

Work for a Workers World;  
Join the Workers Party!

# LABOR ACTION

MARCH 1, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## When Thieves Fall Out....

In reply to the documents the U. S. recently published, which showed the degree of intimate cooperation between Hitler and Stalin during their period of cooperation, the Kremlin has published charges that the U. S. was trying to negotiate a separate peace with Hitler during the war and that before the war England and France were trying to set Hitler on Russia.

At present there is more reason to give credence to the material published by the U. S. than to the charges made by the Russians, if only because the material published by the U. S. consists of documents while that published by the Russians consists mainly of unproved assertions. However, there is no reason to doubt the charge that before the war both England and France were pursuing a policy of trying to persuade Hitler to advance eastward instead of westward. Nor is it impossible that at one or another point Allied and/or U. S. secondary diplomatic figures put out peace feelers to the Nazis.

The Stalinist charges boomerang against them, however. For if it is true that U. S. diplomatic representatives tried to secure a separate peace with the Nazis, it must be remembered that they could not possibly have acted on such an important matter without the knowledge and consent of the then President Roosevelt — THE VERY SAME PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT WHO WAS SO ARDENTLY SUPPORTED BY THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY AND WHOSE NAME IS TO THIS DAY INVOKED BY IT AS A GUIDING LIGHT.



BUT CP-WALLACE GANG  
SHOUTS HIS PRAISES

If, then, the Stalinist accusation is true, it means that the entire policy of the U. S. Stalinists is immediately and totally condemned. What will the Daily Worker say to this?

More important, however, is the fact that in the current exchange of accusations and denunciations, neither side is able to defend itself against the other.

After the U. S. published the highly damning documents which it found in Nazi archives and which showed how closely knit was Russian policy with the Nazi war effort before Hitler's sudden attack on Russia, the Russians had nothing to say. They have thus far had nothing to say about those revelations. They cannot, and do not, deny the authenticity of these documents.

All that the Stalinist regime could do was to point to the duplicities of its former partners. Here, in turn, Britain, France and the U. S., formerly so loquacious, are stricken dumb. They have nothing to say about the Russian accusations—other than vague and extremely weak denials.

Each counter-accusation is not a denial of a previous accusation, not a defense. Each counter-accusation is merely a cry that "you're as bad as I am."

For what is happening here is that the truth about the war is gradually coming out—thieves having fallen out among themselves now telling the truth about each other.

For our part, we wish only to encourage them to tell more and more about each other. In fact we think an appropriate need with regard to the war is that the full story of secret diplomacy be revealed to the international public—that all documents, all secret commitments, all the records of secret diplomacy be made public. Then both totalitarian Stalinism and Western capitalism can go ahead and tell the truth—about each other.

# Stalin Acts to Enslave Czechoslovak People!

"Liberated" Europe!



By HENRY JUDD

FEBRUARY 23—Moving with the speed and organized ruthlessness of totalitarian movements, the Czechoslovakian Stalinist party is openly seizing total power over the country and its 6,000,000 people. Openly discarding all pretenses of legal action, within the framework of the Czech constitution, the armed gangs organized by the Stalinist leaders have launched a reign of terror and arrests throughout the land.

The aim is to create a majority of Stalinist supporters in the Czech Parliament by the expedient of liquidating enough opponents to get this "majority." Then an all-Stalinist government will

be proclaimed and put forward as the legitimate government of the nation.

Action committees of the Stalinist machine are arresting hundreds of non-Stalinist political officials, beginning with top ministers of

## Appeal Fine In Philly

PHILADELPHIA—An appeal challenging the undemocratic and illegal decision of Judge McDewitt, who last October fined candidates and supporters of the Workers Party and Socialist Workers Party a total of \$300, is being filed in next week's session of the State Superior Court by the two parties. Arguing that the judge's decision is completely unjustified, David Felix, attorney for the defendants, is seeking revocation of the fine. It is also expected that a victory for the two parties would be a great aid in establishing more democratic legal precedents in election procedures.

Turn to page 3, World Politics column, for further analysis of Czechoslovakian events.

all parties and ending with the smaller officials of local and city administrative bodies. Opposition newspapers and magazines are being silenced by outright seizure, confiscation or the refusal of Stalinist-controlled printers' unions to publish them. Police and soldiers, all dominated by the Stalinists, and backed up by armed gangs, have occupied the headquarters of all parties, including the Social Democrats.

The Stalinist Minister of the Interior, Nosek, is the directing hand behind this seizure of power. Directing the police forces and supplemented by the party machine of the Stalinists, Nosek has ordered all local officials and political representatives to take their orders from the local Stalinist leadership.

Simultaneously, the National Labor Organization, entirely controlled by the Stalinists, has been ordered to take over all factories and businesses having 50 or more workers. The seizure of Czechoslovakia by the Stalinists is proceeding along several lines at the same time—seizure of the state power and its administrative branches; seizure over the country's entire economic system and strangulation of all opposition political tendencies.

(Continued on page 3)

Concluding Article in Series on Civil Rights Report

## Wages Low Where Jim Crow Rules

By E. R. MCKINNEY

When one reads that the wife of a senator from South Carolina did not attend the Jefferson-Jackson dinner of the Democratic Party in Washington, because "I might be seated beside a Negro," it is not easy to know what is in this woman's head and what it is that she is really talking about. She would perhaps say that she does not want to be "mongrelized," or that she is opposed to being a "conquered province," or this is her way of showing that "we love our Negroes."



E. R. McKinney Negroes should have donated that \$1,200 to help toward the building of a school house for the poor white children of South Carolina. That might not be a bad idea, since the intelligence quotient of the Northern Negroes is higher than that of South Carolina whites.

If the intelligence of the poor whites in South Carolina could be brought up to that of the Northern Negro, the white masses of South Carolina might begin to understand that their leaders are a bunch of ignorant and conniving demagogues, who are not only against civil liberties for Negroes but for the poor whites also. We suspect, however, that the lady from South Carolina knows little about such things as intelligence tests and civil liberties. It's not required reading in the South, especially in the case of women.

### UNDERScore SERIOUS SITUATION

These observations are not mere facetious jibes at the South. They only underscore a very serious situation. It is a fact that the poor whites of the deep South will have to reach a far higher level of intelligence before they can understand even in the most elementary way what is happening to them and why. I will now relate a few relevant considerations which the Southern poor white has never heard of but which undoubtedly played an extremely important role in the deliberations of the Committee on Civil Rights, and in the thinking of Messrs. Wilson and Luckman. The statistical material which I am going to relate is kept from the Southern poor whites by the Rankins, Byrds, Eastlands and Gosetts.

Alabama, with a population of 2,832,961, in 1940 paid income taxes to the federal government totalling \$244,295,520. Minnesota, with about the same population, paid \$612,200,194. Alabama's corporation taxes were \$39,605,414 and Minnesota's \$105,876,494. Alabama and Minnesota are both manufacturing and agricultural states. The population of Kansas is about 250,000 less than that of Mississippi. Yet Kansas paid into the federal treasury three and a half times what Mississippi paid. South Carolina is a manufacturing and agricultural state. And so is Connecticut. The populations are about the same. The corporations in Connecticut paid twice as much as the South Carolina corporations, and individuals paid nearly four times as much. What does this mean? It means that there is something substantial to tax in Minnesota, Kansas and Connecticut, while in South Carolina, Alabama and Mississippi there just isn't much.

I am not making an argument for paying taxes. I am merely demonstrating that the South is so poor in comparison with the North that there isn't even anything much for the tax collector. This is one of the reasons—among others, of course—the South has the poll-tax; these poverty-stricken backward states really need the money.

(Continued on page 3)

## UE Leadership Talks Big, Works Against Members' Interest

Matles-Empak-Fitzgerald Endanger Members' Bargaining Rights, Will Avoid Fight for Workers' Needs Under Cover of Bluster on Taft-Hartley Affidavits

By M. BURT

In its shadow-boxing in connection with the Taft-Hartley Act, the Stalinist leadership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE) is displaying a maximum of bluster, froth and fury, and a minimum of action in defense of labor's rights.

As part of their cold war with American imperialism, the totalitarian imperialists in the Kremlin have required their little servants in such unions as the UE to increase pressure upon the U. S. government and the American capitalist class.

At the present stage of maneuvering by the Stalinists in the United States, this means that the Stalinist leadership in the UE and other unions will concentrate on a major propaganda effort against the Truman administration and on organizing the Wallace movement to campaign for a pro-Russian foreign policy.

### AVOID MILITANT ACTION

It also means, however, that the Stalinists in the UE and in the other unions under their domination will retreat from any determined struggle with the employers for fear of jeopardizing their union control. At present they feel too weak to run the risk of incurring the charge of striking merely to hamper American production in the cold war with Russia. They feel too isolated to take any action that might provide an excuse for being singled out for further attack by the government and the press.

Therefore, regardless of the needs of the union membership, the Stalinists in the UE will avoid pressing any demands that substantially exceed those put forward by the rest of the labor movement. They will sound off loudly and militantly, with brave threats in radical language. But they will not take the initiative in formulating any new demands for labor. They will evade all strike action needed to back up the demands of the workers, except when they have the protective covering of strike action or projected strike action of other large unions. They have poured out a torrent of words, but they shrink from action against the employers.

In pursuing their present strategy of confining the fight against the Truman administration to a propa-

ganda barrage and to the Wallace movement, and avoiding any real action, the Stalinists have found a convenient weapon in the vicious "non-communist affidavits" provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. The UE leadership has to date refused to sign these affidavits.

Refusal to sign affords the Stalinists the opportunity to strike a heroic pose. They can now make a gesture of being "militant." And they can contrast themselves with others in the labor movement who will be labelled as cowards and conservatives. They can exhibit themselves as the only intransigent opponents of the Taft-Hartley Act. In short, they have found a cheap way to cover themselves with the glory of being "fighters."

And they have accomplished all of this without actually striking a single blow. For it is a plain fact that refusal to sign the affidavits does not in any way undermine, weaken, modify or interfere with the Taft-Hartley Act or its functioning.

The refusal to sign the affidavits also serves as a substitute for a genuine fight against the Taft-Hartley Act. They bar an effective campaign

against the Taft-Hartley Act, since that would require the organizing of independent political action of labor through a Labor Party, rather than a Stalinist-controlled third party whose chief function is serving as a lever to influence American foreign policy in a more pro-Russian direction.

