

Buckmaster Ouster In URW Resulted From Power Fight

By BILL HICKMAN

AKRON, June 4—On May 24, the Beacon Journal of Akron (owned by the Knight newspaper chain—Detroit Free Press, Miami Herald) blazoned forth with a banner headline declaring that L. S. Buckmaster had been ejected from the office of international president of the United Rubber Workers by the International Executive Board. From that day to this the ouster of Buckmaster has been front-page copy here.

The Beacon Journal's coverage articulates what the whole managerial and industrial class of the rubber industry feels on this issue. The rubber barons regard Buckmaster as a "reasonable" and "respectable" union leader—and so he was. He was the type of man who could as often as not see the "other fellow's" point of view. He was one of those gentlemen who, once in office, fancy themselves to be delegated mediators between the workers and the management; one of those union leaders who conceive the role of the union representative to be, not a defense attorney for the worker, but an impartial judge—with the leanings toward wealth and power which often characterize the judicial bench. The removal of such a man must naturally meet with considerable disapproval, if not alarm, on the part of the pillars of the rubber industry.

BEHIND THE OUSTER

Here is the story behind the ouster of the URW president.

The expulsion of Buckmaster from office represents a continuation of the fight between two groups in the union: the Bass-Eagle forces and the Buckmaster-Watson group. The move to oust Buckmaster was initiated by Robert E. Garber's charges, placed

before the International Executive Board following an attempt by Buckmaster to remove him bureaucratically from the office of president of Local 336, Pottstown, Pa.

The Buckmaster group had succeeded in barring, whether rightly or wrongly, the delegates of the Pottstown local from being seated at the last convention of the URW. These delegates are reported to have been pledged to vote for George Bass (president of Goodrich Local 5) for international president. Bass lost the election to Buckmaster by two votes, 810 to 808. But the Bass-Eagle-Lloyd forces succeeded in electing all the remaining international officers and a majority of the International Executive Board.

Recently, however, Buckmaster had charged Garber's administration in Pottstown with "financial irregularities." He called a special meeting of the Pottstown local in March to discuss these irregularities. Arriving with his entourage (two of the boys), Buckmaster, apparently thinking himself among his cronies, declared himself chairman of the meeting. Garber was unreasonable enough to hold that since the membership of Local 336 had elected him president, he had the right constitutionally to preside. Buckmaster disdainfully refused to accept this affront by a man of lesser rank, whereupon the assembled men of lesser rank pushed Buckmaster off the stage and caused his aides to be hospitalized.

BASIS OF CHARGES

It was following this altercation that Buckmaster decided that Garber was no longer president of Local 336 and Garber brought charges against Buckmaster for malfeasance in office.

(Continued on page 2)

AN EDITORIAL

Trial Manufactures 3 Stalinist "Martyrs"

Gerhart Eisler, the unscrupulous operator for the Russian GPU who is now laughing at his American opposite numbers from a haven behind the Iron Curtain, may be right about at least one thing.

Gloating over his successful escape, Eisler tauntingly told reporters that Attorney General Tom Clark is the stupidest man in the United States. This is not a label to be lightly pinned on anyone. There are too many competitors.

The latest development in the New York trial of the eleven Communist Party leaders makes Clark a leading contender, at the very least, even without passing on his competence in the Eisler case.

We are assuming that Clark is overseeing government tactics and strategy in the CP trial. At any rate, it is improbable that his third assistant office boy is saddled with this responsibility.

Last week, three of the defendants—Gates, Hall and Winston—were jailed by Judge Medina for contempt of court. Out on bail until now, they will now attend the court sessions under guard.

What was the occasion? It is obvious, of course, that the CP's tactics in the trial have included stalling and judge-baiting; while, on the other side of the bench, some of the judge's remarks from his elevated seat sound to a layman's ear as if the mask of judicial impartiality, always pretty thin in such cases, has been popping off. Considering that Medina had the knife out anyway, what was the occasion he used to dig it in?

It was the refusal of defendant Gates to stoop for the government by putting his finger on the members of a CP subcommittee.

To crack down on the CPers for this is the height of stupidity because

(Continued in Editorial Column on page 3)

State Dept. Line on A-Pact Wins Out; Senate Committee Gives Rubbery OK

By HAL DRAPER

JUNE 7—With today's unanimous vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to endorse the Atlantic Pact without any reservation or interpretation, it would appear that the State Department has won a victory for its point of view within leading Congress circles, both Democratic and Republican. There will be no effort to clarify the doubletalk in the A-Pact.

The only statement to accompany the pact which is proposed by the Senate committee is one reaffirming this country's "dependence upon Almighty God." (The N. Y. Times re-

ports that this was accepted "in principle.") The controversy which has been raging over the signing of the pact has, however, been over more earthly sources of strength.

The nature of this factional struggle within the bipartisan ranks of U. S. foreign policy makers has been quite public. On May 24, for example, a Washington dispatch to the Times reported:

U. S. WALL IN EUROPE?

"Influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are considering accompanying its approval of the North Atlantic Treaty with a statement defining and limiting the nature of the American military commitment to Western Europe.

"That was disclosed today by a highly placed informant. He made it clear that the proposed declaration would be to the effect that there was no thought of offering to lay in advance across Europe a wall of security, involving American troops, against any Soviet invasion."

Referring to the testimony before the committee given by James P. Warburg (a former New York banker and a prominent world-government advocate), the dispatch further said:

"Statements by Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and General Omar N. Bradley, army chief of staff, were cited as permitting an interpretation offering Western Europe a kind of guarantee against invasion that was not contemplated by members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan, senior Republican member of the committee, indicated much interest in dispelling this interpretation. Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, committee chairman, is understood to be ready to go along with an explanatory statement."

In a lead article at the time of the signing of the pact, LABOR ACTION gave further details about the pressure from high personages to put

through a guarantee of this sort, involving the garrisoning of U. S. troops along the border of the Iron Curtain.

PRESIDENT'S POWERS

The reasoning behind this pressure was further highlighted by a dispatch from Germany by Times correspondent Drew Middleton (May 12) concerning a proposed compromise with the German people's desire to rid their country of the occupation troops. This "compromise device" of withdrawing the troops of the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States into Stettin, Hamburg and Bremen, which was drafted by the State Department's policy planning staff, under George Keenan, is felt here to have several advantages and disadvantages.

The disadvantage, from the West's point of view, is that the screen of United States, British and French troops now standing between the Soviet army and Western Europe would be withdrawn.

"This thought disturbs some officials in the Western countries, where the populations have been reassured by the thought that the Russians could not attack them without first attacking the Western occupation troops and provoking a major war."

Associated with this question of a more or less long-term screen of occupation troops, guaranteeing the instantaneous entry of the U. S. into the Third World War as soon as the first shot is fired, is the question whether the president of the United States could dispatch troops to Europe in the event of hostilities—without waiting for a declaration of war by Congress but acting under his powers as commander in chief to implement the A-Pact.

This would obviously mean that the power to authorize the waging of war is no longer in the hands of Congress, even formally, but in the hands of the executive—a new high in the

Murder-Mill in the Mines: Lewis Gives Facts of Life — and Death

John L. Lewis, who is good for lots of front-page copy when the miners are out on strike and the press is screaming about the "national emergency," didn't make the major-newspaper headlines with his testimony before a Senate subcommittee last week.

And that was because, in his best Lewisian style, he was setting forth the horror of worker casualties in the mines—and the newspapers don't find that so interesting.

The mine workers' leader was testifying for a bill introduced by Senator Neely of West Virginia which would put teeth in the federal coalmine inspection laws, by giving government inspectors power to close down a critically dangerous mine until it was made safe. The operators are fighting the bill because it would "cost money."

Lewis told the subcommittee the other side of the cost picture.

Since 1930, he told them, over one and a quarter million miners "have been maimed, mangled and killed." This means 65,000 a year.

On the basis of mine employment, it means that "statistically every man employed in the industry was injured or killed three times during the 19-year period," Lewis said.

"What a record of horror! Was any war ever fought more terrible and more desolating to the population?" he exclaimed. In the first one and a half years of America's participation in World War II, "the casualties in the coal-mining industry of our country exceeded the losses in our armed forces."

"If I had the powers of a Merlin," he dramatically said, "I would march that million and a quarter men past the Congress—the quick and the dead. I would have the ambulatory injured drag the dead after them. I would have that mighty concourse of men flanked by five weeping members of each man's family, his dependents—six and a quarter million people wailing and lamenting while this concourse of death and agony and travail went by."

What about the operators' claims that they are too poor to do anything about the man-made slaughter that goes on in their diggings?

(Continued on page 2)

Russians in Retreat At Paris; 4 Powers Stalled Over Trade

By HENRY JUDD

For over two weeks representatives of the Big Four have been gathered in Paris discussing the problems of Germany and their relation with each other. The Paris Conference, which many believed would mark a sharp and definite Russian retreat in Europe, has dragged on so far without any serious accomplishment, although it is clear that a general-scale Russian retreat has begun. But just as clear is the fact that the Russians are determined to retreat only a half step at a time, fighting for each inch of ground as they give way before the superior pressure (for the moment) of the Allied imperialist bloc.

