

## End Berlin Strike Under Pressure; Expect Reprisals

By V. JENSEN

The Berlin railway strike is over. It was ended not by decision of the members of the striking union, but by decision of the Western military commanders of Berlin, 39 days after the strike began.

Only ten days before, the membership of the West Berlin union had overwhelmingly rejected a settlement proposal reached by the four occupying powers in Berlin because at the last moment the Russian Zone authorities declared that they would not guarantee that there would be no reprisals against strikers.

This time there was no referendum of the union membership. General Hawley, American military commander in Berlin, who at the time of the referendum said that strikers would have been "damn fools" to return to work without guarantees against reprisals, handed down a decision that if strikers did not go back to work they would forfeit unemployment compensation. There had been, of course, no guarantees from the Russian authorities meanwhile. Under this pressure, the union leaders ordered the strikers back to work after a five-hour debate.

In order to make this decision more palatable, the Western Allied powers granted the strikers their full economic demands. The Western railway workers had originally struck to get their full pay in West marks, instead of the depreciated Eastern Zone currency. By the terms of the first four-power compromise settlement proposed, the Eastern Zone authorities were to pay 60 per cent of the railwaymen's wages in West marks, while the Western Zone authorities would give them an additional 15 per cent in the wanted currency. The final agreement provides that the Eastern Zone authorities will pay the 60 per cent agreed upon, while the Western Zone authorities will make up the full 40 per cent difference in West marks.

Anxious to get the railways going, the Allied authorities even vaguely offered to try to help any striker who was afraid to return to work because of reprisals to find some other job. This offer was met with cynicism by the strikers.

### REPRISALS AHEAD

Just what the form and the timing of the expected Russian reprisals will be is not yet clear. Strikers returning to work found that the Russian Railway Administration headquarters, which formerly were located in West Berlin, had been moved to the Eastern Zone—a move that was greeted with understandable uneasiness among the strikers.

The Russian authorities have shown no hurry to get the railways back into action. They are inspecting every rail and tie for "sabotage" with suspicious thoroughness, claiming that damage through strike violence keeps them from resuming service. Berliners who saw the elevated and railways operated through severe bombing damage during the war are hooting at this explanation.

While it is true that the Russians are none too anxious to lift the

blockade in any great haste, it is equally reasonable that this propaganda about "sabotage" has another and grimmer purpose. In earlier negotiations about the strike, the Russian military commander made clear that "saboteurs" would be punished.

It is unlikely that any immediate, widespread and overt measures of reprisals against the strikers will be taken because of the anti-Russian temper in Berlin, the high-water mark of militancy reached by the striking workers and the pressure that would be put upon the Russians by the politically embarrassed Allies. It is more likely that any reprisals will be in the all-too-familiar pattern of kidnappings and disappearances. Still, it is likely that the Russians are preparing themselves with a legal cover for future prosecutions on the basis of "sabotage."

### MAGNIFICENT DEMONSTRATION

The strikers have returned to work with reluctance and resentment—resentment not only against the Russian authorities but against the Western powers as well. Their economic demands have been won. Their union has not been recognized and they return to the threat of reprisals by one occupying power under pressure of the others. It was probably the only settlement that could be expected, given the occupation and the stage of the "cold war."

Again we say it was not, it could not be, a total victory. But the Berlin railwaymen have shown the way. Their strike was a resounding slap in the face for Stalinist policy and became the center of one of the most impressive anti-Russian political demonstrations since the war. Their militancy was magnificent; their solidarity untouched to the end; their strike unquestionable evidence that the great tradition of the once powerful German working class movement is far from dead.

The strike of the German railway workers is over. Their fight has just begun.

## RDR Conference Affirms Stand Against War Blocs

PARIS, June 27—The National Conference of the RDR (Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire, or Revolutionary Democratic Rally), the first one held since the movement was launched in France some eight months ago, has just concluded its two days of sessions here with the adoption of decisions on the political course of the Rally which underline and reaffirm its basic position of independence from capitalism, imperialism and Stalinism.

Despite the fact that the conference, called immediately following the organizationally successful International Day Against War and Dictatorship, which met in Paris on April 30 on the initiative of the RDR, could not be preceded by as extensive a discussion in the ranks as was desirable, it was attended by representative delegations from the Paris region and the most important provinces of France. The frank and lively discussion which took place at the sessions proved to be an effective contribution toward clearing the atmosphere which had been disturbed by some of the aspects of the April 30 international demonstration.

By an almost unanimous vote, the delegates approved the political resolution presented to it by Georges Altman, editor of the powerful Paris newspaper *Franc-Tireur*. The resolution, substantially representative of the views of the leadership of the RDR, came at the end of a vigorous discussion of the report delivered for the directing committee by Paul Parisot.

### AGAINST BOTH WAR BLOCs

"The RDR," reads one of the key passages of the resolution, "remains in France the new force capable of uniting a great number of militants of the democratic workers' movement with the view of forming a left wing that is autonomous and independent of all the forces of social conservatism, of reaction, of dictatorship and of war within the two blocs [the reference here is to the American and Russian blocs]."

"It denounces the impotence of a purely governmental Third Force and is opposed at one and the same time to the system represented by American capitalism and its European annexes and the Soviet statism expanded to its so-called 'popular democracy' extensions. It rejects both the oppression of the moneybags and the dictatorship of a single party.

"It fights for the social abolition of colonial slavery. It declares its solidarity with the initial efforts, similar to its own, which are arising and developing throughout the world: tendencies toward a socialism which is autonomous in face of the blocs, movements of national and social emancipation of the peoples beyond the seas, legal or illegal, revolutionary democratic opposition inside the blocs.

"The RDR participates resolutely in international action for the formation of a united and federated socialist Europe to which the peoples emancipated from colonial dominion will freely associate themselves.

"The RDR is ready to act jointly with all forces which are working along the same road, with respect to the freedom of expression of all tendencies. It leaves to its local organizations full autonomy in evaluating the circumstances in which and the methods by which the RDR militants can arouse action in favor of demands by joint struggle or associate itself in full independence with other organizations. It aims to be the rallying of the workers and the republicans against the aggression of RPF [de Gaulle] neo-fascism and its shock troops.

### FOR SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

"It does not fight against Stalinism by borrowing its methods of calumny and persecution, but by demonstrating to the exploited and the oppressed that the RDR is in their camp and that its ambition is to become their best defender. The RDR will defend democracy, its liberties, the possibilities which it affords to the movements for human emancipation, not only against the aggressions of neo-fascism but also against the policy which aims at repeating in Europe the 'Prague coup' and to install the pseudo-popular democracy.

"Defending democracy by all means, it aims to place in the forefront the action of the workers and the people who, always in the hours of peril, have guaranteed the defense or the rebirth of liberties. It denounces, as contrary to the elementary liberties of democracy, the imprisonment of miners on the ground of having engaged in a strike, as well as the persecutions, the arrests and the internments of militants of the peoples beyond the seas.

(Continued on page 3)

## Senate Government By Injunction Vote: Challenge to Labor

### Bell UAW Strike Ranks Solid, Company Arrogant

By MICHAEL FERRIS

BUFFALO, July 2 — Bell Aircraft workers tightened their belts this week and settled down for their fourth week on the picket line.

Management representatives once again stalked abruptly out of negotiations with Local 501 (Auto Workers Union, CIO) committeemen. As the union representatives came out of the negotiating room, management handed them a court order to show cause why picketing at the plant should not be limited. There is little doubt that management's overbearing demands in the day's negotiations rested in large part upon their faith in the court order which they had hidden in their back pocket.

The meeting, held Saturday, July 2, had seemed, at first, to offer some hope for an early settlement. The meeting was called as a result of the company's asking the union on Thursday, June 30, to allow engineers to cross the picket line. A pre-strike agreement between the company and the union had made provision for maintenance men to enter the plant. The company had agreed not to try to get any other employees into the plant. The union, holding to the terms of the agreement, said that "if any workers are to go back, all of us will go back—when a settlement is reached."

### COMPANY IS ARROGANT

Breaking the agreement, the company issued a call to engineers to report to work on Friday, July 1. Normally Local 501 maintained about 20-30 pickets before the gates of Bell Aircraft. When the company's announcement was made on Thursday morning, the union had only half a day to make arrangements for Friday morning. 700 pickets turned up Friday morning. Only one or two carloads of engineers approached the gates—no one entered the plant. The plan of the company to divide the production and non-production workers did not bear fruit.

Thus on Saturday, July 2, the union and management sat down to negotiate. The company's position was amazingly arrogant.

It demanded that the strike be called off at once, that the old contract be put into effect, that the union drop all demands for a pension or wage increase, that the workers remain at work for two weeks—and

then the company would condescend to discuss the questions of additional insurance and vacation pay—plus a clause "which will protect the company against any subversive activity affecting government contracts."

The union offered a variety of proposals in an attempt to reach an agreement. Edward Gray, assistant regional director of the UAW-CIO, said that the union asked for a ten-cent-an-hour increase, which was to be packaged with increased vacations and insurance benefits. The union proposed also that its pension demand be held in abeyance for three months. "Our last proposal," said Gray, "was to remain in continuous session, all night if necessary, to settle all non-economic issues. There are 16 of them, but they are not too serious."

The company representatives announced that the union's demands were unacceptable, rose abruptly, stalked out of the room, took the injunctions out of their pockets—and handed one to Robert Sigler, president of the Bell local, and one to Mike Berdyck, chairman of the bargaining committee.

### BOSSSES ADVERTISE WHOPPERS

"We suspect that while our sessions were in progress, management was preparing the court orders in another part of the hotel," charged Edward Gray. "We also suspect that management got us down here so that we would be available to have the court papers served upon us. Apparently management did not meet with us today for the purpose of negotiating seriously."

Paul Russo, assistant director of aircraft, UAW-CIO, said: "It is the international position that the company has no desire at this time to settle the strike except by a complete surrender of the union's just demands. This is indicated by the company's proposal that the union drop its wage, vacation, pension and insurance demands."

"The national aircraft department of the international union will recommend increased benefits for Local 501 members in order that they may carry on a very effective strike."

The latest move of the company was a full-page ad in a Sunday paper. The ad repeated the company's arrogant proposals, blamed the "unreasonable demands by international

By SUSAN GREEN

The Senate has passed legislation which, in the words of Florida's Senator Pepper, is "nothing but a bobtailed edition of the Taft-Hartley Act enacted by the 80th Congress."

The crux of the dispute between the administration Democrats and the Republican-Dixiecrat bloc was the legislative authority for injunctions in what are called "national emergency strikes." (President Truman a while ago announced that he had injunctive powers without special act of Congress.) Before the showdown came in the Senate last week, the administration forces had already compromised their stand by consenting to include in new legislation a provision for plant seizure by the government. This compromise had President Truman's blessing, in spite of his public avowal that he is for unconditional repeal of T-H.