Of course, this policy of not signing will greatly injure the membership of the UE and its locals by depriving them of the chance to use many of the legal rights labor still retains even under the pernicious Taft-Hartley Act. This policy necessitates a tremendous additional expenditure of time, money and energy by the union and its membership as a result of the many struggles rendered more complicated and more difficult by failure to fully utilize all legal bargaining rights. It will result in the loss of many shops and the failure to organize many new ones. It will result in the diversion of energy and attention from the genuine fight for labor's rights and interests to the false issue of signing or not signing the affidavits.

But the Stalinists consider all this a small price to pay for the chance to appear militant without actually

launching any large-scale fight. They will continue their non-signing policy as long as it does not threaten to boomerang in the loss of too many locals and too large a section of the membership.

If, as the result of an all-out attack by the big corporations making use of the UE failure to sign, the UE faces the prospect of losing a large part of its membership, the Stalinists will reverse their policy, a thing in which they are supremely adept. They will then explain that they waged a noble and desperate struggle against signing but were betrayed by the rest of the labor movement.

In executing their non-signing policy the Stalinists controlling the UE are assisted by the tendency in current collective bargaining for labor agreements to follow the general pattern set by the large unions in key industries. By negotiating in conformity with the patterns already set or in the process of being set, the Stalinists are often enabled to obtain similar conditions to those won by other unions.

The UE Stalinist leadership has announced its intention of striking if its bargaining rights are not recognized by the employer. However, its whole record demonstrates that, far from waging a last-ditch fight against the large corporations, it is more inclined to bargain away some of the workers' demands on wages and working conditions in order to obtain the recognition and union security clauses essential to the union. Typical of the behavior of the UE leadership in this regard is its signing of a contract in the General Motors electrical division in 1946, providing for an 18½-cent increase, while the United Automobile Workers Union was still on strike against General Motors for a higher increase. Its acceptance of a highly inadequate Westinghouse contract for 1946, in spite of the spirited strike of the membership, is another example.

In current negotiations with GE and Westinghouse, the UE leadership will be willing to trade away many of the workers' demands to obtain union security provisions without a strike.

In the light of the fact that refusal to sign the affidavits contributes nothing to overthrowing the Taft-Hartley Act, Matles, Empak, Fitzgerald and the other national leaders who lay

down the line in the UE have been unable to explain what motivates their refusal to sign.

Instead, they raise a whole series of false arguments implying that there are no circumstances under which any union gains any practical advantage from using what legal rights are left under the Taft-Hartley Act. However, these arguments are already being answered by the loss of several UE shops that could have been retained within the UE if the affidavit had been signed and collective bargaining elections had been made use of.

While the majority of the UE locals may be able to retain their positions without recourse to the NLRB machinery, it is evident that there will be many locals that will find themselves in a critical position as a result of failure to use their full rights under the law.

In new shops, for example, UE locals faced by the intervention of another union must go through the complicated, confusing and dangerous procedure of urging workers to vote "no union" and then striking for bargaining rights. In such cases, the

(Continued on page 2)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Local 45, UAW, Debates T-H Signing

CLEVELAND, Feb. 22 — Before a good turnout of the membership about 200, Local 45, Fisher Body of Cleveland, debated whether to comply with the non-communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley law, and finally decided to instruct incoming officers to comply.

The issue was somewhat complicated by the resignation turned in by Charles Beckman, president of the local for ten years. Beckman was not present, due to top negotiations in Detroit, but his letter stated that he did not feel that he could sign the non-communist affidavits and so was reluctantly giving up the office. The Executive Committee of the local had voted to refuse to accept the resignation and asked that the membership unanimously reject the resignation. The speakers for the Executive Committee position lavished all sorts of praise on Beckman as a militant leader. However, they did not

spend much time on explaining the meaning of his resignation at this time.

INSTRUCT OFFICERS

Local elections are being held now and Beckman and the other officers have only a few weeks left to their terms. The statement was made that Beckman felt compelled to take this action due to a letter from the International setting February 22 as a deadline for compliance, but apparently no other officer saw the need for leaving his office. The members voted to reject the resignation, but not unanimously.

The next question was how to instruct the incoming executive officers. The Executive Committee recommendation was for them to comply, with only Fenster and DeVito against. The discussion was hot and heavy. Those against compliance tried to make it seem as though the issue

was one of being against the Taft-Hartley law and against compliance, or for the law and for compliance.

Some of the speakers in favor of signing were undoubtedly motivated by reactionary feelings, but many pointed out that you could be against the law and also for compliance because of the isolated circumstances of the local. The UAW convention had gone on record for signing the affidavits and all the other locals with one or two exceptions, had complied. Refusal would mean the sending in of an administrator for the local and added difficulties in organizing the new Euclid Avenue plant, Bert Foster and Paul Miley, regional director, in general gave fairly good talks on being opposed to the law and for signing, and the membership voted overwhelmingly to instruct the incoming officers to sign.

POSSIBLE MANEUVER

Beckman's resignation was probably

a maneuver to put him squarely on record as opposed to the T-H law and to have the local membership back him up as president in spite of this. Other officers will have the obligation of agreeing to comply before running for election, but Beckman can point to the membership's refusal to accept his resignation as a mandate for him to run again. Of course he too will have to comply then, as "forced" by the members. It is just possible that Beckman took the Stalinists' "I'd rather die than sign" speeches seriously and that he will not run for re-election, but that seems unlikely.

The vote on the second question at the meeting: for signing because of the circumstances, was the first actual defeat the Stalinists have suffered in the local in some time. It showed that the membership, with its militant tradition, was not taken in by the adventurist and factional stand of these fakers.

ADA Program Is Inept and Misleading

Mr. Berle and the Liberal Credo

By SUSAN GREEN

Everybody and his uncle is today a "liberal." There are Democratic "liberals" and Republican "liberals" and of course Wallace "liberals" of the Stalinoid variety. But the purest strain—to be written without quotation marks—supposedly congregates in the Liberal Party of New York State.

The state chairman of the Liberal Party, A. A. Berle, Jr., calls himself "a lifelong New Dealer." Though Franklin D. Roosevelt, hirer of the New Deal, fired it in favor of Dr. Win-the-War, Mr. Berle continues to pay homage to FDR—an inconsistency you are not supposed to notice.

In the special election in the 24th Congressional District of the Bronx (see page 1 for story on election—Ed.) Mr. Berle is campaigning for the candidate of the Liberal Party on the basis of his independence, of his "strong, clean American liberalism," as opposed to the Democratic Flynn machine, the Republican big interests, the Stalinist American Labor Party. But down in Washington, Mr. Berle, no longer so independent, pays court to the White House and in the November election, as in the past, he and his party will undoubtedly line up behind the Democratic ticket—a

lack of political independence we are also not supposed to notice.

MR. BERLE'S CREDO

These are some identification marks of the "strong, clean, independent liberal" and "lifelong New Dealer." For a better understanding of Mr. Berle and liberals in general, nothing is more helpful than to examine Mr. Berle's own credo. In his party's paper, "The Liberal," issue of November 25, 1947, there appeared (we are told in abridged form) his credo "for modern progressives." There, black on white, we see that the ground the liberal stands on is quicksand.

"A liberal program thinks of people," says Mr. Berle—and what politician doesn't declaim his love for the people! Ah, but liberals "start from the demonstrated fact that the United States has adequate resources and capacity to provide not only for the present consumption but for an increase of production and of consumption capable of giving an adequate standard of living and opportunity for every man, woman and child in the country."

Revolutionary socialists have long ago demonstrated the fact that there can be plenty for all, including not merely "an adequate standard of living" but the luxuries and beauties of life for all. However, the question always is, HOW? How do we get this?

The weakness of all liberalism is that it does not answer this question. Mr. Berle's variety is no exception. Though Mr. Berle's specific aims and demands may be very worthy (to this we will come later), he does not provide the fundamental HOW? His whole program, therefore, is a snare and a delusion.

Mr. Berle, of course, understands "the evils of private enterprise." On the other hand, to him "it is equally clear that a wholly statist economy can unleash abuses as great or greater." So having nothing to offer as a third alternative, in the final showdown some liberals—like Mr. Berle and Mrs. Roosevelt—go over kit and caboodle to private enterprise with all its evils, and other liberals—like the Wallace crew—go over to Stalinism with all its abuses.

The revolutionary socialist says that the evils of private enterprise cannot be overcome WITHOUT ENDING THE SYSTEM OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE. The revolutionary socialist also says the horrors of Stalinism must be avoided—and can be, by the socialization of industry under a truly representative workers' government, truly representative of the workers, the farmers, the small fry, the great masses, as opposed to a totalitarian system; and by basic workers' control of industry as opposed to bureaucratic control. But liberals act as if this third alternative to private enterprise and to what they call statism, has never even been mentioned.

PECULIAR NOTIONS

They have other peculiar notions. For instance, Mr. Berle in his credo says he wants to abolish "the con-

cept" of the proletariat. Is the proletariat then only a concept, only a figment of the imagination, or is it the expression of the real relationship between the capitalists who own the means of production and the workers who do not? One can understand why Mr. Berle prefers to consider the proletariat merely as "a concept." "A concept" can be abolished by wrinkling the brow and thinking real hard about it. But the actual relationship between the capitalists and the workers, between the possessors and the dispossessed, can only be changed by revolutionary action against the capitalist class. A liberal will not go near such a struggle with a ten-foot pole. He likes to believe that the evils of capitalism can somehow be wished away without disturbing the capitalists too much.

In character with this wishy-washiness are all of Mr. Berle's general tenets. He makes the point that "the job of meeting economic and social misery can be done whenever the United States wants to do it. The technicians have the knowledge on demand." The rock bottom fact is that a CAPITALIST United States, with the profit motive predominant, will not want to do "the job of meeting economic and social misery" as the people need this job done. And the technicians who have the know-how for this job, are not at the service of humanity while they are beholden to and in the employ of the profit-motivated capitalist class. Therefore, lip-service to the "abolishment" of economic and social misery far exceeds accomplishment.

Mr. Berle's specific points to meet the pressing social problems fare no better on examination than his general principles. To avoid depressions recurring with such infallibility, Mr. Berle believes that "continued expenditures of capital is the first line of attack." Along this line, "the first, and least controversial, is for the government to provide capital to private enterprise." What do we have here? The liberals want public money to go to private enterprise at a time when private enterprise proves itself a failure. This is the measure of the neurotic dependence of liberalism on private enterprise. They want it maintained at all costs, even at the cost of public funds which should be used for the people's living needs ra-

ther than to pump oxygen into the corpse of capitalism.