Any belief that may have existed that a general political settlement for all of Germany—including a peace treaty—might result from this conference is now largely abandoned. Both camps that now occupy Germany and exert their control over its 65 million people are unable to settle on any form that a unified Germany, under their guardianship, shall take.

The Russians, in view of the severe defeats they have lately suffered in their zone, cannot permit extension of the Bonn Constitution to the Eastern zone since they know a free election would sweep their quisling SED (Stalinist party) out of any position of influence. This proposal was therefore countered by Vyshinsky's fantastic proposition to resume full military control over all of Germany, just as if the country had suddenly been conquered all over again!

At the moment, the Western Allies feel strong and capable of standing fast on their demand for a unified Bonn Constitution Germany. Thus there seems little likelihood of any agreement, in addition to the fact that the Russians will not yield to the demand that they give up their Russian-owned trusts in Germany and turn back these properties to the Germans.

RUSSIANS FEAR DISCONTENT

It is still possible that some progress toward political agreement may be made or even that a final treaty with Austria will be written at this conference. However, after two weeks, these have become secondary matters on the agenda, as the conference turns more toward narrow and practical matters where some

RUSSIANS FEAR DISCONTENT

It is still possible that some progress toward political agreement may be made or even that a final treaty with Austria will be written at this conference. However, after two weeks, these have become secondary matters on the agenda, as the conference turns more toward narrow and practical matters where some

(Continued on page 4)

Dems Push Brannan Farm Program

Worried About Horrible Prospect of Farm Surplus and Vote Shortage

By SUSAN GREEN

Many weeks ago the Truman administration submitted to Congress a new farm bill named for Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. After some hearings and some publicity in the press and on the air, both for and against, the bill was tucked away in a cubbyhole. Administration leaders are now going to try to pry it out of hiding.

The starting point will be a Midwestern Democratic conference to be held at Des Moines, June 12 and 13, at which four cabinet members and other moguls of the Democratic Party, including the Democratic governors of eight Midwestern states, will boost the Brannan bill. So it will be much in the news. Let us see what all the shouting is going to be about.

In the first place, this bill, like all other farm acts of recent vintage, starts from the premise that the whole agricultural sector of American economy has failed as private enterprise in a private-enterprise system. Of course, the politicians and lawmakers do not put it this way. They have gone ahead and provided government subsidies, government price support, government buying of surpluses, government plow-under programs, government regulation of planting, etc.

All of this is made necessary by the fact that the capitalist profit system does not allow the working people a share in the national income large enough to permit them to purchase the quantities of goods and foods that modern manufacture and agriculture can produce and must continue to produce.

The new Brannan bill is occasioned by the fact that the current parity-price-support farm law is causing the administration a very bad headache. The present law makes it incumbent upon the government to buy up farm surpluses or to take them up on loans, the price to the government or the extent of the loan being 90 per cent of what is called parity. Parity under the law is supposed to give a farm commodity the same exchange value, or purchasing power, in terms of things farmers have to buy, as that commodity had in the 1909-14 period.

During the war and in the post-war period this system worked out fairly well for the simple reason that prices were high and there were no distressing surpluses, except for potatoes and a few others of the less important farm products. But with the present sag in demand and with a deflationary pressure on prices, the situation has changed. Already the government is head-over-heels in farm surpluses and bids fair to be completely overwhelmed by them.

SURPLUS HEADACHE

At the beginning of 1949 the stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation (the government agency involved) or pledged to it under loan included 156 million bushels of corn; 284 bushels of wheat; 4,275,000 bales of cotton; 28 million pounds of eggs; 103 million pounds of wool—to name only a few items. The grand total, at the beginning of 1949, of stored commodities was valued at \$2,186 million.

These huge quantities of farm products are kept from human consumption, but not because people are

glutted with food and are over-clothed. Indeed we all know about the millions who lack adequate food and clothing abroad and in this country too. But their need is not backed up by purchasing power.

So \$50 million worth of eggs remain in government storage. Potatoes are bought by the government and plowed under. Wheat and corn are converted to pep up gasoline to burn in motors instead of in human stomachs, as Secretary Brannan pointed out.

TO MAINTAIN FARM INCOME

But this situation is mild compared to what is expected. With farming reviving in Europe and other parts of the world, and with unemployment steadily mounting in this country, the farm surpluses will grow and the threat to farm prices will be indeed serious. If the present farm support system remains in effect and the government must take up farm surpluses, it is expected that next year the government "investment" in this field will climb to \$4 billion.

Obviously this is an unhealthy and an untenable situation. The problem of storage is the least of the problems, though it exists. Also no government wants voluntarily to throw so much good money after bad, as the saying goes; the government does worry about taxes—where its money comes from. And further, fundamentally it is impossible to maintain high farm-price levels with such surpluses on hand and with a general deflationary tendency. The Brannan bill embodies what the administration believes is a way out.

The basic change it seeks to make is this: Instead of parity (that is, the relation between farm prices and industrial prices) being the pivot of government support, farm income will be the determinant. The objective will be to prevent total farm income from dropping below a certain level. The average for the ten years 1939 to 1949 will be that level, or around \$26 billion per year.

With the objective of keeping total farm income at this figure, the prices of some farm commodities will be supported and the prices of others will be allowed to seek their market level. In the former category will be more stable and storable products such as corn, wheat, cotton; in the latter category will be perishable products such as milk, eggs, meat, poultry. As an instance Secretary

(Continued on page 3)

Bosses Stepping Up T-H Offensive

In the eighth month since President Truman was re-elected to get rid of the Taft-Hartley Law, a report of the National Labor Relations Board reveals that there has been a sharp upturn in the utilization of T-H by employers to hit at the labor movement.

For the second consecutive month, so-called "unfair labor practice" charges filed by bosses against unions have increased. In April, 135 such charges were instituted, as compared with an average of 84 during the previous six months.

At the same time, another section of the NLRB report shows that workers are still voting for the union. In elections for a union shop, labor won out in 98 per cent of the cases. Out of 40,000 ballots in 429 collective-bargaining elections in April, mostly among previously unorganized workers, over 76 per cent voted for union representation.

And if the workmen and women vote for THEIR OWN PARTY when election days roll around in the nation, there won't be any Taft-Hartley Law or labor-baiting drives. BUILD A LABOR PARTY!

Pres. Buckmaster Ousted



(Continued from page 1)

After a hearing that lasted four weeks, the International Executive Board found Buckmaster guilty of the following charges:

"He conspired with certain individuals to deprive local union officers of their rights.

"He issued public statements falsely attacking the character of local union officers.

"He was responsible for a riot at a meeting of Firestone Local 336, Pottstown, Pa., last March.

"The former president's conduct was part of a general plan to deprive a local union of its rights and democratic privileges with the international union."

"Such conduct against union members constituted malfeasance in office."

On this basis they removed him

Lewis --

(Continued from page 1)

"I have the most infinite contempt for such polecats who come down to this Congress to continue to give them the unlimited right to keep on operating the coalmines under that record of death and mutilation," Lewis thundered.

"Earnings and profits in the coal industry in 1948 exceeded all other years in history, and the first quarter of 1949 exceeds last year by millions of dollars."

There is probably not another social fact about the United States which shows so plainly that, under capitalism, profits come first—even as the NAM says they have to—even if a million and a quarter men have to spill their blood in order to ensure it.

from the office of international president. They elevated H. R. Lloyd from the office of vice-president to that of president, and named H. M. Dickenson, a district representative from Tennessee, as vice-president. Following this change, the new Lloyd administration proceeded to make two or three other changes whereby Buckmaster men were replaced by Bass-Eagle-Lloyd men.

The Buckmaster-Watson forces have established headquarters at Local 7, of which both are members, Buckmaster having been president of the local before moving up to international positions, and Watson being the current president. Their first declaration was that they intended to appeal the expulsion to the next international convention of the rubber workers.

Following that, Watson reportedly told newsmen that an appeal had been made for a congressional investigation of communism and left-wing activity, but refused to say just who had requested such an attack on the URW. The papers have been ringing every possible change on that theme ever since. The Akron Beacon Journal and the interests it represents are quite obviously in Buckmaster's corner and with good reason.

POWER STRUGGLE

But for the worker directly concerned and the unionist seeking to understand the situation inside the URW, it must be made perfectly clear that this is essentially a fight for power, for offices, and the spoils thereof. Neither faction has a program—unless one can consider Buckmaster's gentlemanly relations with management to be one, and Bass's often-voiced criticism of his lack of toughness to be another.

As between the two men, Bass's consistent record of firmness and astuteness in negotiations of all kinds makes him preferable. In comparison with Buckmaster, he represents the better alternative, but only in comparison with Buckmaster. Actually there is little to be enthusiastic about in either man.

Bass's growing talents for organizing a solid machine of relatives and cronies who decide most issues in advance, even in advance of his own caucus, and then simply pass the word down the line that George is voting this way or that, has made him a potentially dangerous man. The machine itself has a growing tendency to solve the question of minorities by attempting, or at least suggesting, abrogation of democratic rights. Nor have they proved themselves to be above a bit of mauling and kicking when some "smart guy" insists on spreading criticism of them. The fact that Bass himself always denies any connection with these acts

does not relieve him of responsibility for them. He is the one authority that dominates the whole machine.