Senator Taft sought by amendments to guarantee that the administration's Thomas bill would be another T-H Law except in name. Also in a "compromising mood," he came up with an amendment to provide BOTH the anti-labor injunction and the plant seizure techniques to break a "national emergency strike."

The administration forces offered their own amendment to strike the injunction alternative from the bill, leaving only the seizure provision—this at least they would "do for labor!" So sure of victory were the administration Democrats that Senate Majority Leader Lucas promised Truman that the amendment was as good as passed. However, with a narrow margin of 44 votes for the administration and 46 against, the amendment to eliminate the injunction provision was lost.

### T-H STILL ON BOOKS

The Senate then quickly passed the Taft amendment providing for both injunction and plant seizure to break a "national emergency strike" by a vote of 50 to 40. A couple of days later, on June 30, the defeat of the administration forces was completed. By a vote of 45 to 40, the Senate accepted the whole gamut of twenty-eight Taft amendments to the Thomas bill. And, leaving no step untraced, the Senate passed the Thomas "repeal" bill, as amended by Taft, 51 to 42. The outcome is . . . "nothing but a bobtailed edition of the Taft-Hartley Act." All the essentials of that vicious law have been preserved.

However, the cloak of innocence does not too well fit the Peppers, Humphreys, Douglasses, et al., either. For, in making the compromise on plant seizure to break "national emergency strikes," they were complying only with the letter of their promise to labor, not with its essence. For these "friends of labor" in the Democratic Party also take the anti-labor position that when a strike reaches the stage when it can be won, the government must somehow step in to send the strikers back to work.

Capitalist politicians of both parties think in terms of coercing strikers back to work, never in terms of coercing the bosses to grant workers' demands. And we might just as well

(Continued on page 3)

### Civil Liberties the Victim

## What's at Stake in Witch Hunt?

By WILLIAM BARTON

In a recent press conference, President Truman has declared that current "investigations of subversive activities" are a manifestation of "hysteria" similar to what happened during the days of the Alien and Sedition Laws, passed by the John Adams Federalist administration as a weapon against the incoming radical democracy of Thomas Jefferson's party. He said it was something that seemed to follow every war, and he felt that it would soon subside, as it always had. And he insisted that none of this hysteria stemmed from the executive branch of government.

In a letter to the New York Times of June 26, Eugene Lyons, who drifted from disillusion with his Russian "Utopia" to becoming the chief public defender of the record of Herbert Hoover, mildly took the president to task. He wrote these two fantastic sentences: "The only truly impressive symptom of hysteria is the curious assumption that it exists. And that, I am convinced, is a product of deliberate Communist strategy."

### GOVERNMENT BEHIND THE DRIVE

We are compelled to agree with Truman in one respect. There is a witch-hunt atmosphere. Its extent need not be exaggerated; it has not assumed anything resembling "lynch" proportions. The reason is that there is little popular drive behind these developing persecutions.

Reports from all over the country show that the public is getting tired of the whole thing. What is being witnessed is an entirely officially-instigated and officially-administered campaign. It has not been sufficiently opposed because of a combination of widespread apathy and confusion. And a large part of the inspiration is coming from Harry Truman's executive branch of the federal government.

A good percentage of the front page of every newspaper is devoted to accounts of trials, investigations, loyalty oaths, snooping, etc. It is a matter of high political policy—the "cold war." The starting point is the claim that agents of the designated enemy must be weeded out of positions where they can effect policy and administration.

But the process does not stop there. The government is not only concerned with Stalinist agents of Russia; it is worried about "dangerous thoughts"—dangerous to its social system. Many fervently anti-Stalinist organizations become likewise branded as "subversive." To complete the development, individual government officials, legislators, writers, etc., drive the trend further and the whole affair becomes cruelly ridiculous.

Most publicized are the headlined

trials and the work of the government loyalty boards. Two of the trials (Hiss and Coplon) involve actual charges of espionage which are not part of this discussion of civil rights. The trial of the American Stalinist leaders has turned out to be not only another malicious use of the Smith Gag Act to prevent teaching of "unaccepted" doctrines (the first victim was the Socialist Workers Party, at which time the Communist Party cheered the ver-

(Continued on page 2)

## CP Leader Faces Trial in Israel

Charge Mikunis Urged Police States to Ban Jewish Emigration

By ED FINDLEY

Samuel Mikunis, CP leader and deputy in the Knesseth (Parliament) of Israel, is to be haled before a special investigating committee of the Knesseth to answer charges growing out of his stoolpigeon activities in satellite Rumania, according to S. Z. Shargai, Knesseth deputy now visiting New York.

Mikunis, on his current trip to Bucharest, Rumania, urged the police states of Eastern Europe TO PROHIBIT AND OUTLAW ALL EMIGRATION OF JEWS as long as the present Mapai government of Israel remains in power and fails to adopt a pro-Soviet foreign policy.

This typically Stalinist stab in the back of the Jewish masses trapped in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe has aroused the people of Israel to an unprecedented degree. Demands that Mikunis be brought to justice fill the entire Israeli press. However, in view of his parliamentary immunity, it will require an act of the Knesseth to bring him before a court of law.

The Mikunis scandal merely highlights the progressive alienation of the Israeli labor movement from Stalinist Russia and the "people's democracies." The illusions about

Stalinism, engendered by Russian diplomatic and arms aid to the fledgling republic of Israel during the Arab-Israeli war, are being fast dissipated by the anti-emigration, anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish policies of the Stalinist-controlled countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

In this connection it is reliably

reported that the hitherto pro-Russian Mapam (United Workers Party) has in recent weeks lost many of its supporters and sympathizers as a result of Moscow's new policies.

Within the Mapam itself a crisis is brewing between its die-hard Stalinists and those of its members

(Continued on page 4)

### NAZI-STALINIST ALLIANCE AND MINERS' DEFEAT

## Bolivia Witnesses Intense Social Drama

By JUAN ROBLES

Bolivia is the scene of an intense social drama, where all the international as well as national contradictions converge, and where the mine workers struggle against imperialist exploitation as well as against the backward feudalism of the country and the domination of the feudo-bourgeoisie. In this traditional and spontaneous struggle, the native Bolivian proletariat is confronted by "teachers" and "leaders" who exploit its sacrifices, its readiness for struggle and its revolutionary heroism for their own corrupt ends, and divert it from its true historic road.

The Bolivian petty bourgeoisie is a typical representative of its class in all of Indian America. Hungry and impoverished, it seeks social betterment through continuous military conspiracies, uprisings and "native revolutions." It desires to displace those who hold state power, the source of national income, for its own benefit.

But the change it demands is only a question of a change of guard, of a change in the men and groups who govern, while the base of the capitalist regime remains intact. "Criollo" politics is only a naked and cynical struggle for power as a means of enriching a new, small clique at the

expense of the brutalized, exploited and backward masses.

These military uprisings and conspiracies, at times supported by the social struggle of the oppressed masses, are what the native petty bourgeoisie calls a nationalist "revolution."

### NAZIS-STALINISTS AT WORK

Under the ideological influence of German Nazism, the petty bourgeoisie embraced a homegrown Nazi program and created a party, the MNR (Revolutionary Nationalist Movement). When German Nazism went down before Allied arms, the Villa-

(Continued on page 4)

## Coming —

in the July 18 issue:  
A feature page documenting anti-labor laws and practices in Stalinist Russia

## Company Stalks Out of Negotiations

## Bell UAW Strike Ranks Solid —

(Continued from page 1)  
representatives of the UAW-CIO for the suspension of negotiations.  
"Your management believes," read the ad, "that its proposal involved the only possible area of agreement and would have met with the approval of Local 501 representatives and the great majority of its membership. However, the international representatives of the UAW-CIO indicated that under no circumstances could they allow Local 501 to sign any agreement which might adversely affect the international's hoped-for economic demands involved in the UAW-CIO's so-called national pattern."

## 90 PER CENT ON PICKET LINE

The all-too-clear line of the company is: "Look, boys, we can get together—but your international representatives won't let us." This line of trying to separate the aims of the

Bell Local 501 workers from the aims of the international representatives will have little effect. A meeting of Bell workers has been called by the union for Tuesday, July 5, to vote on the company's proposals.

The Bell workers have clearly demonstrated their solid support of the strike. Over 90 per cent of Bell workers have reported promptly and regularly for picket duty. At the merest suggestion of a threat to their picket line, 700 workers showed up on a few hours' notice.

The newly elected Reuther administration has done an efficient job of organizing the strike. More solidly than ever it is supported by the membership.

Readers of LABOR ACTION will be particularly interested in the events of the recent elections, held in the midst of the strike, for delegates to the national convention. Three groups ran a slate for dele-

gates: the Reuther group, the "Rank and File" Caucus and the majority of the ex-supporters of the "Rank and File" who now call themselves the "New Group."

The individuals who make up this "New Group" up until yesterday were described by The Militant, organ of the Socialist Workers Party, as "progressives," "militants," the cream of the labor movement. The "New Group" now declares itself in favor of "Americanism," of kicking out all "subversives," and stood before the polling booths intimating that if the Reuther group had not been elected to local union office the strike would not have taken place.

By an accident, which resulted from a small membership meeting, this "New Group" got two out of three members elected to the election committee. Despite the request of the executive board and strike leaders to hold the election at or

near the picket line, the "New Group" election committee insisted upon holding the election at the union office—20 miles from the picket line. They hoped by this method to insure a small vote and thus enhance their possibility of getting a delegate.

## SWP FLOPS AGAIN

Also interesting is the analysis made in another of a series of consciously distorted articles in The Militant. The Militant had maliciously charged that "the fiasco of the negotiations conducted by the Reutherites has engendered the deepest resentment and bitterest criticism on the part of the rank and file." The Militant blandly accused the Reuther group of "company-appeasement policies" and falsely asserted that "at last night's strike preparation meeting the workers gave more than a broad hint that they are looking toward the militants to lead them to a victorious conclusion to the strike."

Both the red-baiting of The Militant's former supporters and the falsehoods of The Militant were clearly rejected by the members of Bell Local 501. The result of the election was an overwhelming victory for the Reuther group, which won all three of the delegates to the national convention.

The membership and the leadership of Bell Local 501 are faced with a difficult situation. An arrogant company, backed up by court injunctions, supported by the whole airframe industry, and most likely by others interested in seeing the UAW's 1949 demands smashed, is not an obstacle easily brushed aside. Local 501 has opened the battle; it is up to the UAW convention delegates to bring up the big guns.

## Industry Stand on '49 Contract Demand Poses Question for Labor

By BEN HALL

Contract negotiations for 1949 cover all the major industries. The companies are offering nothing with the reckless generosity of misers. The spotlight is on the auto and steel industries.

The Textile Workers Union has already abdicated its position in this round of bargaining by adopting a policy of asking for no wage increases, presumably because of growing unemployment and increasing competition for a narrowing market. The maritime unions, also faced with a shortage of jobs, will have to be satisfied with the \$7.50 per month increase of their newly negotiated contracts.

