matter of sincere interest: what was the nature of this anti-fascist record apart from "opposition to the Ethiopian War?"—E. G.)

Perhaps unintentionally, Kraus does a neat job of destroying some of the myths built up around the persons of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and former Governor Frank Murphy, long heralded as outstanding "friends of labor." Kraus relates the story of the first break between John L. Lewis and President Roosevelt. It took place during the GM strike, when Roosevelt called Lewis to the White House and demanded that Lewis order the GM workers to go back to work, without a contract. That was Roosevelt's sole contribution to the auto workers, engaged in a life-and-death struggle. If Lewis had done nothing else but say no to this outrageous strike-breaking demand, his role would have been progressive. Lewis stood by the auto workers, he poured funds and qualified organizers into the strike and personally came to Detroit to handle negotiations!

The GM Strike

THE MANY AND THE FEW, by Henry Kraus, the Plantin Press, Los Angeles, 1947.

Reviewed by WALTER JASON

If Henry Kraus' book on the great 1937 General Motors sit-down strike did nothing else than remind the trembling bureaucrats of the CIO that this powerful organization was built through class struggle, it would serve a useful purpose. It is also a valuable source of study for younger militants who were not fortunate enough to participate in that significant period of turbulent labor history. For much of what Kraus writes is accurate, descriptive and revealing, in spite of the inevitable factional slant of the author, one-time editor of the United Automobile Worker and active participant in the GM strike. The Daily Worker's complaint that Kraus underplayed the role of the Stalinist party in the GM strike indicates that he did try to see further ahead than his pro-Stalinist vision ordinarily would permit.

For example, the Reuther brothers, Victor, Roy and Walter, come out looking pretty good in this book, in spite of Kraus' obvious hero-worship

of his old-time associate, Wyndham Mortimer, and his exaggeration of the work of Robert Travis, organizational director in the Flint area. In fact, the Reuther brothers look all the more impressive when described by a factional opponent. Homer Martin flashes through this book, as he did through the UAW. So do other labor figures, many of whom have since passed into obscurity. The book is good background reading material, in a word, for those who are vitally interested in the UAW and the labor movement as a whole.

The most significant part of this book treats with the politics and the national personalities of that day. Regrettable indeed that this wasn't written with the kind of critical and analytical approach that marks a book like Charles Rumford Walker's "American City." Walker drew the social and political forces operating in the Minneapolis strikes in clear-cut pictures. The politics in Kraus' book are indirect. We are not speaking of the inner-union politics, but rather of the major political forces operating in the GM strike struggle.

Perhaps unintentionally, Kraus does a neat job of destroying some of the myths built up around the persons of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and former Governor Frank Murphy, long heralded as outstanding "friends of labor." Kraus relates the story of the first break between John L. Lewis and President Roosevelt. It took place during the GM strike, when Roosevelt called Lewis to the White House and demanded that Lewis order the GM workers to go back to work, without a contract. That was Roosevelt's sole contribution to the auto workers, engaged in a life-and-death struggle. If Lewis had done nothing else but say no to this outrageous strike-breaking demand, his role would have been progressive. Lewis stood by the auto workers, he poured funds and qualified organizers into the strike and personally came to Detroit to handle negotiations!

As for Governor Murphy—the epitome of the New Deal liberals—he demanded that Lewis back down from his demands on GM and that he get the sit-downers to evacuate the plants or he'd send the National Guard into the shops to clear them out. Lesser men might have quailed before this threat of a "friend of labor," but Lewis merely told the Governor that in those circumstances he'd have to leave the conference immediately to join the sit-downers so he could be there when the troops came to clear them out! The counter-pressure worked and Murphy took a "middle of the road" position again. Lewis understood the temper of the sit-downers. Murphy was a befuddled politician.