The strategy of the Bass-Eagle-Lloyd forces is apparently to have Lloyd again run for vice-president at the next convention and to run Bass for the office of president. Both sides have launched an active campaign to win the support of the membership. The Watson forces will attempt to use any settlement that Bass reaches with Goodrich in their present negotiations as ammunition. If Bass gets ten cents they will point to the 18 1/2 cents that Buckmaster won in 1946—and which he won then because the auto workers had set the precedent and because Bass and his supporters fought Buckmaster down when he wanted to settle for considerably less. But they will point to this 18 1/2 cents (as the Beacon Journal is already doing) and say that it is representative of Buckmaster's superiority over Bass in negotiations.

This, of course, is pure rot. Bass is unquestionably firmer, tougher, smarter and more aware of which side he represents in negotiations than Buckmaster.

STALINISTS NOT INVOLVED

The real difference between these two men can be put most clearly by saying that Bass is not the kind of man who would invite, or allow his

associates to invite, Congress to launch a meddling, anti-union, red-baiting "investigation" of the URW. The request made by the Buckmaster-Watson forces for such a Pinkerton move is nothing more or less than calling the cops.

Everyone knows who the CPers in the union are. They are few and they have no mass base. They are riding on Bass's coattails and whistling in the dark. All Buckmaster and Watson (a man with considerable previous experience at red-baiting) want is a chance to tell the bosses' representatives in Congress those whom they suspect of being "communist," foreign-born, illiterate, ungentlemanly, behind in his rent, and other interesting tidbits—among which will be sandwiched all the confidential information about the union itself.

The choice stands then between Buckmaster of the "respectable" school of trade-unionism, on the one hand, and Bass of the growing bureaucratic and tough school, on the other. The healthiest thing that could come out of the struggle would be the formation of a rank-and-file third group, based on a written and proclaimed program of democratically chosen political and economic aims. The formation of that type of caucus could help considerably to elevate the struggle above the quest-for-power level where it now seethes.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

Cleveland AFL Plans Political Action to Defeat Senator Taft

By JOE CLARK

At a recent meeting of the Cleveland Federation of Labor a motion was passed to instruct William Finegan, the federation secretary, to intercede in the strike of the International Association of Machinists against the Warner & Swazey Co. which is now in its sixth month. He was also instructed to urge Cleveland's Mayor Burke to step into the dispute in an effort to reopen negotiations. Finegan said he will try to arrange a meeting of Burke, the company's President Stilwell, and leaders of the union, in an effort to bring peace. The strike involves 1800 workers. While he has not yet been officially approached by Finegan, Burke has announced that he would be glad to intercede.

This action by Burke is not entirely an altruistic one. As mayor of a large industrial city in Ohio he has a part in politics. One of his predecessors in office, Harold Burton, rose to the position of justice of the Supreme

Court, no less. Who knows what Burke might do? Already there are signs on the horizon.

In his secretary's report at the above mentioned meeting Finegan announced that an effort to solidify all factions of organized labor behind one candidate to defeat Senator Robert A. Taft for re-election next year would be discussed next Thursday in Columbus. He reported that leaders of the AFL, the CIO, the Railroad Brotherhoods and the United Mine Workers in Ohio would attend the meeting and "try to get together on one candidate we can all support against Taft."

He indicated that Burke, who was promised support by William Green only last week if he received the Democratic senatorial nomination, would be one of the men who would receive very careful consideration. "We are not picking the candidate," said Finegan, "but we will decide whom we can all support and then let the Democrats know."

CIO Councils Deprived of Democracy Through Specious 'Majority Rule'

By GORDON HASKELL

Recently LABOR ACTION carried a brief note reporting that during April a special convention of the Los Angeles CIO Council resulted in a smashing two-to-one victory for the forces representing national CIO policy over the Stalinists in that body.

In the course of winning this victory, the anti-CP wing of the CIO passed a number of by-laws and amendments to the constitution of the Los Angeles CIO Council which have a grave bearing on the future of democracy in the CIO.

Though all of these deserve discussion, we will confine ourselves to the one which has the greatest bearing on democracy. On the face of it, this amendment looks quite harmless. It reads simply: "The autonomy of local unions affiliated to the council shall be preserved."

In voting against this clause, delegates from the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) entered the following statement in the minutes:

"The proposed provisions of the constitution interpreted by the constitutional committee chairman and the convention chairman denies the CIO Council delegates the right to speak and vote according to their own convictions and the instructions of their local unions. For these reasons and these reasons only, the ILWU voted unanimously no, because we are for full and complete autonomy and not autonomy that is left up to any chairman's discretion or interpretation."

The ILWU asked for inclusion of an amendment giving delegates the right to discuss and vote upon any matter coming before the council. This was defeated.

MAJORITY RULE?

In discussing this amendment, the West Coast edition of the CIO News (a Murray paper) states: "Supporters of the accepted amendment protecting local autonomy claimed that adoption of the ILWU-backed language would have given council delegates the power to smash CIO Council rules by voting against national CIO policy. Such an action would actually interfere with the autonomous right of the national CIO to establish rules for the councils, which are an organizational part of national CIO, and not of locals or international."

This statement explains the real purpose of the amendment on "local autonomy" about as clearly as could be desired. Further, it falls in line with the whole strategy of the Mur-

ray leadership in smashing the Stalinist control of CIO councils all over the country by demanding that all councils must go down the line in advocacy of national CIO political policies (support of Truman and the Marshall Plan), regardless of the opinions of the delegates and the local unions which they are supposed to represent.

Those who, in the name of democracy, defend this idea of what CIO councils are supposed to do, reason something like this: Policies of the CIO are laid down in conventions and meetings of the National Executive Board. These are the highest bodies of the CIO and the majorities of these bodies represent the majority of the rank and file of the CIO. They have the right to insist that their subordinate bodies, the city CIO councils, carry out these policies. Surely it isn't undemocratic to demand that the policies established democratically by the majority of the CIO membership as represented at national conventions and on the National Executive Board be carried out locally, even if a local body happens to have a majority which disagrees with these policies. Majority rule in the CIO will have no meaning if anyone who disagrees has the right to act contrary to the will of the national majority.

Loaded Against Minority

Looked at from this formal point of view, the policy seems to have merit. Yet it seems very likely that it will serve to take away from local CIO councils much of their reason for existence. Further, it will go a long way toward making it impossible for any point of view which starts as a minority from ever being able to win a majority in the CIO.

Let's say that some local union, after full discussion, comes to the conclusion that national CIO policy on political action is wrong. The local passes a resolution to that effect, with copies sent to its international and to the national CIO. Yet the delegates of this local cannot present this resolution for adoption in their city council. There they are compelled to vote for resolutions which are exactly the opposite of the one adopted by their local. They are not even permitted to abstain on such resolutions, nor to move to table them.

Congressional elections are rolling around in 1950. One of the life-and-death questions of the labor movement is going to be the policy adopted on these elections. If a local has passed a resolution demanding the formation of an Independent Labor Party, or at least that locally the la-

bor movement cease playing around with the Democratic Party, select labor candidates and run them as such—what are the delegates of this local going to do in the council? Will they vote to support some ward-heeler whose record in the last Congress was 51 per cent "pro-labor" as against some candidate whose record was only 30 per cent "pro-labor"? Are they going back to their local and whoop it up for the membership to get out the vote for him?

Most likely they just won't go to council meetings. Why should they? Why have a council which is bound, even against the will of possibly 95 per cent of the local unions which are represented there, to carry out "national CIO policies"? Isn't it enough to have an office of the regional director of CIO who is paid to carry them out?

PACKING A CONVENTION

Some more questions: Local councils send delegates to national conventions of the CIO. If the councils and their officers haven't the right to discuss or pass resolutions contrary to present national CIO policy, that will mean that all delegates from the councils to the national CIO conventions will be a solid bloc for the present administration. And that is no small matter. At the last convention of the CIO there were 150 delegates representing local councils. These delegates had the same number of votes as delegates representing the internationals in the following industries: auto, electric, steel, rubber, textile, clothing, longshore, seamen (NNU), packinghouse, transport and oil.

If local delegates to the councils can't even put the views of their membership before the delegates from other unions (if these views happen to be contrary to national CIO policy), what chance will they ever have to get the support of other locals for their views? Democracy means majority rule, but there's more to it than that. It also means the right of a minority to fight for its views and its right to become a majority if it can get enough support.

We are very well aware of the fact that the Stalinists, who are now howling for democracy in the CIO, were the chief ones to abuse it when they were in a majority in locals and in the councils. But in the process of ousting them in the name of "American trade-union principles," isn't the Murray majority setting up procedures which look much more like those of a bureaucratic political machine than those of political and trade-union democracy?