The United Mine Workers Union has stepped out of the peacemaker's place to wait and see. The "no contract-no work" tradition has been temporarily set aside. The union, however, has "unilaterally" decreed a three-day work week in the industry to prevent the accumulation of big piles of coal and to protect its position if it is compelled to strike. Naturally, this step has been denounced by the mine owners as an invasion of the sacred rights of free enterprise.

## CAPITAL PUTS THE SQUEEZE ON

The demands of the big CIO unions are more far-reaching this year than last. The United Auto Workers, the Steel Workers Union and the United Packinghouse Workers Union (to cite examples) are demanding pensions, health and welfare benefits, and wage increases.

When this list was worked out, pigs had not yet been stuck into the

Fair Deal balloon. The labor leaders had only to hold on and rise with the warm winds of the 81st Congress. But only a puff of hot air came.

Disappointment. Taft-Hartley hangs over "collective bargaining." The steel industry won't even give Murray the courtesy of bargaining on social-security plans. The Chrysler Corporation refuses to dicker with even so responsible a labor "statesman" as Norman Matthews of the UAW. Ford is willing to accept only that which will cost the company nothing... that is, nothing.

The international board of the United Packinghouse Workers Union warns: "We face a hard, tough fight in our efforts to achieve this program... The packinghouse companies can be expected to resist each and every item which demands any reduction in the profits of the corporations. Not only will the companies resist our forward-looking efforts to improve the conditions of the workers, but they may be expected to carry on and are already carrying on a counter-attack on our living and working standards."

The speedup issue, so dramatically highlighted in the rank-and-file Ford strike, generally affects all labor. The packinghouse union for example reports: "One of the most important forms of this counter-attack is the growing speedup practised in the packing plants throughout the nation... The fight of the Ford workers against speedup in their plant is identical with and part of the fight of the packinghouse workers against speedup in packing plants. These are struggles which will require the united resources of all labor."

Consoling thought: but last year

all the big companies turned down the demands of the unions, yet it was relatively easy for the UAW to turn the tide in the Chrysler strike of 1948 and in the settlement with General Motors.

What are the possibilities of a peaceable settlement in 1949, a little give-and-take in collective bargaining, one which more or less satisfies the labor movement with substantial concessions? To help answer this question let us give Senator Paul Douglas the floor (excerpt from a speech in the Senate):

"The truth of the matter is that up to November 1948 a large section of the employers in the country did not want to utilize the full provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law lest they frighten the workers of the country. They had won a great election in 1946 and they looked confidently upon the November election of 1948 as one which would return them to power by overwhelming majorities in the House and Senate, and send the governor of New York to the White House. They did not want to 'stir the animals up' before election. That was one reason why the full powers of the Taft-Hartley Law were not used prior to November 1948."

"The companies may well be willing to 'stir up the animals' this time if necessary. The labor leadership does not want to scare off its timid friends in Congress. Big mass strikes would push Truman off his tightrope."

Dilemma of 1949: The labor movement can fight for its demands and dump its "liberal" friends in Congress; or it can reassure the "friends of labor" and dump its demands. Lines in the trade unions are going to be drawn on this choice.

## At Stake in Witch Hunt —

(Continued from page 1)

dict), but it has become a test of whether it is criminal to refuse to identify other members of an organization.

## "DO YOU READ A BOOK?"

The trial of Judith Coplon did offer one aspect that should be of immediate concern—snooping by a secret police to uncover political affiliation and implication by a few fragmentary facts. The FBI report found on Miss Coplon, supposedly identifying several well-known people in the entertainment world as members or fellow travelers of the CP, appeared both hilarious and pitiful to those who are sufficiently aware of how the Stalinist orbit operates.

This actress Helen Hayes, an active supporter of Dewey in the last election, was listed as a possible fellow traveler because she had participated in some campaigns for Russian War Relief (a fact which required no FBI investigation to learn). Taking off on such antics, a publication of the anti-Stalinist Americans for Democratic Action worked out a very plausible (fictitious) dossier on J. Edgar Hoover, "clearly proving" him to be a clever "Communist undercover agent."

The work of many of the loyalty boards might provide enough material for a dozen Olsen and Johnson shows. Historian Henry Steele Commager lists some of the following as questions which have been asked, presumably to prove subversion: "Is your wife a churchgoer?"—"Do you read a good many books?"—"How do you explain the fact that you have an album of Paul Robeson records in your home?"—"Do you believe that Negro blood should be segregated in the Red Cross blood bank?"—"Would you say your wife has liberal political viewpoints?"

The results are not so funny. Witness the case of James Kutcher, legless war veteran, fired from his clerk's job with the Veterans Administration because of admitted membership in a Trotskyist organization listed by the attorney general as subversive. Our governmental structure must be impossibly weak if a VA clerk can subvert its functioning.

## NO REPENTANCE FOR SINNERS

It should not be forgotten that organizations classified as subversive have no means of appealing, nor can they even find out how it is possible to get off the list. Individuals accused do not see the evidence against them nor do they face their accusers. That these violations of elementary court procedure are part of the loyalty boards' operations is supposedly justified by the idea that people investigated are not formally on trial on criminal charges.

The results, however, may be just as severe in terms of an individual's life as many a court sentence. Such "administrative" procedures are too convenient a method for circumventing the Bill of Rights. The opposition to them has been much milder than one would expect.

The latest and most far-reaching example of thought-control hysteria involves the country's campuses. The House Un-American Committee has subpoenaed lists of textbooks from 107 colleges to determine how much "subversion" had crept in. The prospect of these legislators presumably devoting all their waking hours to reading them is a delightful one. No one seems to know just what their aim is. Will they prevent the Catholic school of St. Johns College at Annapolis, Maryland, from including Marx's "Capital" in its list of prescribed "great books"? Encouragingly, several college presidents and administrations have either refused to submit the lists or have protested vigorously.

The drive against academic freedom is more extensive than this. The regents of the University of California have prepared a new loyalty oath in which every teacher must swear that he was NEVER a member or sympathizer of any "subversive" group. Just about every church allows for repentance. Even Stalinist Russia sometimes allows those who "confess" to resume their public lives. But

the California Regents believe that those whom they have designated as sinners are damned forever.

Similarly, atomic scientist Frank Oppenheimer has been dismissed from the University of Minnesota because he admitted that he and his wife were members of the Communist Party a decade ago, a fact well known to those in charge of the atomic program during the war.

## SEED-PLANTING VERBOTEN

In New York, the state legislature passed the Feinberg Act last session, instructing the state Board of Regents to prepare a list of its own of "subversive" organizations and dismiss all teachers who do not swear they are free from taint. The list put out by the Regents is very similar to that of the attorney general.

In Illinois, the state legislature's Broyles Commission has demanded immediate expulsion of any teacher or student who would not sign a loyalty oath, and loss of tax-exemption for colleges which permit "subversive" groups.

The notorious Ober Act in Maryland includes the possibility of criminal charges against certain types of "subversive activity."

The Regents of the University of Nebraska hit the jackpot. They proposed to ban any discussion that might "plant the seeds of subversion."

Frank Ober, author of the above-mentioned Maryland legislation, wrote to his alma mater, Harvard, asking for the removal of members of its faculty whose public activity has been "disloyal." His principal target is astronomer and leading Wallace supporter Harlow Shapley. The university officials suddenly woke up in fear and angrily replied that "Harvard is not afraid of freedom. Teachers have rights as citizens to speak and write as men of independence. There will be no harassment of professors."

The irony of this bold statement is that Harvard President James Conant is one of the leading educational spokesmen for the view that educational institutions should assume the function in the coming period of instructing students in their role in the cold war, and he was a leading member of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association which recently proposed barring CP members as teachers.

## JOHN DEWEY SPEAKS UP

This is typical of the dilemma of those American educators who are fearful of the possible results of the current witch hunts but are willing to go along part of the way. Thus the faculty of the University of California was against the proposed loyalty oath, but might go along if its representatives would help frame it. Several college administrations which protested the textbook inquiry of the House Committee left the door open for "policing" by themselves. Despite their own best inclinations, they are thus yielding to the hysteria.

It is good to see some prominent voices in outspoken, complete antagonism to these tendencies. Historian Commager has been one. President Harold Taylor of Sara Lawrence has been another. But most encouraging was this week's statement by the famed philosopher and leading spirit of American education, John Dewey.

Because so many of his distinguished colleagues had declared differently, he was reluctant to make any definitive statements until now, he declared. But he is now convinced that any idea of barring people from teaching, because of ideas of affiliation is wrong and dangerous. Would that some of his prominent disciples could think as clearly on this matter as their master!

This airplane view of the current witch-hunt hysteria would not be complete without a few words about some of its most absurd episodes. One of the most farcical has been the attempt of Senator Hickenlooper to "get" Atomic Commission Chairman Lilienthal, whose administration has in reality not displeased the most conservative. There has been the case of TVA Chairman Gordon Clapp, listed by the army as "unen-

playable" for a job in Germany about which he knew nothing. There is the story of a Military Government official in Germany, a known anti-Stalinist, removed from his post by the military despite the opposition of German anti-Stalinist political leaders.

## JOB FOR LABOR!

As was mentioned above, the suppression campaign has received little active popular support. But neither has it been met by much opposition. Those who could lead such an opposing force are hamstrung by their fears of Stalinism. But it is, in fact, the Stalinists who cannot but gain from such antics. In fact, by appearing to be the leading organized proponents of civil rights at present, the Communist Party and its satellites have regained some of the support that their criminal tactics had recently lost.

There has been some effort by non-Stalinists to forestall the witch hunting drive. The American Civil Liberties Union and Workers Defense League have been active in legal defense of individuals and organizations. The Kutcher Defense Committee has received wide support. The Americans for Democratic Action has shown some alarm, at least in its press. The Columbia University chapter of the American Veterans Committee began a campaign late last semester to make the administration of the Feinberg Act less virulent, in preparation for a lively campaign for its repeal.

But where does the labor movement stand? Some unions have gone on record against some features of the hysteria wave of persecution. Many have not done even that. The unions are the ones to suffer most from a suppressive atmosphere. These witch hunts are part of the same setup as Taft-Hartleyism and government by injunction. It's about time all realized this connection. An organized labor campaign against the manifestations of police-statism is overdue.

## Word of Cheer!

Here's to good old Dr. S. T. Possony, who's just had a book published by the Infantry Journal, "Strategic Air Power for Dynamic Security."

The doc is on the optimistic side. Says the N. Y. Times (July 3):

"If an atomic attack were launched against the U. S., Dr. Possony challenges a statement that 40,000,000 persons would die in the first twenty-four hours."

Reason: "That many atomic bombs will hardly be available as long as atomic technology remains as complicated as it is, but this is little solace."

So here's the cheerful news: "We can calculate that at least a million people will be killed" for each 135 atomic bombs loaded into bombers, allowing for misses and planes shot down en route.