How amusing to read the special explanation in Kraus' preface on why he gives the facts showing Lewis' progressive role in that period. Since the break in 1941 between Lewis and the Stalinists, he was nothing but a

devil to them. In fact, they even called him a fascist. No doubt Kraus wanted to soften the blows his Stalinist audience might have in reading about Lewis. They aren't very happy about the build-up this book gives Walter Reuther, either.

We know that many of the participants in the GM strike disagree with this or that aspect of the description Kraus gives either of a specific event or of individual roles. Certainly his sharp attack on Kermit Johnson, Flint strike leader, is contradicted by other accounts written of those days. As an example, Rose Pesotta in her autobiographical work, has a much higher and more accurate evaluation of Johnson. So do others.

THE GM EMPIRE

This book concerns itself primarily, and properly so, with the tense struggles at Flint, heart of the GM empire. The Battle of Bulls Run, the capture-of-Chevy 4 and other highlights of the strike will refresh the memories of old UAW militants and bring back that feeling that was the mark of a CIO man in those great days.

The GM strike furnished important lessons to all labor. The sit-down strike got its biggest test and won its biggest victory as a new and powerful tactic of labor. But more important than the tactical lessons are the political implications of that struggle. The GM workers rallied the decisive masses of American people behind them through their bold fight and uncompromising opposition to the Wall Street owners of General Motors. They proved what class independence, class action and class leadership could do. They showed what class power labor possesses. Those factors brought victory for the CIO. They are the source of a successful labor program for this epoch of Taft-Hartley laws and the general anti-labor drive.

Notice to New York Readers:

The TIME and PLACE of the DEBATE between DWIGHT MACDONALD Editor of "Politics" and

HAL DRAPER Editor of "The New Internationalist"

on

"Is Working Class Action the Road to Socialism?"

has been changed to

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 29

at LABOR TEMPLE, 14th Street, near Second Avenue, N. Y. C., 7:30 P. M. Auspices: LABOR ACTION FORUM

ON DOGS:

Who Does the Chewing And Who Gets Chewed?

By GORDON HASKELL

The other day my friend, Jack, and I were sitting in the Workers Party office reading the papers and chewing the fat generally.

"I'll be damned," says Jack, "if the AFL hasn't gone and did something progressive for a change."

"What have they done now?" says I. "On a motion by Paul Clifford of the carpenters," says Jack, "the San Francisco Council has unanimously disapproved Bill Green's proposal to increase the work week from forty to forty-five hours. Furthermore, they are wondering what Green is thinking of, if anything, in proposing to junk the forty-hour week which labor fought so long to establish. Listen to this," he says, and reads me the following from the paper.

"William Green ought to be ashamed of himself," said Joe Iacona of the culinary workers. "We want to go with the times, not backward. It's about time we go for the six-hour day. We ought to tell Mr. Green he's all wet. It's about time somebody told him."

"Maybe Brother Iacona reads LABOR ACTION," I says. "We've been advocating the thirty-hour week without a cut in take-home pay for a long time, as a starter toward what the workers should get."

"He don't have to read LABOR ACTION to know it's the only proposition that makes sense," says Jack, "though it wouldn't do him no harm to read it at that. All he has to do is take a look at the union members sitting around the hall waiting for work, or to read this other piece in the paper about General Motors laying off 445 workers this week in Oakland."

"I guess the thirty-hour week is going to become a hot demand pretty soon," I says, "especially if the layoffs get more widespread. But it's going to have to go along with a demand for a real increase in wages. Otherwise the older workers who stand less chance of being laid off on account of their seniority will figure the only way to make a living is to chop the younger men off rather than cut hours and spread the work."

CHEWING REAL MEAT

"Yes," says my friend Jack, "it is the old capitalist game to keep the workers divided: If they get the old men saying to the young ones: 'You're a pretty good dog, and I'm a pretty good dog, but only one bone got tossed out today so you had better go get yours someplace else,' they will have them just where they want them chewing on each other instead of all chewing on the capitalist, where the real meat grows."