In French

Alfred Rosmer: Le Mouvement Ouvrier Pendant la Guerre\$3.00

Victor Serge: Portrait de Staline 2.50

Leon Trotsky: Ma Vie 1.50

C. Tates: La Commune de 1871 (Préface de Trotsky) 2.00

Pierre Naville: Psychologie, Marxisme, Matérialisme—Essais Critiques 3.00

Theorie de l'Orientation Professionnelle 2.00

D'Holbach 3.50

Lissagaray: Histoire de la Commune de 1871 2.50

Z. Zarembo: La Commune de Varsovie50

La Crise Française: Essais par C. Bettelheim, Martinet, Naville, Bessaignet, Le Corbusier, Hardy 2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York

These Pamphlets Are Now Available

By LEON TROTSKY

The Lesson of Spain, the Last Warning! 20c

Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay 25c

The Russian Revolution 10c

Whither France (chapter I) 10c

The Communist Manifesto Today 10c

What Is an Insurrection? 15c

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

Name

Address

City

Zone State

Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

13-24

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW

Every Dollar Counts!

By JOSEPH ROAN
Business Manager

Few of our readers realize the role that LABOR ACTION and The New International play on the international scene. Each week hundreds upon hundreds are mailed abroad to our co-thinkers in every country. We frequently receive letters from socialists in every land praising the high standards of LABOR ACTION and The New International and stating that they play an irreplaceable part in creating clarity of thought and action in the socialist movement.

It will be nothing new to our readers to learn that the economic nightmare that has settled over Europe and Asia often makes it impossible for our foreign readers to pay for their subscriptions. The impoverishment of the workers, students and intellectuals does not permit them to spare the necessary money. Even where they are in a position to afford it, local regulations do not permit them to send us dollars.

SPREAD THE MESSAGE

On our side, increased printing and distributing costs make it increasingly difficult for us to fill the needs of our friends abroad. Each year, nearly \$1,000 must be spent for postage alone to mail our publications to other countries. We are compelled to look to our readers to assure us sufficient funds to continue this important



work. Help us to spread the message of socialism abroad!

We urge you to fill the coupon below and send it in with your contribution. For a single dollar, over 60 copies of the paper can be mailed to those in other lands who ask for, and need, our press. Every dollar counts! No contribution is so large that it will not be put to the best possible use, and none so small that it will not be gratefully received. All contributions will be acknowledged by return mail.

Contributions to the \$14,000 Fund Drive of the ISL which are mailed to LABOR ACTION will be credited to the LABOR ACTION quota, and will be used to aid the work of spreading our press abroad.

Readers of LABOR ACTION: Help Launch the ISL!

Do your share! Help us hit the 100% mark! Send your contribution immediately to: Independent Socialist League, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Enclosed find \$..... as a contribution to the \$14,000 Fund Drive of the Independent Socialist League.

Name Date

Address

City Zone State

ISL Fund Drive Nears the Three-Quarter Mark

Nearly \$10,000 Raised at Record Speed, but Last Push Needed to Put Final 30% Over the Top

By YETTA BARSH
Fund Drive Director

JUNE 6—We are approaching the end of our Fund Drive. Only two more reports are to follow. We have raised 70 per cent of our \$14,000 goal and have less than two weeks within which to raise the balance. If all units participating in the drive continue to push ahead with the utmost vigor, it will be possible for us to hit the \$14,000 mark.

It is interesting to note that the total of \$9,869.72 which has been collected to date is the largest sum ever to have been raised by us in so short a period. We started out with the idea of speedy collections and on the whole the pace has been good.

If the delinquent units will start their last big push right now, we will be able to raise the remaining 30 per cent within the time limit set.

Nine units have achieved 100 per cent or better of their quotas. Philadelphia, which has been maintaining an even and steady pace, sent in the \$51 which brought it into the 100 per cent class. "You'll be receiving above the quota before the conclusion of the drive," reads the note which accompanied its last contribution.

Reading too hit the 100 per cent mark with its second \$50 contribution and writes that it is "conceivable that more will be raised." Streator sent in \$5, which completed its quota, and will be used to aid the work of spreading our press abroad.

Books for Germany: Help Build Socialism!

From many parts of Western Germany we have received requests for Marxist literature IN ENGLISH. Books and pamphlets by Trotsky, Lenin, Marx, etc., are in urgent demand, but any Marxist works are needed. Almost none of this literature is available at present. All books and pamphlets contributed will be widely circulated.

it sent in an additional \$15, raising its contributions to 146 per cent.

All but one of the Socialist Youth League units are in the better-than-100-per-cent class. The Chicago SYL increased its percentage to 196 with its \$43.75 last week, thus putting it ahead of the Bronx SYL, which jumped to 176 per cent with another \$10 contribution.

Manhattan SYL sent in \$30 and Brooklyn SYL \$6, raising their percentages to 111 and 116 respectively. The Berkeley SYL, having sent in \$10, is now up to 40 per cent of its quota.

New York City continues to push ahead vigorously. Its last \$385 increases its total to \$3790.65, or 95 per cent of its quota. The comrades who have been directing the collections in New York City have been following a well-laid plan and their results are exemplary. They tell us they will exceed their \$4,000 before the end of the drive.

Cleveland has now achieved 92 per cent of its \$400 quota and San Francisco 91 per cent of its \$800 quota. Both branches, sending in their respective \$30 and \$199.10 contributions, write that they will hit the top and perhaps go over.

Buffalo, which met with a few difficulties at the beginning of the drive, sent in another \$100 (increasing its total to 89 per cent of its \$1,000 quota). "We are doing our best to end with a bang," they write. "Sorry we didn't put our best foot forward all during the drive but we will try

to have close to \$1200 the last day of the drive."

Detroit's \$160 increased its total collections to \$519.46, 87 per cent of its quota. They too write: "We are setting for ourselves the goal of raising \$700."

Chicago is another branch which is above the national average—its \$105

last week raised its total to 74 per cent and the prospects are that it will have no difficulty in raising its quota.

This week's receipts include the following contributions: National Office \$94, Newark \$39, West Virginia \$35, Boston \$30, Akron \$21, Baltimore \$12, Connecticut 10. The total for the week was \$1,440.85.

Branch	Quota	Received	Per Cent
Chicago SYL	\$100	\$196	196
Bronx SYL	50	88	176
St. Louis	50	73	146
Brooklyn SYL	50	58	116
Manhattan SYL	50	56	111
Buffalo SYL	50	52	104
Philadelphia	400	400	100
Reading	100	100	100
Streator	25	25	100
New York City	4000	3791	95
Cleveland	400	369	92
San Francisco	800	724	91
Buffalo	1000	890	89
Detroit	600	519	87
Newark	300	251	84
Chicago	1500	1110	74
West Virginia	125	78	62
Boston	100	52	52
Akron	200	100	50
Labor Action and New Int'l	150	68	45
National Office	1500	615	41
Berkeley SYL	50	20	40
Seattle	300	80	27
Los Angeles	500	107	21
Connecticut	50	10	20
Youngstown	100	20	20
Baltimore	200	16	8
Pittsburgh	50	2	4
Indiana	100	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Miscellaneous	877		
TOTALS	\$14,000	\$9870	70

Editorials

Stalinist "Martyrs" - -

(Continued from page 1)

It is an issue guaranteed to consolidate the greatest amount of sympathy—or at least arouse a minimum amount of antagonism—for the defendants. The name of the Communist Party is mud among some of the best sections of the working class because of its crimes against labor and its permanent willingness to sacrifice labor to the interests of the Kremlin. But the firmest working-class enemy of the CP—and we count ourselves high up on this list—cannot but support Gates' refusal to comply with the judge's "instruction" that he constitute himself a stool-pigeon or go to jail.

The issue is not the protection of Gates' buddies (Stalinist henchmen like their master, no doubt). The issue is whether a court has the power which Medina has assumed.

There is no law which requires the public disclosure of the membership of the CP. Such laws have been and are being proposed, but none has been passed by Congress. Judge Medina has passed it all by himself, as far as the court trial is concerned. And if we are wrong in assuming that Clark is behind it, then he should, as attorney general of the United States, do something about this monstrous piece of judicial legislation.

We are concerned with the meaning of this act, not for the CP, but for the labor and socialist movement. It puts a reactionary weapon in the hands of the government which can be used against any radical group or against any group considered radical by the government. It does this in a situation where everybody knows that another arm of Clark's embryonic Gestapo is ready and able to secure the dismissal from industry of anyone named in response in Medina's leading question.

But this piece of stupidity seems to be a more or less inherent part of the government's procedure in the CP trial—a trial which has been an offense against civil liberties from the beginning. The government case has proved no "clear and present danger" and obviously does not intend to do so. The conviction of the CP defendants on the flimsy "evidence" of the kind presented (which has nothing to do with the Stalinists' REAL crimes against labor) and on the basis of the Smith Gag Act would constitute a precedent of great danger to all movements of social protest frowned upon by the capitalist powers—that-be in this country.

And as the safeguards of civil liberties get torn down, after the Stalinists come the real socialists, "radicals" of any sort, the labor movement itself, and finally any government opposition. If the U. S. is still far from the end-result of this well-worn process, why on earth should that be the slightest reason for failing to fight with all one's strength against its clear and obvious beginnings?