And a final cheerer-upper: "Fortunately, for mankind, the cost of killing men has risen steadily with each war, he observes. It cost Caesar 75 cents to kill each enemy soldier; Napoleon \$3,000; \$25,000 per man in World War I; \$50,000 with the technology of World War II."

It's good to have men around who see the brighter side of things.

## Books Received

From the New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocketbooks, June 27, 1949:

ARTS AND THE MEN, by Irwin Edman. A Mentor book, 144 pages, 35 cents. A revised and enlarged edition of the author's book published in 1928 under the title "The World, the Arts and the Artist." Subtitled "An Introduction to Aesthetics."

AT HEAVEN'S GATE, by Robert Penn Warren. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents. Abridgment and introduction by George Mayberry. A novel.

## Ohio Lesson: Strike Breaking by Injunction

IAM Returns to Work at Warner &amp; Swasey After Longest Strike in Cleveland's History

By JOE CLARK

CLEVELAND, July 1.—The longest strike in Cleveland's history, the one at the plant of the Warner & Swasey Company, is ended. For several reasons it was an important strike, and a review of it is in order for LABOR ACTION readers.

This company occupies a prominent position in the world of machine-tool production. Turret lathes and other high-precision tools, as well as large astronomical telescopes, are among its products. It requires workers with a high degree of skill and experience. The normal working force is about 1800. For a number of years the company has had peaceful relations with its employees, who are organized in the International Association of Machinists.

During last fall and early winter the union made demands for a flat increase of 19 cents per hour as well as six paid holidays per year and regular pay for the time of stewards spent in discussing and arranging union affairs at the plant. All demands were refused and a strike was called last December 27.

A picket line was set up by the union and maintained all through the strike. During the first four or five months of the strike there was little activity on either side. But it soon became apparent that the time was more or less on the side of the company. The peak of the post-war demand for machine tools had just passed. In addition, the U. S. government was disposing of vast war assets, including great quantities of machine tools. This limited the market for Warner & Swasey products. Business was slow and getting slower. No attempt was made to reopen the plant.

## TRIAL BALLOON AT F-A

About a month ago, the company went into court and obtained an order limiting the number of pickets at each gate. This is not an unusual procedure; strikebreaking bosses have done it many times before. But now it had a special significance. Just a short time before this the widely publicized strike at the Fawcett-Airflex plant had gone down to an ignominious defeat as a result of just such a court order. (This strike has been reported in preceding issues of LABOR ACTION.) It was under Stalinist leadership and the strikers were used by the Stalinists for their particular political purposes rather than for the interests of the strikers themselves. After a couple of picket-line skirmishes, the F-A company obtained a court order strictly limiting picketing. The next attempt of the company to reopen the plant brought many arrests of strikers, with heavy fines and jail sentences totaling 440 days. Because of the fact that everyone knew it was a Stalinist strike there was no support for the strikers from any source. Even the Cleveland Industrial Union Council (CIO) gave little or no support. The judge ended the strike by court decree and that was that. Soon after this an AFL union made a contract with the company and the plant is now running without interference.

The court order by the Warner & Swasey Company, therefore, fore-

shadowed things to come. What could it mean but an attempt to reopen the plant? But the union announced that no matter what happened, there would be no attempt at violence. What could be sweeter for the company? It was almost an invitation to reopen.

Meetings were still being held, with the company offering 10 cents an hour and other compromises and the union still insisting on its full demands. But suddenly the company broke off all negotiations. This new tactic bothered the union, which started calling for "arbitration." The union asked Cleveland's Mayor Burke to attempt a settlement, which he was anxious to do because of the political prestige it might bring him. But though he tried hard, he was not successful.

## WORKERS STARVED OUT

The company was in the stronger position. After six months of striking the men were suffering badly. Notices were sent by the company to the strikers at their homes asking them to return to work, offering them vacation pay, etc. At first only a few responded, but after a few days the number increased.

Some outsiders were hired too, but according to the best reports, most of those who went to work were union men. It is this writer's opinion that the company would not have bothered with the union members at all had it not been for the skill and experience which they possessed for the company's particular kind of work.

After a week or so the number entering the plant was considerable. The union admitted it was 300 to 400. The company said it was 600. The union was in a tough spot. Again it pressed the company for arbitration. The company responded with a stipulation (no less). This was handed by the company president, C. J. Stillwell, to Ernest White, general vice-president of the International Association of Machinists.

The stipulation provided that the strike be called off immediately and that all wage and contract issues be settled by direct negotiation. The workers would go back to work with no discrimination but under a new rate schedule proposed by the company, but previously rejected by the union. Negotiations must be resumed promptly and all points of difference settled by direct negotiation.

This stipulation was offered to the union membership in secret ballot and the result, according to union officials, was 621 for acceptance and 143 for rejection.

## A FIGHT COULD HAVE WON

This spells nothing but defeat for the union: not an utter defeat but something close to it. With the workers back on the job, the company is in the driver's seat. The negotiations will consist only of further stipulations and the union can do nothing about it.

In looking back over the history of the strike it appears that, at a certain stage, militant action by the union might have saved the day for the strikers. This was when the company first tried to reopen the plant. If the

pickets had been strongly reinforced and gone into action on the first scabs the results might have been quite different.

Of course, the union members would have had to fight and some of them would have gone to jail. But this could have been made the base for rallying of many thousands of Cleveland unionists to their support. The IAM is no Stalinist organization. It has a fairly good record of union struggle. This case was quite different from the Fawcett-Airflex strike. Some careful strategy, together with a good fight, would have broadened the base of the struggle and brought a lot of support from other unions as well as liberals of all sorts.

But the IAM leadership was not equal to such a task. Perhaps they did not feel sufficient confidence in other workers' organizations, and feared they would not get the needed support. The IAM is far from being

a class-conscious organization. But an appeal to the working class of Cleveland would have brought a far different ending to the struggle. It was worth a try.

Certainly the result could not have been worse than the present. The union has suffered a humiliating defeat; one that will handicap it for years to come. Had it put up a real fight it would have added greatly to its prestige and reputation. A real fight, regardless of the outcome, would have demonstrated to the employers that the workers were determined to support their unions in the struggle for decent living conditions. It would have ended the Fawcett-Airflex pattern and stopped the injunction method of strikebreaking.

The outcome of this strike can only give the bosses encouragement to use the same methods again and again. It is going to take some hard struggle to overcome this situation.



By JOSEPH ROAN

Business Manager

In re-establishing the PRESS SECTION column on a more or less regular basis, our aim is to let you know how our readers and supporters are doing in spreading the message of LABOR ACTION to the four corners of the earth. Here also we'll discuss our mutual successes and woes (write 'em in), and here, too, we'll keep you informed about other press items in which you might be interested.

For instance, a whole batch of new items have come in during the past few weeks. STUDENT PARTISAN, published by the University of Chicago Politics Club, publishes in its summer issue the speeches of Sartre, Rousset, Levi, Plivier, Wright and others made at the RDR International Writers' Rally in Paris. The price from this department is only fifteen cents per copy.

A pamphlet we are certain that many of our readers will find of interest is AGAINST BOTH WAR CAMPS, by Victor Howard, published by the Socialist Education Committee. This is the group with which the Chicago "Libertarian" group of the YPSL, which recently broke with the Socialist Party, is associated. Since many of our readers expressed interest in these developments, we have ordered the pamphlets. Available for 25 cents per copy.

There are still a few copies left of the March-April number of CONFRONTATION INTERNATIONALE, the international discussion review published in French. In this issue there are some articles by Rousseau, Andrade, Stone, Demaziere and others, including our own Jack Brad and Henry Judd. There is an especially interesting open letter to "Politics" by Andree-Geld.

Branches that have not yet placed their orders had better get them in swiftly, lest they find our supply completely depleted. The price: 50 cents for a single issue, 40 cents in bundles of three or more, and \$2.50 for a year's subscription, ordered from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please, on orders of one dollar, or less, include postage.

See you next week.

## This Is Rich

One of the bitterest enemies in Congress of a 75-cent minimum-wage law is Representative Robert F. Rich (R., Pa.).

Sol Stetin of the Textile Workers recently made public a letter to the congressman in which the union organizer pointed out an interesting fact. Representative Rich is the general manager and treasurer of the Woolrich Woolen Mills near Williamsport. Today, when the prevailing wage in the woolen industry is \$1.32, Rich's mill is paying a starting rate of 45 cents an hour, a full 30 cents below the proposed minimum.

That's enough to make any man feel like 30 cents—and be right.

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

### News on Poland

#### ANTI-CATHOLIC DRIVE IS ON; EXILE GOVERNMENT IN CRISIS

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Much water has run under the bridges of martyred Warsaw since the "unification of the workers movement," that is, the fusion between the Stalinist party, the PPR, and the fake Socialist party, the PPS. The new party, the PZPR (Polish United Workers Party) has 1,400,000 members, of which 930,000 belonged to the Stalinist PPR and only 470,000 to the fake PPS. From the point of view of social content 787,000 members are "industrial workers" (how many are authentic workers and how many are bureaucrats?), 240,000 peasants, 62,000 farm laborers, 28,000 artisans, 3,000 small shopkeepers, and 280,000 security employees.

Presuming that the majority of the "industrial workers" are bureaucrats, the social structure of the Stalinist party is typically "bureaucratic." The privileged position of the Stalinist police, hangmen of the working class, is arrogantly provocative.

Zambrowski, member of the Politburo, states that the underground organizations are trying to exploit the discontent of the ex-members of the PPS and of the PPR who have been ousted or put on probation, and promises to counteract these efforts of the "reaction" with a "new offensive against the capitalist elements in the city and countryside." The "socialist offensive" is, of course, directed in the first place against the proletariat, among whom the party cells, as in Russia, impose "work norms" in order to increase the exploitation of the workers on behalf of the ruling bureaucracy and Russian imperialism.

The famous "exportation of coal from Silesia" to Russia at a ridiculous price constitutes flagrant proof of Russia's exploitation of Poland, the "chain of misery" which "unites" Poland to Stalin's empire. The political trials before military tribunals with many death sentences represent the political expression of this "chain of misery."

#### ANTI-CATHOLIC DRIVE ON

Having destroyed the peasant opposition and having "liquidated" the organized workers' rebelliousness by imposing a single party, the regime is now directing its savage offensive against the schools, the remnants of independence in literature and culture, and the powerful Catholic Church. Although the Catholic clergy has had a pernicious and reactionary influence in Poland, now in opposition, persecuted and oppressed, it has become a symbol of national resistance against the Russian invader and of the rebellion against Stalinist totalitarianism.

The destruction of the Catholic Church in Poland is one of the main tasks and one of the fundamental aims of Stalin's Russifying and pan-Slavic policy. While the peasant masses and middle class of Poland continue to be Catholics, Stalinist, imperialist and pan-Slavic Russia will never be able to digest a rebellious and Catholic Poland. Of course, the destruction of the Catholic clergy's influence will some day have beneficial consequences for the future socialist government of Poland.