"That's the way the capitalists would like to have it, all right," I says, "but it looks like a lot of the dogs are getting too smart to fall for that one. The paper says that when General Motors announced the layoffs the union voted to cut their hours down to four days, and on a similar proposal the longshoremen voted overwhelmingly against any layoffs."

"The real fight'll come up this spring," says Jack, "when the big union contracts are renewed. That's when the whole labor movement'll better get together and go to work on the fat boys in a pack for some real demands or there'll be hell to pay."

"Well," I says, "you are right. But with leaders like Bill Green and Phil Murray and the rest of them, it doesn't look too promising for this spring."

"You can never tell," says Jack, "what will happen when a pack of dogs gets real hungry and real mad. If some fat, lazy cur tries to stand between them and where the meat is he's as likely as not to end up wishing his mother had never whelped him."

"And," says Jack, "with the cost of living going up every day, us working stiff's getting hungrier and madder by the hour. When Central Labor Councils start growling at Old Lady Green it means the memberships have started chewing on their delegates for some action. First thing you know even Green will wake up to what's going on and start whining at the employers for a few more bones to keep the boys quiet."

TEN BONES

"Talking of bones," I says, "just reminds me of something. Did you send in those ten bones you promised for the Workers Party Fund Drive?"

"There you go," says Jack. "I should have known better than to bring your attention to anything that could be twisted around like that, on account of your one-track mind."

"As a matter of fact, I sent in my ten bones yesterday. And I hope and trust that every dog smart enough to read this paper is also smart enough to go and do likewise."

Buy All Your Books Through

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

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

Now In Stock:

RELIGION AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM By R. H. Tawney Penguin Books, 280 pages 35 Cents

In French:

MOVEMENTS NATIONAUX ET LUTTE DE CLASSES AU VIET-NAM By Anh-Van et Jacqueline Roussel 83 pages 50 Cents

Orders of 10 or more copies: 10 per cent discount ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID

Read and Subscribe to

LABOR ACTION

and

THE NEW INTERNATIONALIST

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

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

Vol. 12, No. 5 Feb. 2, 1948

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

Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, 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

Sordid Details on Hitler-Stalin Pact --

(Continued from page 1)

that led to the signing of the non-aggression pact opened up, initiated by Stalin, in the spring of 1939. A week before the outbreak of World War II, the pact and its secret protocol that divided Europe into spheres of influence and put an end to Poland, was signed. Then began the period of joint action on the military, political and economic fronts. But Hitler, simultaneously, started his preparations for war on his partner and eventually, in 1941, launched his fateful adventure.

The documents reveal the following, hitherto unknown, or surmised or unprovable, facts:

- That the Russians made the initial approaches to Hitler and were the first to sound out the possibility of a pact.
- That Russia was ready to join the existing Axis tripartite pact for a "new world order," but Hitler was

unwilling to pay the price, namely, the Balkans, Dardanelles and Baltic.

- That Stalin shared Hitler's grandiose scheme to liquidate the British Empire, carve up the Near East and divide the African colonies.
- That Russia did everything possible, up till the moment of attack, to avoid war with Hitler, and was ready for all concessions.
- That Hitler and Molotov agreed to organize, "in principle," a coalition of European powers against American imperialism.
- That Stalin rejected the deal offered him by England's Sir Stafford Cripps, for a free hand in the Balkans in exchange for support in the war against Germany.
- That Hitler believed he could counteract the effects of the British blockade with raw materials received from Russia.
- That Stalin accepted the following division of booty as yet unconquered:

Central Africa to Hitler; North and Northeast Africa to Italy; Manchuria to Japan and south of Russia to the Indian Ocean for Russia.

What is the picture, then, that we see? A naked, open, un concealed partnership between German and Russian imperialism, deliberately executed by the two ruling cliques of the respective countries who well understood one another's aims and methods. The fact that this partnership proved temporary and never reached the full heights and hopes harbored by Stalin does not dim its true nature one bit. The partnership was dissolved NOT by Stalin (his sole wish was to make it more enduring and stronger!), but by the insatiable imperialist greed and arrogance of Hitler and the power he represented. This is the essence of the two-year Russian-German alliance for conquest and division of Europe and the world.