The second line for the flow of capital, according to Mr. Berle, is the well-known one of government projects to provide employment. Mr. Berle gives a list of them, including more TVA developments, urban construction, soil conservation, and so on. To the question, "What are you going to do for money?" Mr. Berle answers that money can be obtained "whenever there is need for it." He doubtless has in mind the oodles of money spent for war. But here are things of different categories.

Waging war is a necessary task of capitalism for its international life and survival and for this the capitalist politicians are obliged to make appropriations. Note, however, that right after the war the campaign started to reduce taxes, to cut government expenditures, to slice the Marshall Plan even though it also is designed for capitalism's survival. The many, many billions needed for a program such as Mr. Berle outlines for public construction and developments, and for public health and education, will never be appropriated by a private enterprise system out for private profit.

Only a planned socialist economy, democratically governed and worker-controlled, will set aside from the public wealth the required amounts of developing national resources, for public construction for housing, for health, for education. Mr. Berle's program in this respect is as inept as Mr. Truman's pre-election "liberalism." Mr. Truman says he wants many of the things Mr. Berle says he wants, and both have not the slightest intention to disturb private enterprise to get these things. There is indeed little choice between Mr. Berle's "strong, clean American liberalism" and Mr. Truman's pre-election brand. It is easy to understand why liberals finally cast their votes for Mr. Truman on Election Day.

The instrument for workers' independent political action is an independent Labor Party, in all respects free from capitalist ties. With such a party a real fight can be made for the needs of the masses, and great strides can be taken toward that workers' government, that democratic socialization, that workers' control of industry, without which no permanent progress can be made.

Continuing Discussion On Palestine Issue

Says Jewish State Must Come First

Henry Judd's article, appearing February 9, positing WP's position on Palestine, concluded with: "But is not the first step toward the implementing of such a program the arming of a few socialist Arabs and a few socialist Jews in a correct ideological, political and social understanding of what is needed? This has been and will remain the modest aim of LABOR ACTION, predicated upon its rejection of both blind Zionist chauvinism, and the equally blind denunciation of progressive nationalism by the orthodox Trotskyist parties."

From a purely socialist point of view perhaps, this may be the correct procedure. But is it an answer, as of this moment, to solving anything which goes on in Palestine at the present time? Given that there were enough influential socialist-minded Arabs and Jews, and that they in turn commanded the respect of enough of their followers, this no doubt would be an answer and an adequate one at that, to all the problems besetting Palestine. But there are not enough, and does anyone pay attention to those who make these appeals? Evidently not. The problems of agitation for socialism are not to be rejected out of hand, but at the same time it would appear that until the people comprising Palestine's population have reached the point of intellectual alertness to the underlying causes of the fratricidal warfare, other means must be taken in order to preserve whatever there may be left worth saving. And of the two camps: allowing of course that both are inspired and deluded by imperialism, which should the socialists back? Plainly, the Jews. Be their cause inspired erringly by chauvinistic Zionism or not, they, not out of pity or condescension, should have the backing of freedom-loving people, with the socialists in the vanguard of that support.

ANALOGY OF SPAIN

The case of Spain comes to mind here. The situation is of course not completely analogous, but the underlying principle is the same. Merely by raising slogans the cause of the Loyalists was not aided. The conflicting ideologies of the forces on the side of the Loyalists caused internal dissension and strife, atomizing what should have been a concerted will toward defeating the enemy, fascism. The foe was fascism, and all those opposed to fascism could have well buried their differences and attained freedom; once that was assured, the people could then consider which faction to their lights would serve them best. This is as far as socialist agitation should be allowed to go. The foe here is imperialism, BUT—to what extent are the Arabs capable of assimilating such propaganda? Let's grant that they want peace and freedom from their oppressors. Doesn't the fact remain that they have not the slightest vestige of democratic thought from which to draw in order to reach a point of selection? They have no means of telling whether socialistic slogans will be an answer to their needs or not.

It is a known fact that the Arabs are being supplied with arms, and aided by a hands-off policy of England and the U. S. as pertains to the Jews. The situation here is parallel with that of Spain. Wasn't the socialist perspective as it pertained to Spain, to arm and otherwise aid the Loyalists, discounting their own internecine conflicts? The primary objective was to defeat the common enemy. Just what is our business in Palestine, if not the material and spiritual aid given in time of crisis to the Jews? Which camp offers or

holds the greatest hope for becoming acquainted with and digesting socialist perspectives, the Arabs or the Jews?

During the past war, the Arab countries were perfectly content to have Hitler Germany invade and rule over them, in fact they passively worked toward these ends. In their very passivity they aided Rommel in his North African campaign and had he not been stopped, Egypt would have welcomed him as its savior. The Arab world has invited imperialism, whether they actually like it or not, to maintain itself at their expense. Bleeding the British and French treasuries is a familiar and lucrative occupation with them. The masses in their stupidity are incapable of recognizing imperialist designs upon them, unless, perhaps when they are fomented to do so by arch-traitors among their leaders purely for reasons of milking the oppressors of more pounds sterling, or the franc. How then expect them to grasp the fundamentals of socialism? The only faction capable of understanding socialism still remains the Jews. Under what conditions then can socialism be better advanced and understood? In a Free Palestine, under Jewish sovereignty, or in the Arab world, with its dark, backward, superstitious background?

MUST CREATE OWN STATE

The idea of educating all factions to socialism within Palestine at this late date when their crisis is upon them seems rather a moot hypothesis, and strangely reeks of philosophy rather than concretized action. Under Jewish rule, the time no doubt will come when the Jews of themselves will be forced to accept socialism as their only solution to their problems. Simply creating a homeland will not solve their basic problems. Foreign immigrants to our shores cherished notions of grandeur as to how they would be treated by employers of native origins. That the system continues to operate irrespective of borders or special colonies is a lesson which will have to be lived and learned by all working people the world over. Only through this process will the masses come to accept socialism as their remaining hope.

At this period then I think it safe to state that socialism, a mere abstraction as it must be in this case, can do nothing to halt the rapidly nearing crisis inherent in Palestine. The Jews must create their own state at whatever odds, solidify their position and after that will inevitably flow thoughts of solving their internal problems. It is then at that time that socialism will be an issue of vital, consuming importance. To repeat, socialist agitation—yes. Both Arab and Jew should be made aware of their roles as puppets in the hands of imperialism. But there definitely should be action with agitation—in that order. The Jews are the means of bringing socialist thought into the Middle East. From them perhaps the Arabs may some day assimilate the rudiments. At all costs, however, it should not be neglected—concrete action by the Jews. If nothing else was learned from the last debacle, no one will forget Manchukuo, Ethiopia, Spain, Munich and the vacillation and pusillanimity of the "Popular Front" governments in taking forthright action against the aggressors. This time may be too late.

Norman Johnstone.

Contributions to the discussion, received from Ed Findley, Leon Shields and a Newark friend, will soon appear in LABOR ACTION.

Talk Big, Hurt UE--

(Continued from page 1)

right to appear on the ballot tremendously facilitates the fight for bargaining rights.

In addition, NO UE local can now legally obtain a union shop clause in any contract. This necessitates a lengthy and cumbersome procedure, involving the signing of individual check-off cards by every member, as a substitute for the standard union shop clause, even where the employer has been compelled to acquiesce. Compare this with the procedure of other unions, which have won 99 per cent of all NLRB union shop elections and thereby facilitated their winning of the union shop and strengthening of the union.

The Stalinists in the UE have followed a policy that has multiplied the dangers and difficulties faced by the membership in every local. The UE membership should demand that the national leadership sign the affidavits so that locals can make use of all legal means they find necessary for maintaining and expanding the union. Such a demand must be linked to the program set forth in LABOR ACTION as the only effective means for defeating the Taft-Hartley law.

HENRY WALLACE

Man and Myth

By DWIGHT MacDONALD

\$2.50

Order your copy from

LABOR ACTION BOOK

SERVICE

4 Court Sq., L. C. C. 1, N. Y.

Price includes postage

NOW AVAILABLE!

1946

Bound

Volumes

of The New

International

\$4.00

each

Readers will quickly recognize the value of this permanent record of Marxist analysis. It is indexed by author and subject, bound stoutly and neatly in attractive cloth, with name and year stamped on the side—320 pages of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL FOR 1946.

FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED!

We have received only 100 volumes from the binder with this shipment. After this number is sold the price will be raised. ALSO:

We have a limited number of Bound Volumes of previous years. 1938—2 copies in stock—\$15.00 ea. 1943—17 copies in stock—7.50 ea. 1944—1 copy in stock—7.50 ea. 1945—33 copies in stock—5.00 ea. (We also have complete sets of other years, but these are not bound. Prices will be sent upon request.)

Order from

WORKERS PARTY

PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

(All orders must be prepaid)

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Unions, Not Banks, Under Attack

Editor:

I have just read the text of the statement issued by President Philip Murray of the CIO on his indictment for violating the Taft-Hartley law. The entire statement is a criminal act, not against the U. S. government, but a criminal act against the 6,000,000 members of the CIO. These are harsh terms, but what else can be said of a union leader who defends his action against the political expenditure section of the Taft-Hartley bill by claiming he was guaranteeing freedom of the press for the banks and corporations?

Murray said: "What has occurred in respect to the CIO News can be in relation to many newspapers, because the Taft-Hartley Act forbids banks and corporations—as well as unions—from making expenditures in connection with political elections. Obviously no corporation which publishes a newspaper can take a stand in a political campaign without making an expenditure."

"More—much more—than the right of Philip Murray to issue political statements through the CIO News is involved in this case. Frank Harper, Philadelphia.

"The vitally important freedom of the entire press is involved."

President Murray knows, as well as any other CIO member, that this provision of the Taft-Hartley bill was aimed at preventing unions from engaging in political action particularly independent (of the Democratic and Republican Parties). Everyone knows that if it takes lots of money to run an election campaign and that unions can run such campaigns only by contributions and dues from their members. No union member can afford to lay out several hundred thousands of dollars to elect his union brother to public office. On the other hand, the owners of the giant corporations can well afford to give sizable chunks of cash as individuals to support their own candidates.