Within the Stalinist party itself, the tendency represented by Zawadzki, Jozwiak, and Bierut directs its fire against the "nationalist-rightist deviation," its chief victim to date being Gomulka. Now there is some talk that the "economic dictator," Minc, is in disfavor, although for the moment he continues as "vice-premier" of the government. In the anticipated reorganization of the cabinet there is talk about the retirement of Cyrankiewicz, who labored hard to complete his job of "fusing the PPS with the PPR." His place will probably be taken by Zawadzki, an obscure figure trusted by the GPU.

In the Polish emigration the division deepens between the "Democratic Coalition" composed of the authentic Socialist Party, the PPS, and Mikolajczyk Populists, and the Right, represented by the remnants of the Pilsudski camp and the National Party. The Polish government-in-exile of London has suffered a sharp crisis as a result of the withdrawal of the PPS, and the resignation of General Bor-Komorowski.

#### RUNNING TO WASHINGTON

The new government headed by Tomaszewski is altogether lacking in influence and authority, and is supported only by a military-bureaucratic camarilla in émigré circles. Tomaszewski, a member of the PPS, has been expelled from his party for accepting this post.

Even the National-Democratic Party itself, seeing how bad the situation is, refused all responsibility, and officially left the government. Now all the leaders of the emigration, in imitation of Mikolajczyk, are making tours of the United States where there are about 6,000,000 Polish-Americans, in order to gather funds and to offer their services to Washington. Some dream of a new national resistance against Russia, with a new Polish army, a new government, etc.

But in Poland itself, in spite of the hatred for Russia, there is a tremendous distrust of the Anglo-Americans. The Polish people hate Stalin and the yoke of imperialist Russia, but have no desire to ruin the country for the benefit of the American capitalists.

Consequently, all the offers being made by the Polish politicians, all the bartering of Polish blood in the capitalist markets of New York, and all the plans of anti-Russian resistance seem very premature. June 1949.

### 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 .....

### Next-A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party.

25 Cents for Single Copies Independent Socialist League  
20 Cents ea., bundles of 10-50 4 Court Square  
18 Cents ea., bundles over 50 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.: LRinsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 28

July 11, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper  
Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett  
Business Manager: Joseph Reas

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.

# RDR Conference Affirms Stand Against War Blocs —

(Continued from page 1)

"At all times, the RDR supports, arouses and develops all the forces which aim, on the basis of political democracy or by going beyond it, to lay the foundations of a genuine economic and social democracy. "It reaffirms once more the fundamental principle which marked its birth: there is no complete and genuine democracy without an economic and social revolution; no revolution, no socialism is any longer possible if the essential freedoms and the elementary dignity of man disappear."

#### AFTERMATH OF APRIL 30

The adoption of this resolution is especially significant in view of the situation that developed in the RDR following the demonstration of April 30 in Paris. Many of its militants, in the leadership and in the ranks, felt strongly that the opportunity which this large and representative demonstration afforded the RDR to give incisive expression to its political position, to its forthright independence from American and Stalinist imperialism, was not utilized as it could and should have been. This feeling was of course enhanced by the spontaneous revulsion against the flagrant apologies for American imperialism which were voiced by the American delegates, Sidney Hook, James Farrell and Doctor Compton.

In the very vehement discussion that ensued in the RDR, it even seemed for a while that the very future of the movement would be called into question. Some of those who criticized the shortcomings of the RDR delegation at the April 30 international conference allowed themselves to go to untenable extremes. Not only did they lose sight of the fact that the RDR had outstandingly distinguished itself in the political life of Europe by the fact that, small though it still is in numbers, it proved able to initiate a conference of such representative magnitude, but they proposed to resolve the critical situation in the RDR by proposals which would guarantee its speedy demise.

One line of thought would have resulted in "transforming" the RDR, in effect, into a political party. Such

a transformation, however radical in appearance, would surely result in grinding the RDR down to another ineffectual sect.

Just as dangerous, if not more so, was the trend of other proposals for "united fronts" with the Stalinist party here. They were supported by some militants who evidently have not yet freed themselves from the paralyzing mysticism which the Stalinists carefully cultivate, especially in France, and which is summed up in the argument that "After all, they do represent the working class of the country."

The failure to understand the full significance of what Stalinist totalitarianism represents, both here and in Russia, is still an outstanding characteristic even of anti-Stalinist currents in France, and this holds even for some of the militants of the RDR.

#### CRITICIZED LEADERSHIP'S ROLE

Fortunately, as the political resolution adopted by the conference shows, this tendency was vigorously resisted and, at least for the time being, overcome. The best militants of the RDR are becoming increasingly conscious of what Stalinism means in all its implications for the working class, and for the fight for democracy and socialism. The oppressive weight of ideological intimidation which formerly bore down on all political circles in France, especially in working-class circles, is diminishing and the resolution adopted by the RDR is another indication of this.

In another resolution, exceedingly brief and one that frankly represented a compromise between extremes, the conference expressed a restrained criticism of the part played by the RDR delegation in the April 30 demonstrations—that is, both the conference and the mass meeting that followed it—dwelling insistently on the importance of collaboration with those forces which are clearly independent of the two imperialist blocs.

In this connection, it is obvious that there is also a trend in some sections of the RDR, fortunately small, to moderate its opposition to American imperialism. These militants are, like all intelligent revolutionists, so-

cialists and democrats, resolutely opposed to any such "liberation" by Stalinism such as the crucified peoples of Eastern Europe have already undergone. They point to the perfectly obvious and incontestable fact that the fight for socialism and democracy is infinitely more facilitated under conditions of capitalist democracy, such as prevail generally in a country like the U. S., than under the conditions of totalitarian slavery that prevail in the countries ruled by Stalinism.

From this incontestable fact, however, they draw conclusions that are anything but incontestable. In general, these conclusions boil down to the idea that the political struggle against the "Americanization" of Europe, which means nowadays the establishment of Washington's economic, political and military hegemony over the western part of the continent—that this political struggle must be reduced to the point where most of the real fire is directed against Moscow. It is fortunate that the number of those militants in the RDR who lean in this direction is small.

It is evident to the vast majority of the RDR that just as socialism cannot be advanced by alliance with Stalinism or silence about the slave regime in Russia, it is impossible to combat Stalinism and win from it the workers under its domination—and consequently likewise impossible to make a serious advance in the struggle for socialism—by any alliance with, reliance upon or embellishment of the atomic-bomb imperialism which continues to hover over Europe like a pall.

In any case, the political resolution of the RDR conference has reiterated its independence from both international blocs. If this is a disappointment to the recent American visitors to Europe who sought to enlist the RDR under the flag of Washington, it is, in compensation, a source of encouragement to those who are working conscientiously for a movement that is genuinely independent of the two war camps, of the two imperialisms, of the two reactions, and who deeply believe that the rise of such a movement is the great hope and a great possibility of our time.

# Government by Injunction—

(Continued from page 1)

say that those labor leaders who indicated approval of plant seizure as a compromise for the hateful injunctions, were dangerously near adopting the same view as the politicians on the moot question of "national emergency strikes."

As to the present status of labor legislation, the consensus is that the 81st Congress has done its all in this field, and that T-H will continue on the statute books to become the No. 1 domestic issue in the 1950 congressional elections.

More than any other issue before the 81st Congress, T-H has been a direct bone of contention between capital and labor. The part played openly and directly by labor has been apparent to all. Not only was the political action of organized labor the main factor in returning Truman to the White House and giving him a Democratic Congress, but labor leaders have been publicly needling their Democratic "friends" to make good on campaign promises, especially on T-H.

The power behind the Republican-Dixiecrat bloc has not been so obvious, though it is generally known that the reactionary Congressional bloc has its "connections." Joseph Alsop in the New York Tribune of July 4 gives us something more concrete. About how Senator Taft rallied his support, Alsop wrote as follows: "He had to build roaring political fires under such senators as Caphart and Hendrickson of New Jersey. These men quite openly hankered to vote the other way; yet they yielded in the end to the BUSINESS LEADERS and Republican organization chieftains mobilized by Taft."

This major capital-versus-labor issue of T-H repeal will in 1950 again be taken to the ballot box, although in 1948 the voters decided it in favor of labor. Organized labor is going to put all it has behind the drive to defeat congressmen who voted against labor in this session. A. F. Whitney, president of the Railroad Trainmen—who smoked the pipe of peace with Truman even though this "champion of labor" had invoked the injunction provisions of the T-H Act against railway labor—the other day used some very angry words against Congress and then got down to the business of how to defeat Taft and the 32 Republicans and 17 Democrats who supported Taft.

Again, the July 4 issue of the CIO News issues a call to CIO members for all-out political action in 1950, urging them to register, to make their \$1 contributions to PAC. "Apparently," says the appeal, "the people's victory in 1948 was not decisive enough. We can and we will win in November 1950 by that overwhelming-

ing majority that will remove the obstructionists and will insure the complete enactment of the people's program." And Green of the AFL, proclaiming that labor "will never swallow the injunction," is girding the loins of the AFL League for Political Education for the 1950 fight.

On the opposite side of the T-H issue, Senator Taft, the standard-bearer of the reactionary congressional coalition, is starting to stump for re-election to Congress this summer—fourteen months before the 1950 election.

Who supplies Taft with the sinews of war? Again quoting Joseph Alsop in the July 4 New York Tribune, here's the answer: "While the Republicans sanctimoniously complain about 'outside labor money,' it is an open secret that right wing business men all over the country are already laying the cash on the line to aid the Taft campaign."

Thus are the battle lines drawn for the T-H fight in 1950. But there is something askew with these lines. For, while business properly chose Taft, a worthy capitalist politician, for its political leader, labor also chooses a capitalist politician, Truman, and a capitalist party, the Democratic Party, to represent labor's cause. And both Truman and his party have proved unworthy of labor's confidence. Truman, for instance has himself on seven different occasions made use of this very T-H Act against labor.

There is a very fundamental reason why labor cannot rely on capitalist politicians, especially not to repeal the T-H law. It must be remembered that the T-H Act was the congealing of the post-war efforts of business to clip labor's wings. All through the war, capital was uneasy about the important role of organized labor, even though plainly for the purpose of keeping the workers in tow to fight the war. So, after war there had to be a law, you remember, "to safeguard the interests of the worker against the union as well as against management."

The basic struggle between capital and labor that only socialism will end, here manifests itself. Capital fears and must fight a strong labor movement because a strong labor movement can get a greater share of the national income, leaving less for the capitalists. So the T-H Act was devised as a weapon of the capitalist class to weaken the labor movement.