These documents should become the property of every revolutionist, socialist worker and thinking individual in the world. Every Stalinist member or sympathizer should be exposed to the blinding light they shed upon the character and historic role of the Russian imperialist ruling class. Are they authentic and true? The silence of Russia, weeks after their publication, is the reply to this. The signatures of Stalin and Molotov are there for all to see. The charge of "Hitler agent" and "Nazi stooge" leveled by Stalinism against Trotsky, the victims of the Moscow Trials, and the Fourth International movement now lies buried beneath the mountains of documents which hurl the charge back in the face of those really guilty of such crimes. A heavy blow has been dealt world Stalinism; a blow that must be followed through by socialists.

A Free Forum for Labor Action Readers

Which Policy for Palestine?

LABOR ACTION is continuing its discussion on the vital and complex Palestine issue. We again invite contributions from our readers, with the request that all letters must be limited to no more than 1,000 words, and deal with the problem of Palestine and Partition rather than the "Jewish Question" in general. A defense of the point of view originally expressed in a LABOR ACTION editorial will be published in our next issue.—Ed.

Accept Partition

The editorial on partition in LABOR ACTION approaches the Palestine problem in what is basically the old conception: the Jews are a minority in a predominantly Arab Palestine, and moreover a "heavily" minority. The Jews should renounce the nationalism of Zionism that seeks a separate national existence in Palestine, break with imperialism and demand an independent Palestine crowned by a sovereign Constituent Assembly. In this way the propaganda of the Arab feudal lords that the Jews want to take over Palestine and displace the Arab people would make no inroads among Arab workers and peasants, who not only benefit from the economic development of the country due to Jewish immigration and capital, but would see the Jews as the champions of independence and democracy.

This approach was a good and correct one. But history has superseded this approach and made necessary the traditional national approach worked out by Lenin.

democratic right, partition, cease firing. BURN SOME BRIDGES

Isn't it time to burn some bridges? Isn't it time to recognize that part of the whole retrogressive movement of society is the "legitimization" of Zionism? That in the ranks of the Jewish workers a party capable of fusing the Arab and Jewish workers in the struggle for independence and democracy didn't arise. That on the one hand 6,000,000 Jews perished, creating in the survivors the extreme nationalism of what has been called "Judeocentrism," while on the other hand there were sand dunes thirty years ago where Tel-Aviv with its 250,000 all-Jewish population today stands. To deny this central fact, that the Jews are in Palestine, alongside of the Arabs, as a nation, means to fall back, willy nilly, on arguments akin to those used in the UN debates. Let us say that the Jews sneaked in under false pretenses, that the Arabs didn't realize the implications of Jewish immigration, etc., etc., the living reality still remains: there are in Palestine two separate nations, Arab and Jews!

The clear, unambiguous recognition of this fact indicates our course: the Leninist application of democracy to the national question, which declares the equality of nationalities; that rejects the formal democracy of majority rule because such formal democracy contains within itself the possibility of the national oppression of one people by another; that rejects in the given instance the abstraction of the Constituent Assembly, and the

equally meaningless "one vote—not more, but certainly not less"; but, rather, starting with the equality of nations, gives the right of self-determination including the right of separation. This is real democracy. And moreover it is only through real democracy that the social struggle can be advanced. We urge the recognition of the right of self-determination on both Arabs and Jews precisely because without that mutual recognition both peoples will only founder deeper and deeper in the morass of nationalist politics. We want to open the road to the essential struggle, the class struggle, which today is submerged in the respective national fronts of ultra-nationalism.