The Stalinists do no service to civil liberties by shrieking at the top of their lungs that the CP trial shows that the U. S. has gone "fascist" (as they do especially for European propaganda). It makes it too easy for the pro-Washington apologists to wrap themselves in the red, white and blue and point to the distance that remains between Russian totalitarianism and even post-World-War-II American democracy. But the policy of the government in the CP trial shows the direction in which Washington is driving, and there is no reason to wait until it gets there before waking up.

The CP can get along without Gates, Hall and Winston. Three other obedient stooges can be set up just as easily as these were. But sitting in jail as martyrs on the reprehensible grounds chosen by Medina, as legitimate symbols of a violation of civil liberties, the CP is able to make an appeal which it cannot make on the basis of its pro-Moscow politics. It will only help the CP, not help to fight it.

IN MEMORIAM

A Fighter for Freedom: Pantelis Pouliopoulos

By M. STEVENS

Six years ago this week, June 6, 1943, Pantelis Pouliopoulos was stood up against a wall at Larissa, Greece, and shot to death. His executioners were Mussolini's military authorities, who were jointly occupying Greece with Hitler's henchmen.

In Pouliopoulos' death, the international socialist movement lost one of its brightest lights and the radical movement in Greece out of the most outstanding revolutionists it has yet produced. As general secretary of the KKE (Communist Party of Greece) and later as a Fourth Internationalist leader, he was held in high esteem by the workers of Greece.

His stature among the workers was so high that the full pressure of Stalin's Comintern for more than four years was not strong enough to remove him and his tendency from the KKE—and then only through gangster methods and the importation of a solid corps from Moscow, including the present secretary of the KKE, N. Zachariades.

Pouliopoulos joined the Communist movement in 1919. He first came into prominence as an organizer of the Soldiers' Councils in Macedonia and Asia Minor. These councils gained considerable strength during the Asia Minor debacle. This was a war organized by King Constantine of Greece and backed by Lloyd George and Winston Churchill immediately after the First World War, in an attempt to take territory away from Turkey.

Fear of revolt by the Greek soldiers and the threat of revolution forced King Constantine to abdicate his throne. But the "democrats" who took power still feared the soldiers' councils; they arrested Pouliopoulos, who was now a member of the central committee of the councils, and in 1922 imprisoned him on the charge of treason.

In 1924, Pouliopoulos was elected president of the Revolutionary Veterans' Conference and during that same year was elected general secretary of the KKE and delegate to the fifth congress of the Communist International in Moscow.

FOUGHT STALINISM

As early as 1926 he was questioning the policies of the Comintern and the directives being forced on the party. He withdrew as a candidate for the Greek parliament to devote his energies toward fighting the non-socialist theories that were being advanced in the party by various elements.

By 1927 he realized that these non-socialist theories were the root of Stalinism and along with others he organized the first Left Opposition group (Piraeus) in the KKE. The fight against him and his co-workers was long and bitter, with the Stalinists eventually winning out. Pouliopoulos organized the Spartakos Left Opposition, which with other Trotskyist groups eventually emerged as a party.

Pouliopoulos was arrested again and stood trial for treason in 1925, 1928 and 1935. In 1938 he was arrested by the Greek fascist dictatorship of Metaxas and sentenced to the notorious prisons on the islands where in 1942 he contracted tuberculosis. He was confined to the hospital when Mussolini's armed forces came to Greece. They took him to Larissa and shot him.

He was the author of hundreds of articles and many serious works on Marxism which appeared in pamphlet and book forms. He also translated many of the Marxist classics into the Greek language. His last translation, finished in prison shortly before he was killed, was Leon Trotsky's "Revolution Betrayed."

On this sixth anniversary of his death we tip our hats to the memory of this heroic socialist.

MOVIE REVIEW

Hollywood Eyes Jim Crow In "Home of the Brave"

THE HOME OF THE BRAVE, screenplay from a story by Arthur Laurentz, produced by Stanley Kramer for Screen Play Corp.; released by United Artists.

By ABE VICTOR

After carefully skirting the subject of Negro discrimination in pictures like "Crossfire," Hollywood has finally approached it with something resembling bravado. The result is a screen event, although it falls quite short of being an aesthetic one.

Not that the picture lacks tension, or vivid pictorial display, or even simple emotional involvement. Whatever the motion picture can bring to play in the form of action, this picture does. Action cannot, however, be used as a substitute for the art of bringing personalities and their relations to each other into full development. Where substitutes fail, this picture does also.

The fact that Hollywood has finally produced an anti-Jim Crow movie is by itself a fact to be celebrated, whatever the other factors involved. The same holds for the making of a movie which has a Negro as its hero.

To give the picture its due, it approaches the subject with admirable directness, such as did "Crossfire" and "Gentleman's Agreement" on the subject of anti-Semitism. The reactionary engages not only in snide remarks against the Negro, but refers to him directly in all the vicious terminology of the American anti-Negro vernacular and is persuaded only at the risk of being himself called a coward, to go upon a dangerous military mission for which he at first refuses to volunteer because he will have to work with a Negro soldier.

The tension which results is easily imagined; but it should be made clear that while simple and clear psychological reasons are given for this Jim Crow attitude, the social and economic causes for Jim Crow are omitted except for some mumbled line about the tradition of slavery in American history—a tradition which evidently still weighs like an albatross on the mind of Hollywood.

TOLD IN FLASHBACKS

The story is the simple one of a patrol sent out on a special and dangerous assignment, consisting of three white soldiers, and a Negro under the command of a white officer. The Negro is the only engineer available and willing to volunteer for this risky duty from a specialist battalion stationed at some distance from the combat organization which takes this assignment.

One of the white soldiers turns out to be an old friend of Peter Moss, the Negro, and befriends him on the patrol, defending him from the scurrilous attacks of Corporal "T. J.," the Negro-baiter. Moss suffers combat shock while on the mission and the entire story is told in flashbacks from the usual psychiatrist's couch, this time draped in the appropriate khaki.

The crux of the plot lies in the friendship of Moss and Finch, the white boy who befriended him and with whom he once played basketball on the high school team. At a crucial turn in the combat, Finch makes a vicious anti-Negro remark which he immediately corrects. From one who was his closest friend and who made all the overtures in the friendship, Moss finds such a remark impossible to take. But why this remark should have been made is not accounted for by the characterization in this movie. In terms of the personality of Finch it could only have been the purest accident, to this reviewer unbelievable and inconsistent. Since all the motivation hangs upon this relationship, when the motivation is thus called into question, the act fails.

CRUDE PSYCHIATRY

It is likewise with the development of "Mossy." Only his simple, direct and elemental reactions to Jim Crow wisecracks are clearly motivated. His feelings for Finch during the patrol assignment are clear enough because they are based on the fact that Finch is the only one who befriends him. This proves merely that where one simple emotion is the motive, Hollywood knows how to portray it clearly, which is perhaps why its greatest talents lie in the portrayal of the act of violence.

It is for this very reason that "T. J.," played by Steve Brodie, emerges as the best portrayal. Playing the villain with a realistic and simple consistency, Brodie takes the acting laurels away from every mem-

ber of the cast, giving the serious as well as the comic intervals their measured and charged quality.

One scene between Finch and Moss comes through, however, with a graceful and highly charged quality. This is the scene of Finch's graduation party to which Moss, invited and later begged to come, refuses to attend with simple clear-headed dignity about the possibility of racial tension.

The motion picture is laden with too many recent screen conventions: the psychiatrist who has a crude time of it combining Freudian with social analysis, the narco-hypnosis, and the flashbacks from the psycho-analytic sessions, most of the sessions being vulgar, unnecessary or misused vehicle for the "message."

When it emerges, however, from the doctor's office to the open sea, the jungle-green island, the simple tale of the four men tensed for some unexpected rifle shot, the curt remark, the friendly cigarette in the dark, the camera becomes lyrical and artistic and entrancing in its movement from leaf to leaf and face to face.

WHAT NEXT?

This is merely the first of four pictures which are being exported from Hollywood dealing with this subject. The major studios are yet to present their more highly budgeted masterpieces on the same theme. But the irony of the situation arises in this question:

After four Negro actors are given the "glorious opportunity" to use their talents as the heroes of major film productions, what will the studios do with them? Are they to be reconverted in true Hollywood style back to playing comics, servants, janitors, cooks and other Hollywood inventions in the Jim Crow tradition?

The ending of the picture would seem to indicate nothing of the kind. With true film-making positivism, the studio patches everything up in the end with a false-sounding symbolism, as obvious as it is hypocritical in its unity of the Negro soldier with his white buddy. What is in life a continuing social and personal tragedy becomes for Hollywood merely the beginning of a new and happy business partnership.

In decades, perhaps, the Negro question will become a subject for historical or "period" movies and the simple, elementary fact of Jim Crow will no longer arouse such dramatic tension as it does today. When the fact of being a Negro is no longer tragic in itself, the Negro individual may become a tragic hero in his own right as an individual.

Those who saw the French movie "Jennie Lamour" may recall the affectionate scenes between Louis Jourvet and his adopted Negro son. Used casually, and naturally this relationship illustrates the gap in race relations and motion picture values that exists between France and the United States, precisely because no attention is called to the color of the little boy's skin.