This being the case, can the organized labor movement, can Whitney, Murray and Green, rely on Truman and the Democratic Party to repeal labor on this issue? Even though there are professed friends of labor in the Democratic Party, the ties between a capitalist party and the cap-

italist class are too deep and ramified for labor to trust it, to trust it on an issue which goes to the very heart of the hostility between capital and labor.

Must not labor, therefore, prepare for the 1950 contest by beginning NOW to form its own independent labor party?

## Mikunis —

(Continued from page 1)

(probably the overwhelming majority) whose Zionism and Jewish nationalism takes precedence over their loyalty to Stalinist Russia. After all is said and done, the Mapam is basically Zionist first and pro-Stalinist second.

Symptomatic of the process is the recent expulsion of 27 members from Zikim, a Hashomer Hatzair kibbutz (commune) in the Negev region of Israel. The 27, comrades in the commune and at the same time members of Mapam, declared themselves in favor of a Stalinist policy, and indicated that they no longer adhered to the Mapam. Whereupon a commune majority ejected them from the Kibbutz.

A special conference of Kibbutz Artzi (federation of Hashomer Hatzair communes) approved the expulsions, which aroused a furor in the Israeli labor movement because of its anti-democratic, monolithic implications. Here were a group of commune members who were thrown out from their homes, which they helped build, and from their means of livelihood because they had developed a political line contrary to the commune majority. The fact that the minority was in this instance composed of new and old (?) Stalinists does not negate this fact.

Ironically enough, PART of the rationale invoked by the Kibbutz Artzi to justify the expulsion of the 27 involved the monolithic concept of "ideological collectivism" ("collectivité rayonnante") which the Hashomer Hatzair derived indirectly from Stalinism. This concept stresses the necessity for ideological homogeneity in a commune and rejects the democratic idea that a commune should allow and encourage diverse political opinions among its inhabitants.

Despite the fact that Israeli public opinion is overwhelmingly antagonistic to the Israeli CP, there is good reason to believe that a majority opposes the expulsion of the 27 Stalinists from Zikim because of its inherent threat to democracy. They realize that the fight against Stalinism cannot be conducted with Stalinist totalitarian methods if democracy in the labor movement is to survive.

# YOUTH and Student CORNER

By JULIUS FALK, National Secretary SYL

This weeks column is by Don Morgan of the Chicago unit of the Socialist Youth League

### The U. of C.'s Politics Club

The history of the Politics Club at the University of Chicago is the account of the development of a new kind of student socialist organization.

It is necessary, first, to understand that its political and organizational evolution occurred, by and large, independently of any preconceived notions of what such a student organization should be. It grew more in accordance with the practical problems which were posed in the course of its development. At the time of its reorganization, in the autumn quarter of 1947, the membership of the Politics Club consisted of half a dozen students who considered themselves more or less a distinct political tendency—which they described as independent revolutionary socialism. At this time, the Politics Club was only one of several campus socialist clubs, each of which represented a rather well-defined programmatic viewpoint.

The course of the club's development in its first year, however, did not follow its original membership's intent. While the original members continued to play a leading role in its direction, the political basis of the club soon expanded to include far more than was initially covered. First a few unaffiliated radicals joined in order to make it their area of activity; then a number of socialists Zionists; and finally members of other organizations and groups. When the last school year ended, the club had grown in size and was already of a distinctly broad nature.

As a result of this greater variability the club undertook a correspondingly broadened program of education and activity. Whereas in the autumn quarter, its first meeting was addressed by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, by spring it was also sponsoring speakers such as Abba Lerner, a contributor to the Social-Democratic *New Leader*. In addition, its membership was sufficiently large to be able to contribute significantly to the forces engaged in the anti-discrimination strike against Goldblatt's department store.

The past year, beginning with the autumn quarter of 1948, has witnessed a continuation and extension of the trend described, but now the Politics Club consciously aimed to become the broad and all-inclusive socialist club on the campus, without regard to party affiliations or sympathies. A number of students with socialist convictions but of no distinct party ties joined for the purpose of better acquainting themselves with the different socialist tendencies, while at the same time participating in a movement of independent status.

The common political conceptions which are held today by the various members of the Politics Club, while not explicitly stated, probably do not extend beyond this: a belief in the desirability of socialism, a militant stand on civil liberties, opposition to the coming war, and the rejection of the imperialist policies of both Washington and Moscow.

### Developing a Broad Socialist Club

The result of this evolution has been the creation of what the Politics Club is today—a broad grouping of socialist students of all varieties of opinion who engage in common activities of a general socialist character, while at the same time putting forward their own particular viewpoint within and outside of the club. The advantages which have accrued to the club because of this character are easy to see; they have manifested themselves in practice.

From the standpoint of presenting socialist ideas to the campus, its larger and broader membership has enabled it to reach a larger and more sympathetic audience. This in turn enabled it to secure more and better speakers, lecturers, and writers. In terms of its own membership, on the other hand, the Politics Club, serving as an arena in which different conceptions could clash freely and openly, enabled many to develop and clarify their own position toward the basic problems of socialist theory and practice.

It should be mentioned, in passing, that it was possible to build this type of broad organization only by providing ample and adequate representation of all points of view in the club's programs and direction.

After considering what the Politics Club is and how it got that way, we can consider what has been accomplished in the two years of its existence. Its most important single project was the publication of the *Student Partisan* which has a larger circulation than any other student magazine on American campuses. Another large part of its activity consisted of sponsoring meetings at which it tried to present a socialist approach to current political problems. In the autumn quarter it presented Jerzy Gliksmann, author of the book *Tell the West* and former socialist councilman of Warsaw, who spoke of his experiences in Russian slave labor camps.

The winter quarter saw the Politics Club's campaign protesting the Allied treatment of Germany, climaxed by a large public meeting entitled "Germany—Our Responsibility" with a fund-raising drive on behalf of German socialists, the proceeds of which are distributed through Dwight Macdonald's relief service. In the spring quarter, the club's program included a symposium on the question "Labor and the Fair Deal," to which representatives of different points of view within the labor movement were invited. At the club's May Day party, another symposium, dealt with the question of "Perspectives of the Labor and Socialist Movements Today."

In addition, the club organized several discussion meetings for its own members on problems ranging from "Why the Russian Revolution Degenerated" to "What Should Be a Socialist Policy Toward Germany Today." One joint meeting with the United World Federalists discussed the Atlantic Pact.

### Radical Anti-Stalinist Force in Campus Life

While the Politics Club considered its main task to be socialist political education, it did not forgo opportunities to participate in campus life as a whole. The general conception which guided its activities was the aim to act as a radical anti-Stalinist force in the campus organizations in which it participated. It always tried to push forward progressive demands, while seeking to prevent domination of any group by the apparatus of the Communist Party.

For example, in a conference which had originally been sponsored by the Communist Club for the purpose of organizing a protest meeting on the indictment of the twelve CP leaders, the Politics Club put forward and had adopted the proposal to invite as a speaker the attorney of the eighteen Minneapolis Trotskyists convicted under the same Smith Act under which the CP leaders were being tried. This caused the Communist Club to withdraw from sponsoring the meeting which protested the indictment of its leaders!

The club's activities in the Student Government consisted of participating in the broad anti-Stalinist caucus which at the beginning of the year swept the CP forces out of power, and then, particularly through the Civil Liberties Committee, fighting for the "political" causes which the conservative forces in Student Government so hotly opposed. Politics Club members were part of the small majority in Student Government which endorsed the Caravan to Olivet College. (see winter issue, *Student Partisan*), fought and won support of UPW's campaign for union recognition from the University administration, and asked for open hearings on the YPA suspension, etc. It was also a part of the very small majority which defeated the proposal to send an exhibit to the IUS-sponsored exhibition to be held this summer in Budapest.

To the above list of activities which were carried on by the Politics Club, should be added—last but not least—the contacts which it established with other organized socialist student groups, and the efforts it made to prepare the way for founding a national student socialist federation. Through its magazine it became known to students in universities as far away as Melbourne, Australia, and the University of Berlin.

More immediately, by coming in contact with many of the now existing student groups in this country, it helped to popularize the idea of founding a national student socialist federation, to be composed of all campus organizations which advocate a socialist society and independence of the two imperialist powers, the United States and Russia. While a national federation has not yet come into existence, the recent founding of the New York Student Federation Against War is an indication that this larger project may be accomplished in the not too distant future.

### COMING IN LABOR ACTION:

Full report on the sessions and decisions of the United Automobile Workers' Convention—by special Labor Action Correspondents. Starts July 25.

## Analyzing the Forces at Work Seeking to Undermine Militancy of America's Greatest Union: Part 2

## UAW Proud Democratic Tradition Under Attack

By ABE MILLER

Last week we outlined the democratic tradition of the United Auto Workers (CIO) and discussed some of the forces nibbling at this tradition as represented by elements among the leadership. Before discussing some of the acts and procedures that have resulted from this, it would be useful to understand the solid basis for the UAW's democratic tradition that stems from its own history.

(1) The very founding of the UAW in the fight against Green and Gorman set a tradition of autonomy and freedom from bureaucratic control. This is important as compared with the way in which the textile and steel unions were formed, like Minerva from the head of Zeus, with a full-grown set of leaders from the start furnished by other unions.

(2) The robotlike character of auto construction technique and the attendant intense exploitation of the workers makes for sharp and violent fights between union and management on a large scale. Both factors lead to greater participation of the rank and file.

(3) Large plants mean large local unions. Their officials are men of power and standing both in their locals and in their communities. They do not jump at the command of the center. All factions court local union leaders with jobs, with support during strikes, and tolerate their criticisms and wildcat activities. Local union officers are loath to give up these prerogatives.

In contrast, the International Ladies Garment Workers, for example, composed of thousands of small shops, has no real need to cater to local officials. They bring the weight of their full bureaucracy to bear on local rebels. The shop chairlady of 75 or 100 workers has no feeling of power or stature. This tends to nullify the will to fight the bureaucracy in the ILG.

(4) The Homer Martin split of 1939 gave prominence to the right of local autonomy and the right to publish local union newspapers, and rein-

forced the earlier union traditions.

(5) Many victories and few defeats have given local unions a swagger and a feeling of independence from the center. The need for aid from the international in the matter of advice and counsel is not important in the day-to-day needs of locals. International representatives do not play an important role in the local union. The local union relies on its own people and its own strength.

Contrast the Textile Workers Union, where centralized direction significantly intrudes into the life of every joint board, with the possible exception of the few very large units. In textile, in many areas, the tradition that exists is not of victories but of defeats. It is hardly accidental that the textile union is not pressing for wage increases.

(6) The speedy growth of the UAW made it extremely difficult for the centralized leadership to assimilate local machines and individuals. For a really hardened bureaucracy to grow up, a long period is needed to eliminate and win over opposition. The teamsters and carpenters' unions, the miners and the ILG needed decades to complete this process.

(7) The large number of Negro workers in the industry makes education and democracy necessary in order that the more backward whites may recognize the rights of the Negro minority.