This is our program for today: to accept the separation. But we do not desire separation. And we work from today on, as we always have, for Arab-Jewish unity. The slogans are already indicated. Palestine united is a bi-national Palestine. We must work from separation toward bi-nationalism. The concept of bi-nationalism is a dynamic one. Its specific content at any given time is that degree of unity and centralization both peoples can agree upon. We must work toward a greater and greater fusing of the two peoples. We can do this by first recognizing their equality, thus making the first step in lifting their struggle out of the ultra-nationalist morass, and on the road of the class differentiation within both peoples, from which will come the Arab-Jewish unity of the working class.

Irving Swanson.

Proposed Solution for Palestine

Partition is a bad solution. It splits up a small country which is a single economic unit. It creates long and artificial boundaries which appear impossible to maintain for any length of time. It neither suspends nor solves the Arab-Jewish problem. Even the realization of partition again puts the Jews face to face with the bi-national reality of its part of the country. In addition, there is the necessity of cooperation with the inhabitants of the neighboring Arab country in order to assure the development of the entire land and make possible a substantial immigration.

Nevertheless, one fact cannot be denied. As of today, the partition solution has concentrated great international support for Zionism and as a result is the only present hope for breaking the status quo which Bevin has imposed on Palestine.

How did this come about? A) Through a mistaken policy, the Zionist movement wasted the opportunities for developing Jewish-Arab agreement and thus prepared the ground for partition from the objective viewpoint. The Biltmore program made partition the sole Zionist program presented to the world. This fact exerted a decided influence. The official Zionist line is not blameless in the partitioning of Palestine.

B) However, the most decisive factor which makes partition the immediate practical solution, is the international situation, particularly the relations between the great powers. The program of an undivided, bi-national Palestine involves a more or less lengthy transition period under actual international supervision. Only this can assure the development of the country for all of its inhabitants, the absorption of a large immigration, and the political and social preparation for an independent bi-national state.

The sharpening conflicts between the great powers and the impossibility of Soviet-American cooperation under present conditions makes real international supervision for any length of time an impossibility. This fact has led the Soviet Union to support the partition solution, despite its announced position that its "first choice" is a bi-national state including Jewish immigration and continued Zionist development.

The British statement concerning its abandonment of Palestine, militarily and administratively, by August 1, 1948, has increased the urgency of a political solution for the Palestine problem. Despite the normal hesitancy to believe any British statement on Palestine, the present announcement may be accepted. There are four reasons for the new British policy:

- A) Defeat of British policy in Palestine and Jewish opposition to the "White Paper."
- B) The lack of manpower in the

British Isles and the need for easing Britain's military obligations throughout the world.

C) The British assumption that despite leaving Palestine, it will maintain a military hold in this area through its treaty with Transjordan which permits the maintenance of military bases in that country and the strengthening of the Transjordan Arab Legion.

D) The growing attitude in British military circles that the strategic importance of the Near East has greatly decreased in the face of overwhelming Soviet power situated so close to this area and the great distance from British and American bases.

To complete our understanding of the British policy, it should be mentioned that there is always the possibility that in the event of an actual partition, the Transjordan Arab Legion will conquer the Arab sector of Palestine and add it to Transjordan. In this fashion, Britain will maintain its right to military bases in Palestine itself (through its treaty with Abdullah).

One of the amazing manifestations of the present UN session is the Soviet position on Palestine. Undoubtedly there are strategic considerations involved in its stand: to support any solution which will remove British military forces from the country. But there is also implied the recognition of the strength and ability of the Jewish Yishuv as well as the right of the Jewish people to receive recompense for its sufferings and sacrifices during the last war. Yet this is not all. Apparently there is more to this Soviet stand than appears on the surface. Let us not ignore the influence which the Soviet stand must have on the masses of Soviet Jewry. Time will tell.

Even if partition will be achieved in the near future, we cannot entirely give up the hope for an undivided Palestine and Jewish-Arab cooperation. Such cooperation will be essential within the proposed Jewish state as well as between the Jewish and the Arab states. The economic union proposed by the UNSCOP as a prerequisite for the existence of both countries can become the basis for an increased program of mutual aid between the two parts of the population and the two states. The necessity for economic cooperation and the development of political relations can be the source of a decisive change with the passage of time.