Brannan Farm Program -

(Continued from page 1)

Brannan states that milk to the consumer might be allowed to go to fifteen cents a quart. The farmer would be entitled to a certain income on a stated amount of production, and the government would make up with a Treasury check the difference between that certain figure and his actual income at market and/or supported prices.

The supporters of the Brannan bill claim it will have some very definite advantages over the present parity-price-support system. They admit that that cost to the government will still be great, but promise it will not be as great as under the present method. They predict that by allowing many commodities to seek their market price level, the consumers will get a break, there will be higher consumption, less produce to store. This increased consumption of certain commodities due to decreased prices is expected to add up to more farm income, and therefore smaller checks from the Treasury will be called for to make up the guaranteed income.

BIG FARMERS AGAINST

To get this government subsidy, farmers would have to meet specified requirements as to soil conservation, possibly acreage allotments, marketing agreements and marketing quotas. While members of Congress and big corporation farms are objecting to government regulation as "socialistic," most medium and small farmers do not oppose government controls in exchange for a guaranteed income. They fear the glutted markets and the decline of prices much more than government controls.

The Brannan bill ingratiates itself with the medium and small farmer because it attempts to remove the complaint against all former farm-support laws that they benefit the big corporation farm more than the family farm. Under the Brannan bill all farmers would get an assured amount of income on a fixed amount of their production, and this top amount of support production would be the same for both a big farm and a small farm.

This would work out so that all or most of the output of a family farm would have the benefit of income support. This is in line with some of the "Fair Deal" ideas of the admin-

istration for maintaining mass purchasing power, not very palatable to the big farm corporations and their representatives in Washington.

The supporters of the Brannan bill claim it will have some very definite advantages over the present parity-price-support system. They admit that that cost to the government will still be great, but promise it will not be as great as under the present method. They predict that by allowing many commodities to seek their market price level, the consumers will get a break, there will be higher consumption, less produce to store. This increased consumption of certain commodities due to decreased prices is expected to add up to more farm income, and therefore smaller checks from the Treasury will be called for to make up the guaranteed income.

VOTE-GETTING AT STAKE

The administration, worried over surpluses, claims that the Aiken farm law which was passed by the 80th Congress and which goes into effect in January, 1950, does not have the power to bring production down. Even though the Aiken law does provide for variations downward below 90 per cent of parity for government support of prices, farmers still consider this support more profitable than reducing production. This has been borne out in potato production where there are heavy surpluses in spite of the drop in price support from 90 per cent to 60 per cent of parity. The Brannan bill, on the other hand, provides for a guaranteed income on a definite amount of production and also for government regulations to check production. This,

One for the Museum

A DOCUMENT FROM THE CP JUNGLE: HOW A FORMER LEADER WAS EXPELLED

While little additional evidence is needed to prove the kind of dictatorial regime that exists inside the Communist Party, the following documentary material may still be of interest. It illustrates the way in which the CPs fuhrers go about expelling one of their own leaders (or former leaders).

The case involved goes back to 1948 but the material has only recently been published in a mimeographed internal bulletin put out for CP members by an opposition group associated with the names of Sam Darcy, Bill Dunne, Harrison George, etc., all formerly leading members of the Kremlin's American agency. The bulletin is entitled "Manhattan Communist Bulletin—For a Bolshevized CP" (sic) and is mailed by the group to CP members in New York. The issue quoted is April 1949.

The case is that of Max Bedacht, former secretary-general of the CP (1929-30), member of its national committee (1919-1936), member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (1926) and formerly editor of The Communist. The document we republish here is a copy of the official charge laid against Bedacht, on the basis of which he was expelled. Readers may find it weird even for the totalitarianized CP. Bedacht was officially expelled because the differences of opinion which he held were not "honest" ones—that's all.

HIS OWN MEDICINE

An introductory note in the MCB summarizes the Bedacht case as follows. All capitalized emphasis in quotes is from the original. Boldface type is our own emphasis.

"The wave of expulsions from the Party is increasing. Today it reaches out to engulf everyone who is even slightly critical of Party leadership. It attempts to drown every voice, regardless of the past or present activity of the individual on behalf of the Party. One of the most incredible and disgusting cases is the expulsion of Comrade Max Bedacht, a charter member and former Secretary General of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

"Comrade Bedacht began to criticize the Party leadership several years ago. Although his criticisms were expressed only through the 'legal' channels of the Party and were based on 47 years of activity in the Communist movement, THEY WERE NEVER DISCUSSED OR ANSWERED. Instead, the Party leadership began a campaign of slander against him. Comrade Bedacht submitted articles to the Daily Worker for the recent pre-convention discussion, but they were never published. He was elected to the New Jersey State Convention, but the leadership refused to seat him as a delegate. He submitted a letter to the National Convention, but instead of discussing it, the leadership of the Convention prefaced a statement to it which, in effect, declared Comrade Bedacht expelled . . .

"After this, the leadership asked Comrade Bedacht's club (Frenchtown, N. J., Branch) to expel him. The club refused. The leadership thereupon appealed to themselves to reverse the decision of the club. This was accomplished without difficulty and Comrade Bedacht was expelled 'officially' on October 13, 1948."

Thus another "enemy of the people" bit the dust. It should be added, in case that is necessary, that the procedure worked out on Bedacht should be perfectly familiar to that gentleman, since it is exactly the sort of thing Bedacht used to engi-

neer in his own time. (He was on the receiving end, this trip.) Following is the official document of the CP. It speaks for itself.

REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW JERSEY

It is our considered opinion that Bedacht's vicious and slanderous attacks against the Party and its leadership are not motivated by, nor is its source, HONEST political differences of opinion on political line. On the contrary, after investigation, we are convinced that Bedacht has attempted to develop "a line" in order to attack the national leadership of our Party.

Ever since 1946 when his thesis on National Group Work was rejected, Bedacht has refused to recognize his error, but on the contrary has embarked upon the road of factionalism, political disruption, and dishonest attempts at "line" making in order to smear and discredit the leadership of the Party—with the purpose of vindicating his own over-exaggerated ego and his wrong position on the national-group question. This explains Bedacht's behavior during the whole pre-convention discussion. His was not a discussion of political problems. It was rather an attempt to USE the pre-convention discussion for factional purposes.

If anyone were to follow HIS "theoretical line" it could lead to nothing but disaster. If followed, that line would lead to the isolation of the left from all other anti-imperialist forces.

But Bedacht himself does not take his own line seriously. He is ready to back down and agree that tactics pursued are correct when he is pressed to answer specific questions. He gave his game away when he stated to the Chairman and Secretary of the Review Commission: "Even though the line is not perfect, SOMETHING could be made of it. But it's the leadership that's no good."

We have therefore come to the conclusion that Bedacht has been embarked upon a factional road ever since 1946. That he has sunk so low as to place himself above the Party and the interests of the working class.

He seeks to undermine the Party by projecting slogans and propositions which would disorient the Party and the working class; by carrying out a dishonest, underhanded campaign against the Party and its leadership; by willfully attempting to deceive the comrades in his club, county and state as to his real purposes and intentions.

Since the convention, Bedacht has shown no inclination towards recognizing the anti-party, anti-working-class road that he is traveling. On the contrary, he has continued his attempt at deceit and through double-talk and appeal to the "soft spots" of the comrades in his branch, attempts to remain in the Party for his self-announced purpose of "fighting the leadership the first chance I get."

It is the unanimous opinion of the State Review Commission that in view of the foregoing, Max Bedacht is no longer eligible for membership in the Communist Party as determined by Article III, Sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution CPUSA. We therefore recommend that the State Board of New Jersey Communist Party reverse the decision of the Frenchtown Club, and expel Max Bedacht from the Communist Party.

REVIEW COMMISSION
COMMUNIST PARTY OF N. J.

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League

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

I want more information about the ideas and principles of independent socialism and the Independent Socialist League.

I want to join the Independent Socialist League.

Name Tel.

Address Zone State

THE NEW COURSE

by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course

by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism

\$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

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

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.

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

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

Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 24

June 13, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper

Editorial Board: Hal Draper,

Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett

Business Manager: Joseph Roan

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

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

Two Americans in Paris Raise the Flag

Farrell: From Studs Lonigan to Horatio Alger

The speeches by James T. Farrell and Sidney Hook discussed in this article were delivered at the so-called "International Day of Resistance to War and Dictatorship" sponsored by the French RDR (Revolutionary Democratic Rally) in Paris. The complete text of these speeches has been received by LABOR ACTION, as mimeographed for press release by the sponsors of the conference. Farrell's speech, though delivered in English, is mimeographed in French; quotations are translated by the author.

By STANLEY GREY

The "American Left" should be interested in the speeches made by James T. Farrell and Sidney Hook in Paris on April 30, in view of the fact that these two deep thinkers were speaking in its name. The speeches constitute texts of American chauvinism and it would be plain ingratitude to permit them to pass without notice.