(8) The creation of the UAW was an act of the auto workers and not of other unions, whereas in the case of the Textile Workers Union the hand of its creator, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, hangs heavily over the organization. The same is true of the steel workers, where former mine workers' officials introduced the internal organizational practices of John L. Lewis.

(9) The presence of all shades of radicals made a struggle over democratic rights inevitable. At the very inception of the UAW, radicals poured into the union at the very center and into the factories in large numbers. No other large CIO union had this development. In other unions

(ILG, Amalgamated, Textile) ex-radicals, mostly former socialists, serve as mere technicians or handmaidens to the leadership.

The sapping of the UAW's democratic life is taking place in the face of all these forces.

We do not maintain that a planned conspiracy to deprive the UAW membership of its democratic rights is in full swing, but we do observe that acts and procedures alien to the traditions of the union are slowly pervading the organization from the top down.

The Michigan State CIO convention was heavily pressured by individuals clearly associated with the "Redhead" to decide in favor of holding its conventions once every two years instead of every year. This is the forerunner of a similar proposal for the national UAW convention. Periodically introduced by various leaderships, such proposals have been regularly defeated and were sharply opposed at the Michigan convention.

The conduct of Reuther, Mazy, McCosker and others during the Ford strike shocked even conservative backers of Reuther in the Ford local. They rejected his impartial-umpire approach and his obvious lack of enthusiasm for the strike—a fact known to everyone. Reuther's manner of settling the strike and his Pollyanna optimism about the results of his settlement caused many workers to wonder about his infallibility. His prestige was seriously dented.

Reuther and Mazy sold their followers a bill of goods to support individuals like Kerrigan, Matthews and others. Reuther has implied that some action would be taken against these Johnny-come-latelies; but up to the present time neither Mazy nor Reuther has encouraged anyone to move against them. The prevailing attitude is: "Sit still, you'll rock the boat; let's maintain the status quo." Everyone believes that Reuther will support the same directors.

The opposition to McCosker, Matthew and Lacey indicates that serious-minded workers in the union

are concerned about the business-trade-unionism that emanates from the regional offices. Bitterness has developed between Mazy and his own local, 212. The opposition to Matthews won half the delegates at Local 7.

On the West Coast, supporters of Reuther have themselves protested against the arbitrary actions of their regional director and object to Vice-President Livingston's support of O'Halloran.

The failure of the UAW leaders at the CIO national convention to present any type of critical view on any question has distressed not a few active workers on behalf of the UAW. The UAW did not always sit on its hands at CIO conventions. The UAW always prided itself on its own point of view as distinct from other unions in the CIO.

During the war the UAW disagreed with the national CIO on a number of questions. Today one hears the attitude "me too." UAW journalists and leaders boast of their adherence to CIO policy. It is well known that Murray has disagreed on the sliding scale of wages and other questions on which the UAW has taken a stand. But "we must demonstrate our orthodoxy and go along with the tide," say some of the leading spokesmen in the Reuther group.

The manner in which the fight was carried on around the proposed

forced fusion of the Farm Equipment Union with the UAW is another case where Livingston and Reuther were content to solve a question bureaucratically. By allowing the Stalinists and their allies in the FE to present the question as a forced merger (and so it was) the UAW lost, for the time being, the opportunity to bring the FE into the UAW.

We have already mentioned the Reuther cult. By official encouragement of this cult the UAW not only falls into the bad practice of trying to build up a blind following but also places obstacles in the way of independent and critical thinking. Of what use are proposals when Reuther has spoken the final word?

Reuther often tends to solve internal questions by exaggerating the problem of the Stalinists. Walter, who knows better, is using the weapon of red-baiting as a quick method of silencing genuine critics—and we mean some of his own supporters. This technique was used during the Ford strike, although Reuther knew that the strike was also supported by Tommy Thompson and others who are certainly not today in any way associated with the CP.

There are other important factors besides those mentioned earlier that make for opposition to a growing bureaucracy in the auto union. The

victory of the Reuther group over the Stalinized opposition came rather late. Whereas in most stratified unions the bureaucracy had years of good times in which to satisfy both the rank and file and the opportunists, Reuther assumes control at the tail end of prosperity and of a short-lived "Fair Deal." The "plums" needed to satisfy the appetite of important local officials for jobs and privileges in the international grow scarcer with the declining economy.

The corporations refuse to give Reuther and his leading associates the breathing spell they need in order to assimilate the opposition both in and outside of the Reuther group. Speedup, refusal by the corporations to accede to the Reuther pension plan, sharpening of the fight between the union and management—these things are bound to keep the union in an unstable condition. Layoffs are already troubling outlying locals of the UAW. In this uncertain atmosphere the conservative wing will find it difficult to carry on "unionism as usual."

The most important development of the 1949 UAW convention may be the crystallization of tendencies in the Reuther group into divisions more clearly recognizable by the delegates. While the conservative section of the Reuther group is much more clearly aware of what objec-

tives it pursues, the militants are uncertain. They cling to Reuther and Mazy, hoping that these men will live up to the promises that were implied in the struggle against the Addes-Thomas-Stalinist clique.

Unfortunately, the conservatives who are bucking the democratic tide are pushing Reuther and Mazy in their own direction. They do not cling—they demand and act. But the conservatives realize that they must go slow in their actions. They talk about changing society; they hurl defiance at the corporations even though they may not act that way. They are keenly aware of the fact that the rank and file want no departure from past democratic traditions. They still talk democracy.

There is still considerable reverence in the Reuther caucus for democracy in the UAW. Hundreds of leading secondary leaders in the UAW support the democratic ideas of the UAW. They have considerable power in the Reuther group. Organized, determined and willing, they can confine the existing bureaucratic tendencies to their proper proportions.

The UAW need not and, we believe, will not follow the bureaucratic path of the steel, textile and other CIO unions.

## AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF THE COLD WAR

## Perjury Is NOT the Real Issue in Bridges Case

This article is condensed from a broadcast delivered by news commentator Gordon Haskell over Station KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., on June 9. Mr. Haskell's commentary may be heard on KPFA, an FM station, every Thursday evening at 7:45.

By GORDON HASKELL

Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, was arraigned recently on a grand jury indictment which charges that he perjured himself when he was naturalized in 1945. The grand jury charges that at that time he falsely swore that he was not and had never been a member of the Communist Party.

Bridges has claimed that the government is persecuting him for political reasons and because of his position in the union. Attorney General Tom Clark denies this. Who's telling the truth? The history of the case, I think, shows this:

The politics that the government is persecuting in this case are the politics of the Communist Party of the United States, and beyond that, the politics of the cold war with Russia. Perjury, fraud—these are but the legal technicalities on which the real issue can be hung.

Ever since Harry Bridges rose to prominence in the longshore strike of 1934 his policies and those of the Communist Party have been indistinguishable.

This coincidence of views extends to ALL major questions of local, national and foreign affairs for 15 years. Bridges' policies have tacked and veered with the exceedingly variable Communist Party line. Similarly, the attitude of the government TOWARD Bridges has, over the years, undergone the same changes as its attitude toward the Communist Party as a whole.

GOVERNMENT FILES CHARGES

Let's take a look at the record.

In 1934 and '36 Bridges led the maritime strikes. These two strikes against a camarilla of diehard Republican shipowners and waterfront employers earned Bridges their bitter hatred. In 1934, charges of illegal entry into the United States were filed against Australian-born Bridges as part of the employers' anti-union strategy. In 1935 Republican representative Hamilton Fish introduced a resolution in Congress asking the secretary of labor to report what deportation action had been taken against Bridges.

But this embarrassed the Roosevelt administration, as it was intended to. For in 1935 Russia had been recognized. By 1936 the Communist Parties of France, Britain and the United States had dropped the class struggle like a hot potato, and were throwing their support behind any and all politicians who were for the hardest policy toward Germany and Italy and for an alliance with Russia. That meant support of Roosevelt in the United States. And Bridges was going right down the line, supporting Roosevelt and the general policies of his administration, especially after the president came out for "quarantining the aggressors" in 1938.

However, the Republican shipowners and their boys in Washington kept pressing for action. Hoover's FBI had been sniffing on Bridges' trail for years. The mere fact that Bridges had been a militant labor leader was enough to make Hoover

and his operatives suspicious of him. So finally in early summer of 1939, the Department of Labor yielded to Republican pressure, but chose Dean Landis of the Harvard Law School as examiner in a deportation hearing against Bridges. Landis was a man of known liberal social and political views. It was expected that he would give Bridges every benefit of the doubt, and he didn't disappoint those who chose him.

In this, he was aided mightily by the caliber of the witnesses produced by the diligent FBI. In only one other case that has come to my attention has the government paraded as more sordid, discredited, vicious and irresponsible group of witnesses. And that other case was the second Bridges deportation hearing, which we'll come to in a moment.

CP CHANGES LINE

But history played the government a dirty trick. Before the case was concluded, Bridges had turned from a friend of the administration into its violent enemy. For at the end of August 1939, Hitler and Stalin signed a pact and later jointly invaded Poland.

From that day, the Communist Party of the United States proclaimed Hitler as less of a warmonger than Roosevelt. As usual, Bridges went right down the line. His union led the "Yanks Are Not Coming Committee," a CP front for isolationist and anti-administration propaganda. In 1940 he supported Willie on the grounds that Willie was less likely to get us into the war than Roosevelt.

But Dean Landis couldn't change his way of thinking just to suit the political winds. He found that no evidence had been presented which proved Bridges a member of the CP. The government had to find another instrument to carry out the policy indicated by the new turn in foreign affairs.

On June 13, 1940, the House of Representatives approved a specific bill to deport Bridges. It never got past the Senate. On August 24, 1940, Hoover, always ready to oblige in such matters, submitted a report on Bridges recommending deportation. This time the government chose a trial examiner whose known social and political views would make it most likely that he would find against Bridges. Judge Sears of New York.

The second hearing started in February, 1941. Once more the government paraded an astounding group of witnesses. Murderers, professional labor spies, pathological anti-reds, men who admitted they were testifying as a result of FBI intimidation—in short, the scum of the waterfront and points inland. There was at least one exception. Harry Lundberg, secretary of the AFL Sailors Union of the Pacific, testified that to his knowledge Bridges had been a member of the Communist Party.

Finally, in September of 1941, Judge Sears did the job for which he had been chosen. He found against Bridges, and ordered his deportation.

HITLER ATTACKS RUSSIA

But, in the meantime, history had again played one of her little tricks on the government. In June, 1941, Hitler had attacked Russia. From that moment on, the Stalinists in America became the most fervent and enthusiastic supporters of every measure designed to get America into the war. In their propaganda the war suddenly changed from an imperial-

ist conflict to a people's war. Roosevelt changed overnight from a vicious warmonger to a great leader of the peace-loving peoples of the world.