This will be one of the vital tasks of progressive Zionism—to take advantage of all possibilities for immigration, for settlement, for development in whatever new political conditions are established and to penetrate deeply into the Jewish Yishuv and the Arab community in order to lay a strong foundation for Jewish-Arab peace.

Sylvia Weiss.

Why U.S. Withheld Facts on Pact --

(Continued from page 1)

discussion tables of Stalin and Hitler. True? Without a doubt. Criminal? Absolutely. But these deals, this matter-of-fact cutting up of other people's territories, this extension of large power control over weaker countries is the daily practice of imperialist politics. All capitalist countries, the U. S. included, are forced by the dynamics of their social system, to imperialist expansion, domination of other countries, high-handed deals with competitor imperialists in slicing up disputed claims. Diplomacy is only the art of carrying out these repugnant policies in the most skilled, hypocritical manner so as to least offend human sentiment.

Korea, a country which had been fighting for its independence for decades and which helped the Allies in

the war with the hope of achieving it, was rewarded for its illusion by being partitioned. By whom? By Russia (of course, since she is the now exposed criminal) and the U. S. Is the division of Korea morally justifiable while the Partition of Poland is a crime? Only if you work in the State Department or for the capitalist press.

POSDAM AND YALTA

The Potsdam and Yalta agreements! Whole sections of Europe and Asia were divided into spheres of influence. If, the day before yesterday, it was Hitler who conceded Eastern Europe to Russia as part of a deal, yesterday it was Roosevelt and Churchill who swapped the peoples of Eastern Europe with Stalin for the people of Greece. The same dance, different partners! And now that the

music has stopped, each partner is calling the other a cynical plunderer, imperialist warmonger and other terms thieves commonly call each other when they fall out.

There remains one more thing to be said about the moralists who now point the finger at Stalin. It would require a specially designed and fabricated naïveté to believe that the U. S. first learned about Russia's motives, methods and dealings with the capture of the German archives. While it is true these constituted conclusive evidence, there was plenty of other evidence to warrant the charges now being made. There was in fact the self-evident character of the pact itself. But why was the State Department quiet yesterday and why is it shrieking today? Ah, yesterday it was in alliance with the criminal of to-

day. Yesterday the State Department was asking, no, commanding, hundreds of thousands of American men to prepare to lose their lives in a war by the side of today's "criminal."

It would not be easy to work up enthusiasm for laying down one's life if a man is told he is to die to help one plunderer defeat another. So, yesterday, all was quiet and Russia was a peace-lover like all the others. (Just as the State Department was quiet through the years when German crematoriums were working full blast and only decided to reveal the horrors of German fascism as a measure of war propaganda.) But today Russia is world-menace and plunderer number one, because it wants more than U. S. capitalism is willing to give. And so the cold war is getting hotter.

Stalinists Caught in Their Own Lies --

(Continued from page 1)

sign policy (not to mention the domestic policy) of the Soviet Union is completely above board. The Soviet Union makes no secret treaties. It does not say one thing and practice another behind the scenes. As a socialist, working class state, the Soviet Union comes before the world with clean hands. Its deeds and its official pronouncements speak for themselves. The Soviet Union operates on the Bolshevik principle that there must be no contradiction between deed and word."

In this connection, it is interesting to note that immediately above Molotov's signature on the secret protocol of August 23, 1939, there appears the following paragraph:

"(4) This protocol shall be treated by both parties as strictly secret."

A Visitor

The Soviet Russian chargé, with whom he had no intimate relations, called on him yesterday without any apparent reason and stayed with him two hours. . . .

The Soviet Union faced the present world situation with hesitation. She was vacillating between three possibilities, namely, the conclusion of the pact with England and France, a further dilatory treatment of the pact negotiations, and a rapprochement with Germany. This last possibility, with which ideological considerations would not have to become involved, was closest to the desires of the Soviet Union.