A certain amount of special interest attaches to Farrell's speech in view of the novelist's precipitous decline in political thinking, a decline which has been so rapid that it almost approaches in velocity one of the quick-change flipflops of the Stalinists themselves. At Paris, said to behold, Farrell delivered a talk such as would have been surprising if heard from a right-wing ADA'er. Speaking before a leftwing audience, almost entirely socialist in its composition, he did not even throw them the sop of mentioning socialism explicitly or implicitly, broadly or narrowly. His speech was little more than a lusty paean in praise of American democracy and lacked only the lyrics of "God Bless America" to render it complete.

While the publication of his entire text would be necessary to prove that the above description is somewhat restrained, it must be said that the effect of the speech is produced as much by its extreme naiveté as by its positive content. Its enthusiasm for American democracy is that of a recent convert.

Professor Hook, on the other hand,

no recent convert and too much the scientist in terminology to fling Absolutes about recklessly, arrives at approximately the same conclusions as Farrell by a more sophisticated path, one properly strewn with references to objectivity, the rules of evidence and bits of critical appraisal. Both Farrell and Hook, plugged in Paris as representatives of the "American Left" (whatever that is exactly), were indeed truly representative of that segment of the liberals and labor leaders who see the present world struggle for power as a battle between the Forces of Darkness and the Forces of Light.

The first section of Farrell's speech takes off on the theme of Horatio Alger (we quote in order to be believed). "I come from one of the freest countries in the world. I spent my whole life there under conditions of liberty which were enough to permit me to get an education and to develop my potentialities. I have always been able to read all the books I wanted to. I have always been able to express all my thoughts and to defend my convictions. When they tried to impose censorship on me in America, I appealed to American justice and defended myself. [Farrell apparently refers here to a recent book-censorship case in Philadelphia—Ed.] I won my case. When the police in an American city seized certain of my books without warrant and contrary to the formal stipulations of the law, I was able to appear before the federal courts of the U. S. and prosecute the police. The U. S. and still on sale in this city. There does not exist any cultural terror in the United States, and if you here, you people of Europe, believe that such exists, you are exposing yourselves to deception."

IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE

After this definitive proof of America's democratic character, he proceeds to give his personal guarantee that it will remain so forever. He denies the wild Stalinist charge that the U. S. is "fascist" and adds: "I am more than certain when I affirm that I do not believe it will ever become so."

The basis for this unshakable conviction is the existence of a large and powerful movement (which, as every student of history knows, was lacking in pre-Hitler Germany . . .) and the fact that this labor movement is "independent . . . and impregnated with the democratic spirit" (in contrast, we presume, with the German pre-Hitler labor movement which was merely . . . socialist). There is not a hint or reference to any social or economic basis of fascism to which the passion of belief is logically irrelevant.

Farrell's zeal in advertising the American product is so fervent as to be embarrassing. About the tendencies in American life towards further militarization, towards persecution of minorities, towards loyalty oaths and witch hunts, there is not a word.

These tendencies do not make American fascist nor do they guarantee that it will become fascist. But that is not the point. It is certainly incumbent on any analyst of American democracy to cite and analyze these growing tendencies, especially as they are part of the general preparation of the U. S. for war which will not cease tomorrow. But perhaps Farrell was right after all. What kind of a salesman is it who knocks his own product?

END OF A SLIDE

It must be added that Farrell did mention the fact that Negroes are discriminated against in the U. S.—his only concession. This may be accounted for by the fact that it is already a well-known aspect of American life. But he mentions it only to assure his French audience that the president has signed a civil liberties report and "the libraries of the U. S. are full of books which criticize all aspects of American life."

And he triumphantly concludes by pointing to how much worse the state of affairs is in Russia. "Do the Russian leaders sign reports condemning the evils of forced labor, repression of civil liberties and the destruction of the free trade unions? To ask the question is to answer it."

But which question? The question whether Russia is more democratic than the U. S.? That's an easy one. But the question that supposedly was under discussion here was the Negro question. On that point, as Farrell examined it, to ask the question was simply to ask it.

Then Farrell comes to his real point which is that all good men must rally to the support of the Atlantic Pact and the Marshall Plan. Only the Russians could benefit from their defeat and therefore we must support them. In addition, the Marshall Plan is a means of satisfying the needs of the European people and as such he is for it. From the point of view of the heart, any measure which satisfies human beings is worth unqualified support. But the heart is not the best organ for valuating a political question and the Marshall Plan is just a bit different from a grandiose project for feeding people.

It is this emotionalism about freedom untarnished by political considerations of how to arrive at it, this hatred of Stalinism unadulterated by examinations of the best means of fighting it, which characterizes Farrell and the segment of American intellectuals he speaks for. For Farrell himself, this speech represents a rush for the bandwagon of American chauvinism at a speed greater than could have been reasonably predicted. One thing is absolutely beyond doubt and that is that there is not much further to slide.

SCIENCE AT WORK

Sidney Hook's speech consisted mainly of his familiar litany aimed at drumming up trade for the Atlantic Pact in the hostile atmosphere of the Paris audience. We wish to focus attention on his last section where "As an American, and therefore free to criticize his own government, I must confess that the American government in the past has made many errors which have emboldened the Soviet regime to threaten the liberties of Europe."

The full list of these daring criticisms, made possible only by American democracy, follows: "It [the

U. S.] did not plan properly for the freedom of Europe after the war. It accepted Soviet assurances of 'free and unfettered' elections with great naiveté. After hostilities the U. S. disarmed too rapidly. It withdrew its forces from the troubled regions of Central Europe too soon . . ."

There are no other "errors" or defects which Hook finds it worthwhile to mention, or any perhaps which he believes to exist, none except the "error" of not being bellicose ENOUGH, tough ENOUGH against Russia. Hook is not in any danger of being declared "subversive" for thus "attacking" the U. S. in Paris.

In his own naive fashion, Farrell remarked at one point: "The Soviet myth represents God and paradise; the anti-American myth represents hell and Satan." Thus he paraphrased the Stalinists. What stands out in both speeches is that this Stalinist picture is merely stood on its head by Farrell and Hook: THEIR myth is also that of the angels versus the imps of hell.

SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE

But where is the socialist alternative? What is left of the socialism which is still the pretense even of Hook? It would indeed have been appropriate at an RDR conference, where were concentrated many people who reject both Washington and Moscow as rulers of the world, to speak out for the socialist alternative.

It is a popular argument against the position of the third camp to say that such a force does not exist, that therefore Realpolitik must make a choice between two evils (or in Farrell's case, a choice of the Absolute Good). But one of the reasons the socialist third force is weak is precisely the fact that Hook and Farrell do so. They spend their energies and talents in organizing and propagandizing for the glory and defense of the U. S. Precisely here at the RDR conference could something have been done to build this third camp whose supposed non-existence is the reason for support to the U. S.

Thus these speakers help to defeat the very force whose present weakness is their excuse for supporting the U. S. Their retort of "Where is the third camp?" stands out, clearly as the sheepest hypocritical evasion. They insist upon the necessity of choosing between two alternatives after themselves helping to throttle the third alternative, the independent socialist position against both war camps.

SPARKS in the NEWS

To Avoid Socialism

"If labor leaders don't want socialism here, and are sincere in their expressed desire to help wage earners, they will cease their senseless campaign to get higher wages for their members."—Walt Sands, public relations director of Thomas Stack's Pension Forum (Chicago).

And if the labor movement came out for wage CUTS—well, socialism would really be a dead duck. So would the labor movement. There seems to be a connection.

U.S. Power Advances

Recent announcement on the door of a church in Frankfurt, U.S. Zone, Germany, according to U.S. Zone Press:

"Tonight at eight—
"Lecture by Professor X—
"The Holy Ghost will descend upon us—
"by permission of Military Government."

No doubt, also, after filling out four applications for permission, in triplicate.

Land of Opportunity

"Deramus is 33. His election to head the Chicago Great Western makes him the country's youngest railroad president. He has grown up

in the business—and is quick to acknowledge the reason: His father, W. N. Deramus, is president of the Kansas City Southern Railway."—Business Week, May 28.

Did you catch that typographical error? Should read: "He has grown up ON the business."

Jane Crow

"If the Austrians are not quite sure what is a 'lady,' they have only to enter the building of the American Headquarters (in Vienna) and they will soon learn. There they will find two lavatories on every floor; one of them reserved for American ladies only; and the other? Well, it is at the disposal of 'the Austrian female staff.'"—George Maranz in the Socialist Leader, May 21.

Well, that takes care of American ladies and Austrian females, but what happens if an American female wanders in?

ORDER YOUR BOOKS
THROUGH LABOR ACTION
BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

A-Pact Okayed --

(Continued from page 1)

State Department no anxiety. Senator George had originally insisted that it be made 'very clear' that the Senate considered that the president would be without authority to send American military forces to the defense of a treaty partner without the approval of Congress.

"The language ultimately adopted, it was said on competent authority, simply would leave the extent of the president's war-making power in the somewhat disputed situation in which it is now, and at all events would put no new check upon him." (Times, June 7.)

TO DEFEND DEMOCRACY

In other words, the doubletalk stays in. If and when a Washington administration ever does decide to do exactly what it wishes to retain the power to do, holdouts of Senator George's stripe will be in no position to object—even if they have not first

been carried away by war hysteria themselves.