If Murray were a child he might not see that the issue at stake is labor's political action and not freedom of the press; but he is not a child and he does know very well that by these moves he is tying labor more closely to capitalist politics. When he takes his seat at the Pennsylvania State Democratic delegation meeting in May the state's bankers and industrialists can say, "Well done, Phil."

Says Shachtman Failed in Debate

Editor:

I had hoped that your paper would make some comment about the recent Shachtman-Bell debate held at the University of Chicago on the question: Does Stalinism Flow from Bolshevism? But since you have not chosen to do so, here are my impressions of this debate which to my mind was in many ways significant.

First, despite an admission charge of 25 cents, there were about 700 people present, the overwhelming majority of whom were young students interested in politics and not afraid to hear radical ideas. This is really a remarkable turnout and it represented a wonderful opportunity for Shachtman to do some real educating. Second, while the subject of the debate had a twang of bomb-throwing radicalism in it, it was a tremendously vital issue, the clearing up of which would do much to advance the radical thinking of young people. And yet, in the midst of this luscious setting, the debate itself was almost a complete failure, especially from the point of view of the Workers Party.

While Daniel Bell, a faculty mem-

ber, was by no means brilliant, he was at least soft-spoken and sincere. His questions and points were made in an intelligent, dignified, almost naive manner. Shachtman, on the other hand, apparently could not stand the absence of sharp polemic in the old radical tradition, and proceeded to drag the discussion down—and I do mean down—to the level of personal antagonism. Instead of sticking to the subject and answering Bell's questions, he attacked his opponent's political position during the war, labelled him a Social-Democrat and went into a long discourse on the evils of Social-Democracy, much to the bewilderment and disgust of the audience. As to the nature of Bolshevism and Stalinism, and why the latter does not flow from the other, very little was said.

Bell, in an effort to defend himself, retaliated on the same level, and the result was a potentially beautiful debate shot to hell, with Bell achieving a kind of moral victory by exposing Shachtman's failure to deal with the subject. The audience gained very little, except a rather bad impression of the manner in which a radical carries on a discussion.

Why is it that radicals so often counter ideas with sarcasm and stereotyped phrases rather than with

better ideas? The most discouraging part about the whole debate was the fact that many WP members thought Shachtman did the right thing; they thought he "ripped Bell to pieces," and approved heartily of his tirades against the Social-Democrats. Most of all, however, they enjoyed his "biting humor." (What, in the absence of content, is more effective than "biting humor?") Only those steeped in radical cultism could fail to react as the general audience did.

And yet this experience may have healthy consequences for your party. If it will help bring to your consciousness the fact that you have developed—perhaps allowed to persist—many mannerisms, attitudes and traditions which alienate those elements on which the future of your party depends, then you may come around to a self-examination and re-evaluation, which in my opinion is a prerequisite for your growth and effectiveness.

Sincerely,  
A U of Chicago Student, Feb. 15.

Read and Subscribe to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription to LABOR ACTION as follows:

- 6 months subscription (26 issues) for 50c.
1 year subscription (52 issues), together with pamphlet "Plenty for All," to be mailed to me, for \$1.00.

Name (please print)

Address

City Zone State

Bill me Remittance enclosed

# Living Standards Are Low Where Jim Crow Rules --

(Continued from page 1)

George has 23,675,612 acres under cultivation. The assessed value of this land with buildings is \$654,244,224. Indiana has 20,027,015 farm acres but its assessed value is \$1,794,314,968, over twice that of Georgia. In round numbers Mississippi has 19 million acres assessed at 649 million dollars, while Pennsylvania has 15 million acres assessed at over a billion dollars.

There is more to this than meets the eye. Why does the farm land of the North have a higher assessed value than that of the South? Here again we get back to the question of schools, ignorance, income and wealth; energy and indolence, hookworm and the absence of hookworm. The higher cultural, educational and technical level of the North produces a different kind of farming and a different kind of farm.

### REFLECTED IN WAGE SCALES

Let's look at something else. The sales figures quoted are for 1939 and the population figures are for 1940. The population of Georgia was 3,123,723. The population of the state of Washington was 1,736,101. In Georgia, 32,870 retail stores sold \$624,705,000 and paid 78,947 employees \$58,874,000 in wages. In Washington, the sales of 26,682 retail stores amounted to \$668,790,000; 66,852 employees were paid \$75,405,000 in wages.

North Carolina and Wisconsin are about the same size in population. In 1939, however, 270,207 North Carolina wage earners received \$199,289,500 in wages. The same year 200,207 wage earners in Wisconsin received \$251,946,993 in wages. That is, there were around 70,000 fewer wage earners in Wisconsin but they received 52 million dollars more in wages than the wage earners of North Carolina. And we have to remember that North Carolina is not Mississippi or Arkansas.

This means that the workers of Wisconsin had 52 millions more to spend or save than the industrial workers of North Carolina. It means that the industrial families of the workers of Wisconsin would have more electric irons, radios, washers, pianos, furniture, clothing and food than the families of the industrial workers of North Carolina. This means also that Wisconsin can have more and better schools and that the state does not need a poll-tax to aid in support of the state government. This higher income means that Charles Luckman of the Committee on Civil Rights will sell more Life-Buoy soap in Wisconsin than in North Carolina or Mississippi. Not only because the masses have more money in Wisconsin but because they have better schools and better homes in which they are taught that human beings should use soap, and that it is no longer necessary to make one's own soap in the backyard from wood ash lye.

Since the figures I have used are for a few years back it might be conjectured that the gap had been closed. This is not the case. The standard of living, in the South, was raised some during the war, but not much. Per capita income in 1946 was \$555 in Mississippi, \$729 in South Carolina and \$809 in Georgia. Compare this with \$1,090 in Kansas which was perhaps the median for the North. It would be interesting to see the reaction of a native Mississippi poor white after he had advanced to the point where he could understand the meaning of that \$555 for this state in relation to what is going on right now. I mean that raising of \$100,000 to teach this poor white not to reach beyond that \$555 if thereby the Negro will get a little more. I have the notion that when the bedraggled and ignorant poor whites of the South begin to understand these things, there will be another civil war but all the fighting will take place in Dixie.

### COST OF LIVING HIGHER

It has been said that while wages are low in the South, the cost of living is also lower than in the North. This is another myth which must be discarded. Following are some retail food price indices for October 15, 1947. The base is 100. On this date the index for Atlanta was 198.9, Birmingham 204.8, Dallas 195.5, Houston 200, Jackson, Miss., 209, Savannah 215.1, Memphis 213, New Orleans 211, Charleston 189.8. For Chicago the index was 203.1, Cleveland 204.3, Detroit 195.5, New York 194.3, Philadelphia 191.7, Buffalo 192.4 and Kansas City, Mo., 183. I have included the highest and the lowest from big cities in each section.

Here at least is something financial which the South is tops in. The assets of Consolidated Edison in New York City may be greater than the assessed value of all property in Mississippi, Arkansas and South Carolina. But there is at least one thing which Little Rock, Ark., and Jackson, Miss., can boast of: it costs more to live in these cities than in New York City. They have a lower standard of living, but a higher standard of prices.

The governors and congressmen from the South are holding session after session and orating all over the place about "Southern democracy," "states rights" and other ancient Dixie nonsense. What they are really concerned about is the possibility of the poor whites looking into the books and seeing and understanding some of the comparative figures I have quoted above. It would be very silly to believe that the concern of these demagogues right now is with the Negro. They are first of all concerned with keeping the poor whites in ignorance and subjection.

These scoundrels understand, for instance, that a part of civil rights in the United States is the right to organize into trade unions. That process is going on in the South today. White workers who join the CIO will tend to support the civil rights program because they will begin to understand that they too have a stake in civil rights as well as the Negro. When a white worker in Jackson, Miss., learns that his wages are lower than the wages of a worker in New York, but that it costs him more to live in Jackson, he will look around to discover the reason why.

When a white toiler in South Carolina learns that Negroes in the North eat better food, wear better clothing and live in a better house than he does, he will begin to question the value of this "white supremacy" which he has been sold by his representative in Congress and his governor.

It is the economic aspects of this question which I have been discussing that the Committee on Civil Rights was concerned with. That is what the white members of the committee were primarily concerned with, particularly Charles Wilson of General Electric, the chairman, and Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., soap manufacturers.

### "WHITE SUPREMACY" TOO EXPENSIVE

Wilson and Luckman and other Northern manufacturers of consumer goods see a vast potential market which they are being kept from developing by the operation of something known as "white supremacy." "Southern democracy," "the purity of Southern womanhood." Northern industrial capitalism is kept from the development of a potentially huge market by the prevalence of ignorance, poverty, disease and "lawlessness" in the South. Wilson can't sell vacuum cleaners to people who haven't the money, who have nothing to clean or who believe the broom they have always used is good enough.

It is clear that Northern capitalism is preparing for another showdown with the South. "Southern democracy" is again interfering with the frantic attempts of capitalism to stabilize itself. Southern "white supremacy" is getting in the way of the maintenance of capitalist supremacy. Jim Crow is too expensive for capitalism today. As capitalism plunges deeper into difficulties, the capitalists tire of contributing to two universities, two hospitals, two law schools where one could serve adequately. All the railroads in the country are owned in the North. The Southern political leaders don't own even a hand car. The money in Southern banks isn't even owned by Southerners. Southern cotton plantations are owned by the Metropolitan Life, New York Life and other insurance companies and banks in the North. Northern owners of railroads will come to the place where they will conclude that it is too expensive to provide separate accommodations for Negroes in order to keep something known as "white supremacy."

I emphasize again that the Northern manufacturer of consumer goods wants to get at this vast potential Southern market. Right now he can't because there is an iron curtain around the South: "white supremacy," "the purity of the white race," "states rights." The civil rights report and the civil rights message mean that Northern capitalism is ready to apply the policy of the "open door" to the South. Open the door to Northern standards of living, educational standards, cultural values and political practices. This means that the door is open for Northern products and the increase of profits and dividends.

It is not my intention to give the impression that the above is the only reason for the new insistence on "civil rights." In the first article I quoted from the report on "The International Reason" for the establishment of civil liberties. Furthermore, there are in the U. S., fortunately, people who sincerely believe that "democracy" can and should be made to work. All of these points of view were represented among the white members of the committee. This means that these points of view are held by members of the capitalist ruling class today. If this were not true such opinions as are set forth in the report would not have come from the presidents of the University of North Carolina and Dartmouth College, the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church and the president of the General Electric Co.