And on the waterfront Bridges was, as usual, leading the pack. The Yanks Are Not Coming Committee disappeared without a trace. In short order his union became the fiercest proponent of the no-strike pledge, even to the extent of scabbing on fellow CIO workers at Montgomery Ward. Bridges' union went further in its wartime capitulation to the employers than almost any other. To cap it all, Bridges was willing to bind his union to a no-strike pledge to extend indefinitely after the war—all in the interest of the war effort.

Again the government was confronted with a most embarrassing situation. They had set out to deport Bridges when he was opposed to them. With Russia in the war, they could hope to find no more fervently pro-war leader to keep the longshoremen in check. They could hope to find no man better suited to quell dissatisfaction on the waterfront and to keep the workers from demanding their share of the golden stream the government was pouring into the pockets of the shipowners.

DEPORTATION PREVENTED

As luck would have it (or was it really luck?) an appeal by Bridges to the Immigration Appeals Board in Washington brought a quick reversal of Judge Sears' deportation order. It seemed that the day was saved for class peace on the waterfront for the duration.

But on May 28, 1942, Attorney General Francis Biddle rejected the finding of the Appeals Board, sustained Judge Sears and ordered Bridges deported. This definitely did not coincide with the best interests of the war government. Biddle had not sought the proper advice on the political consequences of his ruling. There was, however, another body in the land which took its political responsibilities more seriously.

On June 13, 1945, the Supreme Court ruled by 5 to 3 that Bridges had not been proved a Communist, and cancelled the deportation order. (This was the same Supreme Court which refused to review the conviction of 18 Trotskyists on charges of advocating overthrow of the government by force and violence. The Trotskyists, you see, maintained that even after the attack on Russia, American participation in the war was for imperialist objectives.)

The ruling of the Supreme Court seemed to end the matter once and for all. On September 17, 1945 Bridges became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

COLD WAR; NEW CHARGES

But the political struggles of which the Bridges case is only a small by-product went on. The wartime alliance of capitalist America and Stalinist Russia gave way to the struggle for world supremacy now known as the "cold war." The Communist Party again changed its line, in accord with the foreign interests of Stalin and Co., to one of opposition to the government's cold-war policies. And the government set out in earnest to break the Communist Party and particularly to break its influence in the labor movement.

So the FBI and the agents of the Immigration Service were put on Bridges' trail once more. This time, they have new allies. The tremendous pressure of the cold war, coupled

with a long-delayed awakening of the CIO to the role of the Stalinists in its midst, has led to the breaking away of one prominent supporter of Stalinist policy after another. The witnesses called before the Grand Jury are now no scrapings of the anti-union and criminal barrels.

Is the government case against Bridges justified?

Your answer to this question is likely to depend on your attitude toward civil liberties in the first place and toward the labor movement as a whole in the second.

The Stalinists in America are a political organization. Though I abhor their methods, their principles and their objectives, to suppress THEM means to deny civil liberties and democracy to a part of the American people. Also, it is hard to take seriously the government's righteous indignation against the Stalinists today, when they are opposed to its policies. For this same government was perfectly willing to countenance them and use them, and to make an alliance with their masters in the Kremlin when this was to its political advantage.

Isn't it the democratic prerogative of the members of the longshore union themselves to decide whether they want a president and other officers to follow the line of the Communist Party? I think the members of the ILWU are very wrong in electing Bridges and Schmidt and Robertson and all the other party liners to office. I know that Bridges and his friends have themselves tried to frame up opponents in their union, and have used all kinds of trickery to hold on to their power.

But Bridges was recently re-elected president of the ILWU by a majority of some 23,000 votes. Even his most determined opponents agree that this vote expressed the will of the membership. And as long as the membership wants Bridges, isn't it an invasion of their rights for the government to tell them they can't have him because his political views and activities are currently distasteful to the powers that be?

The labor movement, with all its defects and shortcomings, is the bulwark of democracy in America. In it no one has abused democracy and subverted it more than the Stalinists. Yet the labor movement cannot yield to the government its right to deal with the Stalinists in its own way.

For once it permits the government to rid it of the incubus of Stalinism by removing the Stalinists from office, either through legal prosecution or by other means, it thereby inevitably yields its right to choose freely and without government dictation who its officers shall be. That right, once yielded, will not be easily regained. That right, once yielded, will be a long step toward stripping the labor movement of its independence and making it a mere appendage of government.

So the strange case of Harry Bridges involves much more than a simple question of perjury or conspiracy. It is a tiny part of the cold war, and hence a small step in preparation for the shooting war. It is an assault on the political liberties of the Communist Party. It is an invasion of the right of 50,000 members of the ILWU to freely choose their leaders, however unwisely they may exercise that choice.

Those are the real issues in the Bridges case.

## Social Drama in Bolivia —

(Continued from page 1)

roel regime could not survive and fell apart under the weight of a popular revolution. But confronted in the recent past by a rightist government, and supported by the powerful Peronist influence, the defeated native Nazi party regained its influence and constituted itself the chief opposition force. Its strength lay mainly in the unions created by the defunct Villaroel regime as a prop to its rule.

In addition, the Stalinist party, the PIR (Party of the Revolutionary Left), the fighting vanguard against the Villaroel regime in the 1946 revolution, now has instructions to struggle against all the pro-American governments in accordance with the change in the international situation, and to support all the "anti-imperialist" movements in order to utilize the Indo-American proletariat as cannonfodder in Stalin's cold war against Washington.

The native proletariat is not aware of and does not understand the complex international situation. It struggles against the Bolivian pseudo-bourgeoisie, against the "Rosca" (as the right is known in Bolivia), against the Yankee "gringos," who personify imperialism in acting as the agents of the Patino mine enterprises. It understands very well that a majority of shareholders in Patino are American and that Bolivian tin is sold principally to the United States and Great Britain.

ARMED PUTSCH

After a brief first period of "workers' socialism," represented by the PSOB (Socialist Workers Party of Bolivia), the Bolivian working class fell under Stalinist influence and then came under the sway of the Nazi MNR. Now the miners and industrial unions are controlled by the Nazi clique, the railroad workers by the Stalinists. The working-class Left has been displaced by the petty bourgeoisie, anti-working class forces which exploit the proletariat for their own interests.

While the PSOB, exhausted by an internal crisis, remains isolated and incapable of mass activity, the POR (Revolutionary Workers Party), official section of the Fourth International, has become the left wing of native nationalism. The workers' movement, caught between two fires, that of the dominant pseudo-bourgeois opposition, spontaneously tends to move to the left of the petty-bourgeois opposition, acting as cannon fodder for Peronism and Stalinism.

During the elections this past May 1, the MNR rushed 200 to 300 armed men into the main plaza of La Paz to attack the government building, imitating the tactic of the popular revolution of 1946 against the Villaroel regime. But the armed struggle lacked both revolutionary intensity and popular support and was defeated.

Then the MNR decided to push the masses into a general strike in the same manner as the trade-union federation and the PIR had done in 1946. The PURS government (Socialist Republican Union Party), aware of the preparations and of the powerful Peronist support behind the MNR, decided to take energetic measures, that is, intervene in the traditional manner of the pseudo-bourgeois state as the gendarme.

According to reliable sources, this caused an internal crisis in the PURS and the temporary withdrawal of President Hertzog, who opposed a "strong" policy. The leaders of the Miners Federation, all members of the MNR, Lechin, Torres, Grover, with the exception of Lora and Vargas (the latter being affiliated with the POR), had prepared their combat groups to forestall the coming arrests by means of a general strike and the seizure of hostages from the mining companies' personnel. The government sent military detachments to the mines and besieged the headquarters of the miners' union, where the hostages were being held.

MINE WORKERS GO ON STRIKE

The mine workers found themselves caught between the two enemy fires, and in addition carried the brunt of the struggle between the pseudo-bourgeoisie and the Nazi petty bourgeoisie. The miners' strike extended to Catavi and to all the other mining centers, both because Lechin's clique had prepared for this and because of the workers' indignation over the Catavi massacre. The mine workers were followed by the factory workers, also controlled by the MNR.

The important working-class sectors of Oruro and La Paz, the drivers and printers, were opposed to the strike. The key was in the hands of the Stalinist PIR, which controlled the railroad and transport workers. Forgetting the Nazi past of the bosses of the Nazi-controlled unions and their ties with the MNR, forgetting their persecution by the Nazis and the attempt against the life of their leader, Jose A. Arze, the PIR chiefs sent the railroad workers on strike with the demand for the return of the "union leaders" and "respect for the workers' organizations."

The Nazi-Stalinist alliance was effected under the pressure of the South American Stalinist leadership against the interests of the Stalinist party itself, which would be the first victim of the MNR, in case of victory. A propaganda campaign that included the Stalinist circles of the CIO in the United States was launched in behalf of Lechin, depicting the notorious Nazi criminal as a simple trade-union leader.

In spite of this alliance, which represented a majority of the organized working class, the spontaneous resistance of the independently organ-

ized workers' sector defeated the masses "Nazi revolution." Both the drivers and the transport workers resisted the strike. The railroad workers limited themselves to a brief demonstration of solidarity, as did the factory workers. The MNR was once again defeated, leaving hundreds of dead and wounded workers on the field of battle. The assault on a Bolivian frontier garrison by an armed MNR group was the epilogue of a defeated putsch.

FALSE THEORIES AND DEFEATS

The proletariat was defeated not as a conscious socialist force but as an army under Nazi-Stalinist command. The independent socialist and trade-union sector did everything possible to save the working class from defeat, to preserve its forces for the authentic working-class and socialist struggle. Unfortunately, their organizational weakness could not prevent the tragic events. However, their attitude played a role in shaping the spontaneous resistance of the proletariat to the Nazi-Stalinist alliance. If this position had been supported by the POR, Bolivian section of the Fourth International, perhaps the defeat would have been prevented.

But the policy of the POR was determined as much by the false theory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Bolivia as by the false policy and the criminal alliance between Lora and Lechin. Lora, a POR deputy in Parliament, declared that the MNR plays a "reformist" role that is unconsciously "revolutionary," and that he considered it necessary to "push" the MNR by means of the POR and the unions toward the "democratic revolution."

The poor fellow did not realize that the POR had become the vanguard of the MNR, and he himself secretary and counselor of the Nazi boss, Lechin. By means of this tactic, the PORista, Lora, became a national deputy, thanks to Lechin and the blessings of the MNR. His service to the MNR culminated in the preparation of the "revolution" and the seizure of hostages, and led to the massacre of workers. His ambition was to become "general director" of the Patino mines, "nationalized" by the MNR.

Poor Lora, the "native Marxist," forgot that the democratic-bourgeois revolution was inherent in the war of independence carried out by Bolívar and San Martín; that one cannot reverse the wheels of history, and that the only social revolution in South America will be the workers' and socialist revolution, which will finish the delayed and unsolved problems of the democratic revolution.

The native proletariat pays with massacres for the errors and ambitions of its petty leaders. Perhaps this bloody disaster will serve as a lesson in the struggle for the socialist revolution.