In the name of preparing for "defense" against Russian totalitarianism, it would appear, the processes of democracy in the United States are wearing thinner and thinner—a direction of development inherent in the death struggle between the two imperialisms.

Independent Socialism opposes military alliances for a third world war, such as the A-Pact, not from the pro-capitalist, but stupid angle of the Georges, but because it places no reliance for the defense of democracy against the barbaric tyranny of Stalinism in a degenerating and bureaucratized capitalist system which itself cannot but drift in the direction of militarization and its concomitant of regimentation. The democratic alternative to the Stalinist world threat is not reliance on U. S. imperialism but the building of a socialist Third Camp opposed to both Wall street and the Kremlin.

A Document by an Ex-Stalinist Refugee—

East Prussia Under the Russian Heel

The accompanying document was transmitted to LABOR ACTION by a responsible correspondent in Europe. We take the liberty of quoting from the letter which came with it:

"Enclosed is a statement from an East Prussian refugee, which my wife got hold of and which I have translated from German to English. She and her family fled from the same place earlier, but they have spoken with many who came later, and all that they have pieced together would indicate that the enclosed statement is accurate. She does not know the man who wrote it; she dug it out of a file of such statements by refugees collected at a 'bunker' at the Hamburg Main Station—where people could stay three days at the expense of the city, and where they were invited to deposit 'statements.' So far as we know, no one has used these statements journalistically."

I, Herman Matzkowitz, born in Kreuzberg, November 5, 1899, was a sawmill worker in Koenigsberg, East Prussia, with the Anders Company, Schoenflisser Allee. During 1945 and 1946 I lived in Koenigsberg, under Russian occupation.

After witnessing the terror in the town and the innumerable crimes of the Soviets against the simplest rules of humanity, I would like to state voluntarily the following things, to which I am prepared to swear formally. Prior to this experience, I was a convinced Communist.

In October 1942, I was sentenced by the Nazi government to three years' imprisonment for making treasonable statements. For example, I had said: "When the Russians come, all Nazis will be executed." I was imprisoned at Rhein, East Prussia. As the Russians were threatening this province, the prisons were thrown open in January 1945.

Then I went to Koenigsberg, but I couldn't find my family. They had already fled. For a short time I worked for my old company again. I was drafted into the Home Guard, but was released again when they found that I was not "worthy" of this duty.

On April 7, 1945, the Russians entered Koenigsberg - Ponarth, the southern suburb where I lived. They evacuated us civilians to Loewenhagen, but upon showing my prison documents I was allowed to return home. I reported to the 5th Russian Kommandantura in Koenigsberg, where I was straightway appointed mayor of Ponarth.

According to a census of May 1, there were 90,000 Germans in Koenigsberg (normal population 360,000), which increased to about 100,000 during that month due to an influx of older men being released from prison camps.

HEADS AND POTATOES

As soon as the Russians entered the town, they arrested all Nazi Party members, as well as anyone else who had any vague connection with the Nazis; they were taken to concentration camps at Metgethen, Labiau

and Insterburg. Also political prisoners were being held in the city jail with eight men to the cell designed for one.

We German mayors often had occasion to visit this prison where we saw their living conditions and their oppression. During the month of May alone, more than 1500 of the men in this prison either died or disappeared, from an epidemic of typhus and at the hands of the GPU (Russian secret police).

On June 20, 1945, we twelve German mayors, including the newly appointed Mayor Laue, were obliged to witness a mass execution of more than 1000 political prisoners on the Erich Koch Square. They were executed by chopping off their heads at the block. Of this group, only two were given ten years at hard labor; one of them was Herr Flach, the assistant superintendent of the Anders Company.

Inasmuch as the food situation was already catastrophic since April, we mayors begged the Russian occupation authorities to permit the German population to plant potatoes and vegetables in their gardens. (Hitherto the Germans had been confined to their houses, the garden plots being some distance away). This was allowed and the people began to work, but by the end of May the Russians confiscated everything, even the seed, and posted guards over the garden plots. Only we mayors, identified by white armbands, were allowed to harvest some vegetables and potatoes.

THE FOUR HORSEMEN

Toward the end of June 1945 an epidemic of typhus, caused by starvation, broke out in Libau, Latvia, and spread to Koenigsberg. This plague, from the very first, took a toll of about 300 victims per day. In October this figure fell for a time to 50 per day, which reflected a somewhat improved food situation, with the potato crop becoming available during this month.

Nothing was done on the part of the Russians to relieve the starvation

among the surviving population, until the end of 1945. The rations were 200 grams (three small slices) of bread ration, because the ration card but that. Many could not buy their bread ration, because the ration card cost ten rubles (and twenty rubles for jobholders). The reichsmark was no longer in circulation; German paper money was lying in the streets. The daily bread ration of 200 grams cost one ruble, which was often beyond the means even of people who had jobs. Such persons were promised their pay in rubles, but usually they got none. Only we mayors were sure to get our pay (360 rubles per month).

There was no other food in Koenigsberg to be bought, nor were any businesses or craftsmen's shops open. Sometimes people gathered horsemeat from the veterinary hospital. However, this could be done only at the greatest risk; it meant putting oneself at the mercy of the Russians. Half of the women who went out to fetch horsemeat never returned. Almost every day—as I myself witnessed—they were violated and murdered.

NO CHILDREN UNDER FOUR

Inasmuch as people cannot live on 200 grams per day, they traded their last belongings to the Russians for something to eat. The preachers Beckmann and Mueller, both of whom had earlier suffered punishment for being anti-Nazi, begged the Russian military authorities for permission to gather potato peels from the Russian barracks. These potato peels were divided up into little portions and rationed to the people. There were no more small children under four years

old, nor old people in Koenigsberg. The only well-nourished people were pregnant women living with Russian soldiers. The high mortality rate reduced the population from 50,000 in the fall to 32,000. I was able to confirm the correctness of these figures, inasmuch as I, as mayor, was in charge of giving out bread ration cards.

On November 6 and 7, 1945, which was Red Army Day, the Russian soldiers were given the full right to do as they wished: men were beaten, most women were raped, among them my 71 year old mother, who as a consequence of this died at Christmas time. Again at Christmas, soldiers were given freedom of the town and most workers were locked in prison for a few days, including the mayors.

Shortly before leaving Koenigsberg in February 1946, I went with the two pastors, Beckmann and Mueller, to visit a children's hospital. The little children looked like starving children such as you see in the newsreel. Rev. Mueller begged me to tell the outside world about this situation. From the 1st to the 15th of February there was no bread. Since I could not bear this inhuman situation, any longer, I looked for a way to escape. I succeeded with the help of some railwaymen, whom I gave 15 Allied marks to take me with them to Allenstein in the Polish part of East Prussia. Here I was robbed of everything I had by the Poles, but I managed to get along by train, standing between the cars, all the way to Berlin. I am now at Hamburg looking for my family who were last seen in Braunschweig.

(Translated by R. Gould)

Coming --

A full feature page of documentary material on class legislation in Stalinist Russia — excerpts from the Russian criminal code, reports in "Pravda," etc. Prepared by Robert Magnus, this Labor Action Feature will appear in the issue of July 18. But it is only ONE of the reasons why

YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO MISS A SINGLE ISSUE OF LABOR ACTION

Subscribe now—it's only \$1.00 a year!

4 Powers Stalled --

(Continued from page 1)

hope of agreement still exists. This consists essentially, if not exclusively, of two points: Berlin, and resumption of trade and commerce between the East and West of Europe in general and within Germany in particular.

It is now apparent that economic factors forced the Russians into this conference and that any political concessions on their part will come with the utmost reluctance. So tenuous and shaky is their hold over Eastern Germany, so universally hated and despised are they and their quillings in this zone, that the slightest political concession which would permit the holding of free elections, would unloose an avalanche among the population.

They cannot risk this, but they can provide for the resumption of economic life by working out an agreement which will lift the trade blockade imposed by the West. This, together with some practical agreement for a resumption of Four Power rule over Berlin, appears to be all that will come out of the present conference in Paris.

Yet even this will indicate a trend on the part of Stalinism. All the Eastern countries, including the Eastern zone of Germany, are suffering seriously in an economic sense. The worse their economies become, the greater becomes the menace of national-resistance movements against Russia, and the threats of Titoism.

This is why Vyshinsky remains in Paris. This is what forces Stalin into his limited retreat, which he will try to keep as orderly and controlled as possible.

OUTSIDE THE HALL

BUT THE PARIS Conference illustrates a far more fundamental matter. This is the absolute inability of the Big Four to make a real and final settlement of the "German problem," or that of Europe, for that matter. Guided exclusively by their immediate imperialist interests, each of the participants can measure proposals and counter-proposals only in national, imperialist terms.

But outside of and far away from Paris, a real settlement of the German problem is being worked out. More and more, the whole issue is being removed from the hands of Messrs. Bevin, Vyshinsky, Acheson and Schuman.

By Max Shachtman

Under the Banner Of Marxism

A Reply to Ernest Erber

Because of the unexpected size of this Workers Party Bulletin (116 pp.), the charge per copy is 50 cents. All orders already received at the previously announced rate will be honored.

Order your copy from

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.