### NEGROES WILL NOT ALWAYS SUBMIT

There is another reason why some attention must be given to this question by the leaders of society. In the eight states of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and North Carolina there are fourteen million white people and seven million Negroes. These are round numbers. To realize what this means, let's imagine the Negro population of New York to be six million, Pennsylvania five million, Illinois three million and Michigan two million. This would be about one-half of the total population. For instance, would any restaurant or other public place dare deny accommodations to a Negro? Given the present cultural level of the Negro in the North and the Negro population, 30 to 50 per cent of the total population, there could be no possible way by which Jim Crow could be maintained. Under such conditions the Negroes would eliminate Jim Crow by force if necessary.

This is precisely what is likely to transpire in the South. The seven million Negroes in the states I mentioned will not forever consent to live in subjection to fourteen million whites. There is no way for the white people of these states to keep up the subjugation of the seven million Negroes should the Negroes decide that they have had enough. I think it is safe to say that the Committee on Civil Rights did not ignore this aspect of the question. In their opinion civil rights are certainly to be preferred to civil war.

Will Truman hold to his program and insist on passage by Congress? This is a difficult question but relatively unimportant. Why these recommendations were not brought in before has already been answered above. To berate the ruling class or the capitalist parties for using the civil rights question for political advantage may be stating a fact, but it is also demonstrating that one is a little stupid.

To take the position that the findings of the committee have been known for some time even to the white members of the committee and that therefore these members are hypocrites and not to be trusted, is only to waste one's time feeling good over the discovery of a hypocrite.

Any one of these attitudes may be factual and consoling but they hardly contribute to an understanding of what is behind this civil rights agitation from on top, by white people who have civil rights aplenty. That is what I have tried to explore in these three articles. As a result of that exploration I believe the Southern rabble in Congress and the state capitals is going to get a real licking. The South will have to back up. It is interfering again with "free enterprise" at a time when "free enterprise" is less able to bear undue burdens than ever before. The South is going to be forced to put up with a little "mongrelization," with less "white purity," and less "white supremacy." If the South insists on chewing its bitter pills, that will be too bad and nothing can be done about it. Operation Dixie will go on: will go on from CIO headquarters in Washington and from the centers of capitalist production all over the North.

# WORLD POLITICS

## Czechoslovakia: Stalin's Next

It is the misfortune of Czechoslovakia and its six million people to lie in the shadowy No Man's Land between Western Europe and the region of the Iron Curtain. But if Stalin has his way, the Iron Curtain will shortly hang west of this unfortunate land, and its descent will be unmistakable and final. Regardless of the tempo at which it proceeds, Stalin has launched a definitive campaign for inclusion of Czechoslovakia within the sphere of Russian imperialism, and it must be recognized that its chances of victory are only too great.

The background of the long-expected crisis is simple. The country has, since the war's termination, come steadily under the influence and pressure of Russia, even though no occupation troops are now in the land. Czechoslovakia has been an instance on which the major effects of Stalinism have been felt through the medium of the Czech Socialist party itself, once the stage had been set by the original Russian occupation. In the elections of May, 1946, the Socialists received the largest vote and became the plurality party, with 114 out of 300 seats in Parliament. Together with the Social Democrats (a large part of which is under Stalinist control) they had an absolute majority, but they preferred—until now—to rule through a National Coalition government of five parties. The Socialists represented in 1946 slightly under 40 per cent of the popular votes. Their game since then, obviously, has been to sap and undermine the bourgeois parties of the coalition, while simultaneously winning over or paralyzing a majority of the Social Democracy, until they felt they could exercise power in their own name. That moment evidently is at hand.

What is happening in Czechoslovakia is nothing less than a calculated move for the seizure of totalitarian state power by the Socialists, together with the crushing of all opposition, and the erection of a totalitarian state, entirely within the sphere of Russian influence, parallel to the Stalinist states already created in Poland, the Balkans, etc. This crisis has been deliberately precipitated by the Socialists. The arrival of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Valerian A. Zorin as "advisor" tells us much. Stalin has decided to end the coalition farce and pluck the apple. The crisis began over the issue of the police and its control. The Stalinist Minister of Interior had been appointing Stalinists as police chiefs. The non-Stalinist parties, recognizing the beginning of the end for them in these moves, protested and last week resigned. But President Benes, still attempting to hold the coalition together, has refused to accept these resignations and insists that the government continue. The Socialists, of course, wish the resignations accepted and members of the CP appointed in place of the resigned ministers. They also demand the formation of a so-called Social-Democratic-Communist government. We say "so-called" because the divided Czech Social Democracy is either exclusively under Stalinist domination today, or numb with fright. Behind these parliamentary issues, of course, lies the vital and real question of State-Power—who shall be master in the house?

### HOW STALINISM SEIZES POWER

There are two basic questions that concern socialists in the Czech events—how the Socialists operate in their march toward power; how can this Stalinist counter-revolution be defeated, and by whom?

The Stalinist road to state power is marked by the use of blackmail, threats, violence and coercion in every shape and form possible. Kidnapping and jailing of opposition leaders, bribery of Social Democratic leaders with jobs and privileges, police violence against opponents' meetings—all of this is familiar now as weapons in the Stalinist arsenal. Behind all this hovers the menacing shape of the Russian armed forces, able to invade and overwhelm the nation at will.

But all these are techniques, methods and, as such, are subordinate to factors far more important for socialists to grasp. These weapons alone could never put Stalinism in power in Czechoslovakia or, for that matter, anywhere else. Together with their use, Stalinism must (a) mobilize the working masses of the country and (b) offer a political and social program that will actually mobilize the workers. This is what concerns us for it is this that differentiates Stalinism from, for example, an openly fascist movement. It is being employed to the hilt in Czechoslovakia.

A general strike of labor is to build up mass support for the demand of Premier "Stalin" Gottwald that a majority Stalinist cabinet be accepted by President Benes. This climax mass public meetings called in response to the Stalinist manifesto "to good Czechs and Slovaks to join closely in a firm National Front which would secure support for the government of Klement Gottwald and guarantee enactment of all demands which are in the interest of the republic." A convention of 8,000 works council delegates from factories dominated by the Socialists will likewise build up toward the climax while, at the same time, political terror is directed against the Social Democracy to precipitate

its internal split and force its "left wing" to join openly with the Stalinists. The game is played on many fronts at the same time. We are dealing with men motivated by power drives, desperate and calculating; determined to see the thing through. A national peasants' convention has likewise been called but, in this case, not by the official Peasants' Congress (which is non-Stalinist in its majority), but by the Stalinist elements who, of course, will claim to represent the entire peasant mass.

### PSEUDO "DUAL-POWER" POSSIBLE

Precisely how Stalinism will manipulate these masses whose movement it has thus artificially created is something that remains to be seen. It depends upon how quickly and in what form the Social Democracy and the other coalition parties capitulate. There is no question that the Stalinists are prepared to go to the end this time, and may even create a pseudo, Stalinist-controlled "dual power" régime, in the form of the Labor and Peasant organizations, to push aside the Benes Parliament and openly rule in its own name. It seems unlikely that matters will go this far since the bourgeois parties, divided and weakened, unable to get any real aid from America and the Western powers upon whom they depend, cannot be expected to offer lasting resistance.

And by what means are these masses being mobilized? Here again we see another unique weapon, of great importance, that differentiates the Stalinists from their blood brothers, the fascists. That weapon is the demand for nationalization of industry. Those pitiful thinkers of the official Fourth International who have (and still do!) described such régimes as exist in Czechoslovakia as "state capitalism; an alliance between the Czech capitalists and Stalinists," had best spend one moment contemplating reality!

All Czech industry is now 75 per cent nationalized, under state operation and control, yet the Socialists now actively demand that the government nationalize every industry in the foreign and wholesale trades with more than 50 workers—that is, that the 25 per cent balance likewise be nationalized! The Czech bourgeoisie, about to be politically expropriated and soon to find its properties entirely state owned, this bourgeoisie is alleged by some to be the ruling class to which Czech Stalinism has capitulated and with which it has allied itself!

The events in Czechoslovakia, rapidly approaching their final dénouement, demand a more extensive analysis than we can offer here. Profound lessons as to the character and nature of Stalinism must be made. Those American liberals who informed us about the happy marriage of Stalinism with Western Democracy, as symbolized by the Czech National government of Benes, must have the truth shown to them. Those socialists who think of "nationalization" as synonymous with socialism, ignoring its use by the Stalinists as a weapon for creation of their totalitarian state, must again be subjected to the demand that they re-examine their attitude. And those who believe that the bourgeois parties, the liberal parties of Benes and his type, can halt the march of Stalinism must be made to answer the reality of events.

### PROPOSITIONS IN AN ANALYSIS

As our contribution to an analysis of these events, we offer the following propositions:

- (1) In countries where Stalinism can count upon, directly or indirectly, the imminent support of Russian imperialism, its total victory is inevitable. By victory we mean the total seizure of the state and its apparatus. The issue in Czechoslovakia today is state power; unlike France of three months back, it is not intertwined with working class economic demands. Stalinism, at present, cannot take power in those countries whose bourgeoisie can count upon the support, in a tangible way, of American imperialism.
- (2) Stalinism cannot rule together with other parties over an extended period of time. The essence of its totalitarian character lies in the fact that it must have total power; nothing less will do. No matter how meek and subservient the other coalition parties are, Stalinism must destroy them and rule exclusively in its own name.
- (3) The greatest threat in the nature of Stalinism lies in its capacity (based upon organic need) to mobilize the working masses, in the name of a social program (nationalization) which appears to be revolutionary and progressive.
- (4) Capitalism, the bourgeoisie, capitalist parties cannot fight Stalinism successfully. Stalinism will defeat its opponents except where American imperialism is the counter factor, in every case because the capitalist parties are politically and socially bankrupt and cannot halt the Stalinist mobilization of the people.
- (5) A completely re-oriented socialist movement, grasping the true nature of Stalinism in all its implications, is needed to halt Stalinism. The greatest need for such a movement is, above all, in Europe where the threat of Stalinism is strongest.

HENRY JUDD.



By JACK RANGER

## DIAMONDS ON THE SIDEWALK, NO ONE PICKS THEM UP. WHY?

The brokers, the Wall Street letter writers, the financial commentators cannot understand it. They shake their heads and mutter to themselves. There are precious stones glittering up from the sidewalks at the base of the canyons in Wall Street and LaSalle Street—and no one stoops to pick them up.