After the non-aggression pact was signed, the Stalinists termed it "a blow for peace," claiming that it was signed in order to prevent an attack by Hitler on Poland. In a Daily Worker editorial of August 23, 1939, they declared that, "The Polish people will be further encouraged to resist . . . fascist aggression."

In contrast, the Trotskyist Socialist Appeal wrote in an editorial on August 29: "A blow for peace," the Stalinists brazenly call the alliance with Hitler. But Molotov's signature on that pact doomed Poland as an independent power, gave Hitler the signal to go ahead with his march eastward."

WHO STARTED STALIN-HITLER RELATIONS?

An important effect of the publication of the secret documents concerning Russo-Nazi relations will be to dispel the widely held belief that it was Hitler who took the first steps in the alliance. Then Molotov declared in a speech in September, 1939, that "When . . . the German government expressed the desire to improve political relations . . . the Soviet government had no grounds for refusing."

This lie was given official sanction by the Stalin government. The documents now published, however, prove the exact opposite to have been true. The first step, according to the material now available, was taken by the Russian ambassador in Berlin as early as April 17, 1939. Hitler, as a matter of fact, was very hesitant, fearing that the Russians planned to use negotiations with him only as a bargaining factor in their dealings with England and France.

Recently in New York, however, the

Stalinist Daily Worker devoted a great part of its January 23 edition to verbal acrobatics designed to show that it's all a hoax. A lead article by Joseph Starobin, Stalinist foreign affairs "expert," discusses "What the Nazi Files Really Show." Starobin's argument consists of two main parts:

(1) "Above all, it's an insult to American intelligence. For the average man is asked to believe every word of Nazi diplomats talking to each other in their gangster language." In other words, the documents are not to be trusted. This, by the way, is also the line the French Stalinists took in the January 22 issue of their L'Humanité, where they declare the documents to be forgeries.

(2) "The fact is that . . . the Nazi side of the story bears out what American supporters of understanding with the Soviet Union have said for a decade: that there never was a Soviet-German alliance."

This is probably the most astounding statement ever made in a newspaper designed for literate people. The very same documents which in the previous paragraph have been declared utterly unreliable, are now used to "prove" that there never was a Soviet-German alliance!

Undoubtedly the State Department has its own imperialist motives for publishing these documents at this time. Nevertheless, this material is important and useful, since it supports with unquestionable evidence our previous analysis of the nature of the Stalinist state. It bears out, especially, our characterization of the 1939 Russian intervention in Poland as a purely imperialist adventure and proves the correctness of the

Workers Party position regarding the imperialist nature of the Russian state.

"Wit and Humor"

The Reich Foreign Minister concurred and remarked jokingly that Herr Stalin was surely less frightened by the "Anti-Comintern Pact than the City of London and the small British merchants." What the German people thought of this matter is evident from a joke which had originated with the Berliners, well known for their wit and humor, and which had been going the rounds for several months, namely, "Stalin will yet join the Anti-Comintern Pact."

"No Agitation"

Secret Supplementary Protocol. The undersigned plenipotentiaries, on concluding the German-Russian Boundary and Friendship Treaty, have declared their agreement upon the following:

Both parties will tolerate in their territories no Polish agitation which affects the territories of the other party. They will suppress in their territories all beginnings of such agitation and inform each other concerning suitable measures for this purpose.

For the Government of the German Reich:

J. Ribbentrop.

By Authority of the Government of the USSR:

V. Molotov.

Moscow, Sept. 28, 1939.

\$10,000 Collected to Date in WP Fund Drive!

By YETTA BARSH, Fund Drive Director

By the time this issue reaches the hands of LABOR ACTION readers, there will be only four more weeks to go before the end of the Workers Party \$15,000 Fund Drive. It behooves us, therefore, to pause for a moment and analyze the progress we have been making in order to determine while there is still time how much more effort must be exerted to fulfill and oversubscribe our \$15,000 goal by March 1.