The diamonds are the current prices of the stocks in American enterprise. They are the richly-embossed certificates that epitomize private enterprise in the fortress of world capitalism. The various industrial enterprises which issued the stocks are coining money as they never before have in all history. The stocks are paying phenomenal dividends. The financial reserves behind the stocks are stupendous. Behind the stocks are billions of dollars of wealth, all the so-very-wonderful "know how" of the go-getting capitalists, an Army and Navy that span the earth and command the air over the earth, an imperial government in Washington that stands at the peak of its power, dominating the modern world to a greater degree than did Rome in its grandeur the small world of yesteryear. People won't buy its stocks. Why?

Once upon a time, in the days between the two world wars, the speculators and brokers and other honest businessmen thought stocks were worth buying if they sold at no more than ten times their annual earnings. But look! Today there are stocks, good stocks, in famous companies, selling at no more than five—or four—or three, or even two times their annual earnings. Still no one buys.

Here is Glidden, purveyor of paint and soybeans, earning \$7.57 a year, selling at only 23 1/2 —Lukens Steel, earning \$8.92, selling at 22 1/2 —American Smelting, earning \$12, selling at 5 1/2 — nice substantial share of Goodyear Tire, earning \$12, selling at 42—the king of all the trusts, U. S. Steel, earning \$12.50 and selling at less than six times that amount, 73 1/2.

Perhaps you are avid for yet greater returns on your investment. Take the plunge with the picking trust. You know how meat prices are. Here's Cudahy earning a rich \$4.32 on a share you can pick up for about \$12; and Armour, earning \$4.85 and selling for 13 1/2.

Does the sugar market interest you? Here's Cuban-Atlantic Sugar, selling for only 18 1/2 and earning \$10.68. Double your money in 21 months on that one. Cuban-American is almost as good, earning \$6.13 on a 13 1/2 price.

For a red-hot daily special, there is Botany Mills. Botany earned \$16.50 in 1947 on a share of stock that sells for only 22. Why, you could almost get back your investment on Botany in a year, and still have the stock.

WHY DON'T YOU DO IT? Don't you want to get out of the working class and be a capitalist. Here's your chance. Red-hot tips from Ranger's dope sheet. You're entitled to something substantial on the dollar you pay for a year of LABOR ACTION. Invest \$1,000 today, and then in ten years, retire. Tell the foreman to go way back and sit down. Go to sunny California with your family and relax in the sunshine. Travel round the world. Be in the big money.

Go on. You can't lose. Why. Truman's economic advisers have given us a glimpse of the nice, cozy life in the good old U.S.A. ten years hence. Surely you believe the President of the United States. There'll be exactly 64,000,000 jobs. People will spend at a rate more than 25 per cent above the present. There'll be a third more goods and services. Cities and highways will have been rebuilt. There'll be TVA's on the Columbia, St. Lawrence, Missouri rivers. New schools. A million new houses a year. The steel industry will have expanded 20 per cent, the petroleum industry, 50 per cent.

Perhaps you are one of those tough-minded people who doesn't believe it all. Too bad, my friend, you're missing out on a good thing.

But then, there must be people who believe in the future of American capitalism. Philip Murray, for instance. He insists that the workers support one of capitalism's candidates. William Green, and Dan Tobin, and A. F. Whitney must believe, for they all tell the rest of us to vote for Truman. Hutcheson of the Carpenters Union must, too, because he assures the workers that the other old capitalist party has a rosy future in store for us. And unlike you, perhaps, these men have p-l-e-n-t-y of money. They all make twenty grand or more a year. Why don't THEY pick up stocks at these bargain-basement prices? Or why doesn't James Burnham? There's a man with faith in the future of American capitalism. Or Henry Wallace? Wallace clears over \$50,000 a year on his corn processing plant, he is a capitalist, he has dough to spare, and he says the system has a future. Right now, he says the future may not be as rosy under Harry as it would be under Henry, but still he says it has a future.

### THEY JUST DON'T BELIEVE IT

Their actions give the lie to their words. Not a one of them believes in the future of capitalism. NOT ONE. Not the brokers, the financial commentators, the labor lieutenants of capitalism, the politicians of capitalism, the money hoarders. They wouldn't give you a plugged nickel that the system would be anything at all worth living in EVEN FIVE YEARS FROM NOW. Because if they did have the faith in their hearts, they'd be picking up those stocks in a hurry. And stock prices would be up to "normal," where they were between the two great wars.

You and I aren't the only ones who see this and say this. In the February 2 Time, Thomas W. Phelps, a partner in Francis I du Pont & Co., a commanding figure in Wall Street, says it: "Many Americans, despite their dislike of Communism," he says, "lack enough faith in capitalism to risk their money on its ability to produce sustained prosperity. Many others . . . lack not faith but cash to buy stocks after paying record high taxes and living costs." The rich haven't the faith. The scissorbills haven't the cash.

Time quoted another expert as confessing he is "baffled." J. A. Livingston, writing his Washington business column in the Chicago Daily News, says "it's the kind of problem that makes you stop, think and shake your head."

The poor stock market can't get anywhere, not even in the wake of all the fine, flowery New Year's forecasts for 1948, he says. The news can't explain it, he says. There was a fine earnings report by U. S. Steel, he says. There were individual increases, stock splitting, he says.

Yes, it should make every one of us stop and think.

# Moves to Enslave Czechs --

(Continued from page 1)

The Socialists mobilized their forces on all fronts, including a carefully controlled one-hour strike of the labor movement.

### BRUTAL COUNTER-REVOLUTION

Little or no resistance has been offered as yet to the various moves organized by Stalin's supporters in Czechoslovakia. The various capitalist parties are completely routed, terrorized and incapable of lifting a finger to stop the march of the totalitarianism. President Benes will undoubtedly fall into line and accept the Stalinist government as the "legal power," thus actually facilitating its taking over of the nation.

As for the Social Democrats, until now in close political and governmental alliance with the Socialists, they have signified their readiness to join the Socialists. The most pro-Stalinist leader of the Social Democrats, Fierlinger, has become head of the party and will fulfill his function of giving the Socialists a majority of the votes in Parliament.

There seems no force capable of halting the Socialists and preventing them from setting up their reactionary dictatorship over Czechoslovakia. Stalin has given the order to bring the unhappy land firmly within the area blocked off by the Iron Curtain and to create exactly the same type of regime that exists in Poland, Yugoslavia and other lands of the Stalinist empire.

What is taking place in Czechoslovakia is a brutal counter-revolution that will mean the final destruction of whatever political liberties and democratic rights have remained until now. It can only end with the imposition of a new, bloody GPU-Stalinist dictatorship upon the Czech and Slovak peoples. It will mean the destruction of the country's labor movement. It has nothing in common with socialism or the winning of workers' power.

How significant is the fact that when the Stalinist leaders ordered the unions to seize the factories, they commanded them to hold the factories only until the government administrators (that is, the Stalinists) arrived to take charge of affairs. Czechoslovakia will rapidly assume all the characteristics of Stalin's Russia and other lands where police rule, dictatorship, secret police and political gangsterism reign supreme.

Before the eyes of the world, the Czech and Slovak peoples are being enslaved by force and violence or organized on a sinisterly effective scale. Let the labor movement of America and other countries speak out openly in condemnation, without equivocation, of the scene now unfolding in Czechoslovakia. This is reaction and counter-revolution, open and undisguised.

## DEFEND POLITICAL RIGHTS

### PHILADELPHIA RALLY AND DANCE

Support the legal defense of Workers Party and Socialist Workers Party candidates

DANCING • ENTERTAINMENT • REFRESHMENTS

Time: Saturday Evening, Mar. 6 Place: 1303 W. Girard Ave.

AUSPICES: Committee for Defense of Political Rights for Minority Parties

**LABOR ACTION**  
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism  
Published Weekly by the  
Labor Action Publishing Co.  
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.  
General Offices: 4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 12, No. 9 March 1, 1948  
Emanuel Garrett, Editor  
Editorial Board: Albert Gates,  
Henry Judd, Irving Howe  
Business Manager: Paul Bern

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.  
\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, Foreign).

Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24,  
1946, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,  
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

# MIKOLAJCZYK'S ROLE EXPOSED

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Mikolajczyk has received a hearty welcome in the British and American press. The British Parliament heard his story and in official session granted him the right of asylum. It is known that the British authorities aided him in his flight from Poland. The gratitude of the English bourgeoisie is understandable: Mikolajczyk served them well, helping to liquidate the thorny and troublesome Polish question and the Polish government in London, which did not wish to recognize the new partition of Poland. Besides, the government of the United States and the United Kingdom have probably decided to use Mikolajczyk for new tasks, not only in Poland but in Central-Eastern Europe as well. At the present time Mikolajczyk is in the United States engaged in the pursuit of his political activities.

The émigré Polish press in England did not prepare so warm a welcome for Mikolajczyk as did the Anglo-American press. Not only the official press of the government-in-exile, supported by the rightist coalition, but the "democratic coalition" as well, which is led by the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) in exile, subjected the policies of the peasant leader to a severe criticism, demanding of the ex-Premier a frank confession of his mistakes. The leader of the PPS, Kwapiński, Vice-Premier in Mikolajczyk's government, asked for a clarification of his ex-chief's policies. In his recently published book, Kwapiński also criticized the vacillations and zig-zags of Mikolajczyk's policies, reproaching him for his lack of firmness and political character.

The rightist coalition concentrated its fire on the peasant leader for fear that he would take over the government in-exile. The criticisms of the PPS stemmed from its belief that Mikolajczyk had betrayed the policy of Polish national independence with regard to Russia. Kwapiński went to the extreme of hinting that Mikolajczyk could only leave Poland thanks to the tolerance of the GPU.

**SWITCHES POLICIES**

Before such a concentrated offensive in England, Mikolajczyk departed for the United States and in an interview granted to the Buffalo Polish language newspaper, "Everybody's Daily," stubbornly reaffirmed his "faith" in the Yalta pact, his acceptance of Poland's eastern frontier and his recommendation that "friendly relations with Russia" be maintained.

This declaration aroused such a violent reaction in the Polish emigration that Mikolajczyk's political position became untenable. But the astute peasant surprised his adversaries with another zig-zag by coming to an agreement with the Polish-American Congress in Chicago. The Congress represents all the Polish-American organizations and claims to represent six million Americans of Polish origin. The most important parts of the agreement signed by the Peasant Party representation, headed by Mikolajczyk, Baginski and Koronski, and the Council of the Polish-American Congress, headed by Rozmarek, was the condemnation of the Yalta policy, the present eastern frontier (the Curzon Line) and the agreement to defend the present western frontier and to struggle for a democratic and independent Poland between the limits set by the Riga Line (1920) and the Oder-Niesse. With this declaration, Mikolajczyk revoked his Buffalo statement, condemning his recognition of the Curzon Line, thus taking up new political positions which are decidedly anti-Russian.

But much more important than the question of frontiers was the fact itself of the political agreement between the PSL (Peasant Party) and the Polish-Americans, since with this a new center of Polish politics in exile is created, opposed to the Polish government in London. This new center, will probably assume clearer forms, will surely be able to count

on the good will of the American State Department and the British Labor government. For these governments, the peasant with a backbone of rubber is much more easily dealt with than General Bor, hero of Warsaw, or the Polish Socialists, intransigent on the question of national independence, or the National-Democratic right which does not have any great political possibilities. Besides, Mikolajczyk's future Polish government fits in well with Washington's political program for Eastern Europe, which is based on the peasant opposition.

The agreement between Mikolajczyk and the Polish-Americans constitutes a fact without precedent in Polish politics since it admits the intervention of American citizens, who although of Polish origin, are Americans who support either the Democrats or Republicans, instead of adhering to the usual Polish political affiliations, those of the Rightists, Populists and Socialists of various shades. With this intervention, Mikolajczyk's policy will reveal itself as under open American control. Popular Polish opinion, not merely in the Polish emigration but in Poland itself as well, will hardly greet this with welcome eyes. The Polish people remember very well the sellout of Poland at Yalta and Potsdam by Roosevelt's policy, which first called Poland the "inspiration of the peoples" and afterward went ahead with the cynical partition.

With all their hatred of Stalinist Russia, the Polish people have no desire to fight Stalin for the benefit of Anglo-American imperialism, which has sold them out twice. Among the masses in emigration, the program of an independent policy with regard to the Anglo-Americans is very popular now.

### AGENT OF CAPITALISM

For a long time we defended Mikolajczyk's opposition to Stalinist totalitarianism as a symbol of the popular workers and peasants' resistance to the Stalinist reaction in Poland. In the same manner we also defended the workers' opposition, which represented the second line of trenches of the opposition to the Stalinists and which has now become the first line, as is shown by the workers' strikes in Lodz and other places, and the trials and reprisals against the Independent Socialists. Now, after the defeat of the peasant movement and

the Stalinist apparatus which controls the Wallace movement conducted a furious and dirty campaign in the Bronx. Money was no object in the campaign. The Stalinists poured all of their forces into the district, printed large amounts of literature in many languages, canvassed the neighborhood thoroughly, held innumerable meetings and entertained with their star theatrical performers. They were also able to drag out the vote. They ended their campaign with a mass meeting attended by 8,500 people, at which Wallace spoke.

The Democrats, a few nights earlier, also held a large mass meeting at which their start attraction, Mayor O'Dwyer, spoke. O'Dwyer, it will be remembered, was elected Mayor of

New York City in 1945 with the support of the ALP. O'Dwyer's speech consisted of an appeal to Wallace to return to the fold and not to split the votes of the liberals in the 1948 elections. A vain appeal, indeed. A much more moving appeal for the Wallaceites will be some tangible concessions to Russian foreign policy.

**WORKING CLASS AREA**

The 24th Congressional District of the Bronx is a working class area. Large areas of it are one unredeemed slum. It has the greatest number of old-law tenements in the Bronx. It has the most acute problem of disease and juvenile delinquency in the Bronx. It is a neighborhood notorious for its lack of proper school facilities, health centers, recreation centers and playgrounds. There has been a great deal of racial friction in the neighborhood, the product of intolerable overcrowding in housing and acute poverty. It has the largest concentration of Negroes in the Bronx. In recent years there has been a very large influx of Puerto Ricans into the neighborhood. The area also contains a large Jewish and Irish population.

From every point of view it was an ideal place for the Wallaceites to conduct a campaign. Both of the old parties are discredited in the area. The chief Isacson appeal was that he and Wallace were the inheritors of Roosevelt's mantle. But one quick tour of the District would reveal the picture results of 13 years of Roosevelt's reforms. Before the lives of the people in this area are drastically altered, great changes will have to be made in the entire social order of capitalist exploitation and landlordism.

The Wallaceites capitalized on the fully justified hatred that the large Negro population in the area has for the Southern politicians who exercise so much control in the Democratic Party. Truman issues civil rights reports asking democratic rights for the Negroes, with one eye cocked on the Negro votes in the 1948 election. But with his full heart he also tries to make peace with his Southern cronies. Many Negroes feel that Truman, no more than Roosevelt, will give them much more than empty promises.

The Negroes in America should naturally be among those who are the most enthusiastic supporters of a gen-

uine Labor Party. The tragedy of the present situation is that there is no such party for them to turn to. Hence many of the most advanced elements of the Negro population turned to Wallace for the solutions of their problems.

**WALLACE'S RECORD SMELLY**

The record of Wallace who, when head of the Agriculture Department, pursued a policy that favored the rich farmer as against the poor farmer, farmer laborer and the sharecropper, is a carefully concealed secret. The desperate strikes of white and Negro sharecroppers in the Southwest and the heroic fight that they waged against almost insuperable odds, is, however, known. These struggles were directed against Wallace's policies. Who is to reveal these facts? Certainly not the Democrats and Republicans, who pursue similar policies. And certainly not Wallace and his Stalinist allies, who today are posing as the great friend of the Negro.

It will be the task of a genuine Labor Party to unmask the fraud that is being perpetrated against the Negro people by the political demagogues of the Wallace stripe. At the same time the role of the Stalinists, as it affects the Negro people, must be exposed. It must never be forgotten by Negro militants how, during the recent war, in the interests of winning the war for Russian imperialism, the Stalinists ceased advocating the fight for democratic rights for Negroes in the South. All this in the cause of "national unity," so that Russia's ally in the great war for "democracy" should suffer no interruption in its war needs.

Mikolajczyk's flight, it is time to strip the peasant leader bare, whose rustic "toughness" turns out to be very smooth, very soft and very much like . . . rubber, whether in dealing with the capitalists or the Stalinists; a phenomenon typical of the intermediate classes, of the peasant petty bourgeoisie.

In Poland, where five generations grew up in the shadow of Czarist and later Nazi gallows, where the youth were educated in prison and viewed the world from behind bars, there did not exist the environment for the skillful politicians of compromise, the political traders, the traveling salesmen of "pieces of paper" as at Yalta or Potsdam. No politician who sought to compromise with Czarism, as did Czartoryski after the Congress of Vienna, or Wielopolski in the period of the last national revolution in 1863, played a decisive role. The people scorned them and refused to follow them. In Poland there was only room for tough and self-sacrificing men of struggle. We cannot take into account the present Stalinist government, as it does not include any national political figures, but puppets and secret agents who act as Stalin's police.

Mikolajczyk, leader of the peasants, represents the tragedy of his social class, which is fated to be crushed between the Stalinist and capitalist colossus. He represents the custom-bound world of the peasant dwarfed by the giant shadow of industrial civilization. We have defended and shall continue to defend, in the person of the peasantry, men of hard labor and democrats, but we do not intend to defend the agents of capitalism.

### WORKERS CONTINUE FIGHT

Mikolajczyk has already lived out the best of his political life; we do not foresee any great political future for him in spite of the support of Washington and the English Labor government. Peasant Poland will be absorbed by Stalinist totalitarianism unless the Anglo-Americans quickly come to its defense. But a workers' proletarian Poland will remain, an intransigent Poland as always in program of national independence, which today signifies social emancipation, a Poland of the third front.

In this new Poland which will arise from the Stalinist inferno there will be no room for leaders with spines of rubber . . . like Mikolajczyk.

# Says Isacson Victory in Bronx Election Sheds Light on Wallace - CP Movement

By STEVE PARKER

NEW YORK—Leo Isacson, a member and candidate of the American Labor Party and a supporter of the Wallace third party movement, was overwhelmingly elected congressman from the 24th Congressional District of the Bronx in a special congressional election held on February 17.

This special election was viewed on all sides as a test of Wallace's strength in the 1948 presidential election. For days the outcome of the election has been a matter of national interest and the subject of endless newspaper and radio comment. The results will be a tremendous shot in the arm to the Wallace forces. At the same time it is certain to throw consternation into the ranks of the professional Democratic Party politicians. Especially will it be a blow to the large sections of the labor bureaucracy that is trying to tie the labor movement to Truman in 1948.

Isacson received 22,697 votes to 12,578 for Karl Propper, his Democratic Party opponent. A third candidate, Dean Alfange of the Liberal Party, received 3,840 votes. Alfange ran only because Boss Ed Flynn of the Bronx refused to make any deal with the Liberal Party in any local Bronx election. The Republicans ran a sad last with less than 3,000 votes for their candidate. Isacson received over 55 per cent of the total vote cast although in actual numbers his vote was lower than the ALP's vote in the 1946 congressional election in the same district when the ALP received 38 per cent of the total vote cast. These figures alone indicate the scope of the Wallace victory.

The Stalinist apparatus which controls the Wallace movement conducted a furious and dirty campaign in the Bronx. Money was no object in the campaign. The Stalinists poured all of their forces into the district, printed large amounts of literature in many languages, canvassed the neighborhood thoroughly, held innumerable meetings and entertained with their star theatrical performers. They were also able to drag out the vote. They ended their campaign with a mass meeting attended by 8,500 people, at which Wallace spoke.

The Democrats, a few nights earlier, also held a large mass meeting at which their start attraction, Mayor O'Dwyer, spoke. O'Dwyer, it will be remembered, was elected Mayor of

New York City in 1945 with the support of the ALP. O'Dwyer's speech consisted of an appeal to Wallace to return to the fold and not to split the votes of the liberals in the 1948 elections. A vain appeal, indeed. A much more moving appeal for the Wallaceites will be some tangible concessions to Russian foreign policy.