As of January 26 (the end of the eighth week of the Drive), collections totalled \$9,596.35, or 64 per cent, slightly less than two-thirds. If, by pushing with all of our might we can raise our total to 85 per cent by the time we report collections for the week ending February 8, there will be little difficulty in going over the \$15,000 top. That is why we have been urging that extra-special efforts be made by each unit to do its share by

sending in 85 per cent of its quota in the next few days.

Now that Baltimore has sent in its last \$11.20 contribution, raising its total to \$104 (104 per cent of its quota), there are 10 units which have fulfilled or gone over their respective quotas. The Manhattan Unit of the Socialist Youth League continues to set an example by sending in an additional \$7.00 this week, raising its percentage to 173 per cent. Buffalo, too, keeps doing its share by sending in \$33 and raising its percentage to 124. We can add Philadelphia (which has fulfilled 94 per cent of its quota) to the 10 units in the 100 per cent class and say that all of them have done even better than we expected. Therefore, despite the fact that these units will undoubtedly continue to send in any sums that they can raise between now and the end of the Drive, it is not to them that we can look for any further substantial assistance in the next period.

NATIONAL OFFICE AND NEW YORK LAG

The National Office and New York City, with their 59 and 58 per cent, respectively, can be classed together in the next group of over 50 per cent. Unfortunately, we cannot promise that the National Office, which has assumed such a tremendous share of the total goal, will be able to raise its 85 per cent by February 5 (although it guarantees that it will fully achieve its quota by the end of the Drive). Circumstances completely unpredictable and beyond the control of the National Office indicate that it cannot be relied upon to raise the total of \$915 still required of it by February 5th. However, we think that it is quite possible for New York City to raise its full share if it will apply itself within the next short period. Up to now, the progress of New York City has been quite slow; but it has now reached the point where it can speed up its collections and send in the substantial sum necessary for its 85 per cent in full.

These are the facts. We call upon all units in the Drive to

start sprinting now. Even if you are ahead of schedule, move as speedily as you can toward complete fulfillment of your quotas and toward going far beyond your quotas!

Branch	Quota	Jan. 26	Pct.
Manhattan SYL	\$30.00	\$52.00	173
Buffalo	600.00	745.00	124
Connecticut	50.00	60.00	120
Hibbing	5.00	6.00	120
Streator	20.00	21.00	105
Baltimore	100.00	104.00	104
Boston	60.00	60.00	100
Indiana	50.00	50.00	100
New York Misc.	20.00	20.00	100
Oregon	50.00	50.00	100
Philadelphia	400.00	375.00	94
Akron	400.00	315.00	79
Reading	75.00	49.00	65
Detroit	800.00	512.00	64
Cleveland	500.00	316.00	63
Newark	400.00	251.29	63
San Francisco	1,000.00	627.95	63
Chicago	1,500.00	913.63	61
Los Angeles	500.00	300.50	60
National Office	3,500.00	2,061.00	59
New York City	4,000.00	2,310.98	58
Seattle	400.00	200.00	50
Youngstown	200.00	100.00	50
St. Louis	35.00	16.00	46
Miscellaneous	40.00	15.00	37
West Virginia	150.00	45.00	30
San Pedro	100.00	20.00	20
Pittsburgh	25.00	00.00	0
	\$15,000.00	\$9,596.35	64

Readers of LABOR ACTION: Do your share! Help us hit the 100 per cent mark early. Send us your contribution immediately.

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

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

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

Address

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

New York Workers Party Public Meeting
"Wallace and the Third Party"

Speakers: EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor of Labor Action
HAL DRAPER, Editor of The New Internationalist

Date: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1948

Time: 8:30 P. M.

Place: VICTORIA HALL, Irving Plaza, Irving Place and 15th Street

Admission: 25 CENTS