**WORKING CLASS AREA**

The 24th Congressional District of the Bronx is a working class area. Large areas of it are one unredeemed slum. It has the greatest number of old-law tenements in the Bronx. It has the most acute problem of disease and juvenile delinquency in the Bronx. It is a neighborhood notorious for its lack of proper school facilities, health centers, recreation centers and playgrounds. There has been a great deal of racial friction in the neighborhood, the product of intolerable overcrowding in housing and acute poverty. It has the largest concentration of Negroes in the Bronx. In recent years there has been a very large influx of Puerto Ricans into the neighborhood. The area also contains a large Jewish and Irish population.

From every point of view it was an ideal place for the Wallaceites to conduct a campaign. Both of the old parties are discredited in the area. The chief Isacson appeal was that he and Wallace were the inheritors of Roosevelt's mantle. But one quick tour of the District would reveal the picture results of 13 years of Roosevelt's reforms. Before the lives of the people in this area are drastically altered, great changes will have to be made in the entire social order of capitalist exploitation and landlordism.

The Wallaceites capitalized on the fully justified hatred that the large Negro population in the area has for the Southern politicians who exercise so much control in the Democratic Party. Truman issues civil rights reports asking democratic rights for the Negroes, with one eye cocked on the Negro votes in the 1948 election. But with his full heart he also tries to make peace with his Southern cronies. Many Negroes feel that Truman, no more than Roosevelt, will give them much more than empty promises.

The Negroes in America should naturally be among those who are the most enthusiastic supporters of a gen-

uine Labor Party. The tragedy of the present situation is that there is no such party for them to turn to. Hence many of the most advanced elements of the Negro population turned to Wallace for the solutions of their problems.

**WALLACE'S RECORD SMELLY**

The record of Wallace who, when head of the Agriculture Department, pursued a policy that favored the rich farmer as against the poor farmer, farmer laborer and the sharecropper, is a carefully concealed secret. The desperate strikes of white and Negro sharecroppers in the Southwest and the heroic fight that they waged against almost insuperable odds, is, however, known. These struggles were directed against Wallace's policies. Who is to reveal these facts? Certainly not the Democrats and Republicans, who pursue similar policies. And certainly not Wallace and his Stalinist allies, who today are posing as the great friend of the Negro.

It will be the task of a genuine Labor Party to unmask the fraud that is being perpetrated against the Negro people by the political demagogues of the Wallace stripe. At the same time the role of the Stalinists, as it affects the Negro people, must be exposed. It must never be forgotten by Negro militants how, during the recent war, in the interests of winning the war for Russian imperialism, the Stalinists ceased advocating the fight for democratic rights for Negroes in the South. All this in the cause of "national unity," so that Russia's ally in the great war for "democracy" should suffer no interruption in its war needs.

5. The position of the labor leaders who are trying to tie the working class to Truman and standing in the way of an independent Labor Party is now open to the greatest attack on the part of labor's militants. Labor is becoming fed up with the self-defeating tactic of the "lesser evil."

6. However, no labor militant or revolutionary socialist can now afford to ignore the Wallace movement. They must make contact with the layers that are supporting Wallace. They must point out that not a third capitalist-Stalinist party is the present requirement, but rather a class party of labor with a far-reaching program that can solve the problems of the working class and its allies among the people. Not a party that has been cooked up by the Stalinists to aid Russian strategy, but a party that reflects the genuine interests and needs of the American workers.

# HAWAIIAN PEOPLE SEEK U.S. STATEHOOD

By GERALD McDERMOTT

Half a million American citizens, residents of the Hawaiian islands, are demanding their elementary democratic rights. They are demanding statehood. The history of these people, most of whom are workers, justifies fully these demands. The rest of American labor should support their fight.

Hawaii is more than the "Paradise of the Pacific" pictured in the steamship ads. Along with the Hula girls, the island is rich with sugar and pineapple plantations. The city of Honolulu has more than a quarter of a million people. The workers of Hawaii, many of whom live in plantation "company towns" like U. S. coal camps, are strongly organized into a total of 68 CIO and 46 AFL locals. They have won important job and wage improvements as well as favorable legislation. Hawaii's congressional delegate as well as a majority of both houses of the territorial legislature are PAC approved.

Hawaii is one of the most democratic and tolerant areas in the world. The population is one-third Caucasian, one-third of Japanese ancestry, the remainder being Chinese, Hawaiians, Koreans, Puerto Ricans, and other groups. These groups live peacefully side by side, go to school, work and play together, share seats in the territorial legislature and leadership in both smaller business and the union movement, and in general set quite an example for the rest of the United States.

The Island Paradise, however, is thoroughly American in its economic structure. That is, the

wealth of the islands is in the hands of five huge corporations, known and hated by the people as the Big Five. These monopolies control the sugar and pineapple industries, importing, exporting, merchandising, insurance, banking, shipping, and a good deal else. Until the union movement came to Hawaii, they thoroughly controlled local government and other affairs. In the early days, plantation laborers were paid a few cents a day and lived in virtual slavery. The islands, settled by missionaries who quickly became capitalists, were wrested from the natives by the forerunners of the Big Five with the aid of U. S. Marines.

In partnership with the Big Five in seeking continued domination of Hawaii are the brass hats of the Army and Navy. The Navy, along with many of the businessmen, oppose statehood. The Navy would prefer to rule Hawaii as they rule Guam. In Guam, the people have poor education, low wages, no civil rights, and no democracy. The Navy has complete authority. Even now, the traditionally "white supremacy" minded Navy is a threat to the labor movement and the racial tolerance of Hawaiians. The only lynching in Hawaii was led by a naval officer who was punished by "imprisonment" for one hour!

In its present Territorial status, Hawaiians put up with taxation without representation. Hawaiians paid taxes to the U. S. Treasury in 1947 of \$107 million, while expenditures for Hawaii in return were only \$3 million. Hawaii's only delegate to Congress cannot vote and cannot even speak in the Senate. The governor, judges and many other officials are appointed from Wash-

ington. During the war, the military virtually ended all civil rights and ruled with an iron hand. Many citizens of Japanese ancestry were thrown into relocation (concentration) camps without cause.

### PEOPLE WANT STATEHOOD

Fourteen times since 1903 the territorial legislature has asked statehood. Eight times it has paid the way of congressional investigating committees who considered the question. A vote among Hawaiians in 1940 showed them overwhelmingly in favor of statehood. In the continental United States, a recent Gallup poll showed a three to one sentiment for statehood.

What, then, is the opposition? Aside from the brass hats and part of the Hawaiian capitalists fearful of the labor movement, the opposition is racial. Southern congressmen frankly oppose Hawaiian statehood because it would mean more votes in Congress for anti-lynching and anti-poll tax bills and against anti-labor bills. In the best Senator Claghorn style, they ask, "How would you like a Senator Yamamoto elected to the United States Senate, huh?"

LABOR ACTION and the Workers Party strongly support statehood for Hawaii. Listed above are a number of excellent reasons for this. The people of the islands desire it. It would give half a million American citizens—among whom are our CIO and AFL brothers—their elementary rights. The vast majority of Hawaiian people would be in a better position to fight the Big Five. Let the labor movement speak out.

# 16 Units Fulfill or Top WP Fund Drive Quota

By YETTA BARSH, Campaign Director

FEBRUARY 23—The end of the twelfth week of the Fund Drive, with one more week to go, finds 16 of the participating units in the 100-per-cent-and-over class. All but Reading of the four units to fulfill their quotas this week, sent in contributions which took them over their respective goals: Detroit's contribution of \$55 this week raised its total to \$802, or \$2.00 above its quota; Cleveland sent in \$104, raising its total to \$518 (103 per cent), with the promise that more would be forthcoming during the last week of the Drive; St. Louis, which seemed to be slow in getting started, made up for its

past tardiness with a contribution of \$40, raising its total to \$56 (160 per cent).

Baltimore continues to oversubscribe its quota—its \$4.75 contribution is week raised its percentage to 124. Buffalo, which was one of the first to set the oversubscription pace, likewise continues to oversubscribe with a \$55 contribution, raising its per centage to 133, which represents \$200 over its \$600 quota.

Our new San Diego branch, which was organized only a few weeks ago and which was therefore never assigned a quota for the Fund Drive, ran a party for the Fund Drive and sent in the \$11.25 proceeds. The branch apologizes for its inability to do much more for the Drive before it ends, but we believe that this unsolicited support by our new comrades has more than just a monetary value—it is a token of their loyalty and the beginning of a long and harmonious relationship between us.

Our only other contributions this week were as follows: Chicago—\$138.11; Los Angeles—\$40.00; Newark—\$39.30; Pittsburgh—\$5.00; San Francisco—\$140.25; New York—\$99.00; National Office—\$120.00.

Although we have to date achieved only 86 per cent of our goal, there is still time during the next week to raise the \$15,000. In terms of dollars, most of the units which have not yet achieved their quotas have only to raise comparatively small sums during the next week. It is possible to exert that extra amount of energy required to collect all outstanding pledges and without much difficulty to raise the over-all sum to \$15,000.

We ask all Fund Drive Directors who have promised faithfully to fill their quotas not to let down during the last week. Hit the top and go over this last week!

AlltcdpB.

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.....

Branch	Quota	Feb. 16	Pct.
Manhattan SYL	\$30.00	\$52.00	173
St. Louis	35.00	56.00	160
Buffalo	600.00	900.00	150
Baltimore	100.00	123.75	125
Connecticut	50.00	60.00	120
Hibbing	5.00	4.00	80
San Pedro	100.00	120.00	120
Streator	20.00	23.00	115
Philadelphia	400.00	453.50	113
Cleveland	500.00	518.00	103
Boston	60.00	60.00	100
Detroit	800.00	802.00	100
Indiana	50.00	50.00	100
New York Misc.	20.00	20.00	100
Oregon	50.00	50.00	100
Reading	75.00	75.00	100
Newark	400.00	373.34	93
San Francisco	1,000.00	868.96	87
New York City	4,000.00	3,408.98	85
Akron	400.00	334.75	84
Chicago	1,500.00	1,170.24	78
Los Angeles	500.00	383.50	77
Miscellaneous	40.00	30.00	75
National Office	8,500.00	2,560.00	30
Youngstown	200.00	125.00	63
West Virginia	150.00	85.00	57
Pittsburgh	25.00	13.00	52
Seattle	400.00	200.00	50
San Diego		11.25	—
	\$15,000.00	\$12,833.27	86

**The New INTERNATIONAL**

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

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

Six Issues — \$1.25; Twelve Issues — \$2.00

Enclosed is  \$1.25 —  \$2.00 for

Six Month —  One Year Subscription to

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... ZONE NO..... STATE.....