



Navy Chiefs Charge Publicly U. S. Planning War by Terror And Mass Civilian Slaughter

**"No One in Washington Wants to Tell
The People," Says Correspondent**

The Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor paints a picture:

"Failing an accommodation with Russia, these are some of the things likely to happen as they are now dimly unbrated here:

"Congress will approve a 70-group air force.

"A 24-hour radar screen will be set up across the Arctic frontier and probably eventually around the nation.

"The big army-navy-air force expense load, which Mr. Truman kept to \$15,000,000,000 in this year's budget (an all-time peacetime high) will go out of sight.

"Appeals to take over the financial and economic commitments of European allies will have to be listened

to and in great part accepted. This may come anyway, but the movement will be irresistible if the arms race really takes hold.

"Taxes will soar.

"Social welfare expenditures will probably diminish. There will be less need for them since the state will be supporting the economy anyway with vast arms expenditures.

"The unemployment compensation would be reduced. Idle men can always be put to work making the enormously complicated atom bombs.

"In time if tension still mounts, there will be peacetime conscription.

"These are not pleasant prospects and nobody here has any strong desire to tell the public about them."

—R. L. Strout, in the Monitor, September 30.

From behind the squabble inside the armed forces over the allocation of appropriations, there emerged last Tuesday an important revelation concerning the type of warfare being planned by the United States for the looming Third World War.

In a public statement by Rear Admiral Ofstie, backed by "the major segment of responsible officers in the navy," the navy men disclosed (and argued against) the intention of the U. S. war chiefs to make the war a war of extermination and terror against civilian populations rather than against enemy armed forces.

While Ofstie and the admirals spoke in high moral terms, it is well known, of course, that they are letting the cat out of the bag only in the interests of defending a bigger cut in the arms money for their own branch. And while the same charge has been made before by others, this is the first time that it is made with such authority.

The navy brass were arguing, before the House Armed Services Committee, especially against the plan of Secretary of Defense Johnson and the Joint Chiefs of Staffs to allocate more than a billion dollars for the B-36 bomber, part of a perspective which (and this is the rub for the navy) de-emphasizes the role of sea power. Ofstie's statement sought to give navy opposition a political base by pointing out:

- Vital targets for the B-36 and A-bomb strategy includes practically everything "except for the active armed forces of an enemy." Most of those targets "are located where people live and work, in urban and industrial areas."
- "It is appropriate to suggest that sizable areas of friendly territory may well be occupied by the enemy to serve him as a future arsenal. Are we to atomize or otherwise destroy such urban and industrial areas, where friendly peoples outnumber the invaders in a ratio of perhaps 50 or 100 to one?"
- The official plan, said Ofstie, "unavoidably includes random mass slaughter of men, women and children in the enemy country."

Ofstie argued further:

"The Allied bombers in World War II did not initially intend to attack people or cities as the primary target. But because they were incapable of precision attack on selected military and industrial targets they resorted to area bombing of cities. The inherent inaccuracy of high-altitude bombing tends to direct it against large urban centers, especially when such bombing is conceived of as an independent effort and not as a component of an integrated military offensive directed against the hostile armed forces.

"I am sure that the moral force of the peoples of this country is in strong opposition to military methods so contrary to our fundamental ideals. It is time that strategic bombing be squarely faced in this light; that it be examined in relation to the decent opinions of mankind.

"Hunger, poverty and disease are the greatest enemies of our kind of civilization—and the greatest promoters of communism. The physical destruction achieved in Germany and Japan by strategic bombing in World War II has compounded the general misery brought on by the war. The bombing campaigns in both countries destroyed a major segment of the economic basis for post-war society. . . .

"A stable world economy may be impossible to achieve after another war if it is again attended by large-scale destruction of the homes and cities of the belligerent nations. . . .

"But if we mean the survival of the values, the principles and the traditions of human civilization, we must insure that our military techniques do not strip us of self-respect. . . .

"If we now consciously adopt a ruthless and barbaric policy toward other peoples, how can we prevent the breakdown of those standards of morality which have been a guiding force in this democracy since its in-

(Continued on page 4)

House Bill to Expand Social Security Was Won by Strikes

By EMANUEL GARRETT

The House last week passed the first major amendment to the old-age pension provisions of the social-security system since the latter's enactment in 1935.

HR 6000 extends coverage to some 11 million persons not previously included, and raises benefits by about 70 per cent. It further provides that employers and employees shall continue to pay one per cent until 1950, but on \$3600 of annual income instead of the previous \$3000; and that employer-employee contributions shall rise to 1½ per cent in 1950, 2 per cent in 1951, 2½ per cent in 1952, 3 per cent in 1953 and 3½ per cent in 1954.

It can hardly be said that even with the proposed increase in benefits the provisions are adequate. For example, under the raised benefit plan, a worker contributing for ten years and earning \$200 a month would receive \$94—a substantial increase over the \$51 he gets now but still far from what he needs to live. Nor can anything be said in favor of the employee contribution provision.

But we have no wish here to belittle the progress made by Congress; if it is inadequate, it is nevertheless welcome and long overdue, especially in its provisions for wider coverage. HR 6000 is progress. While the Senate is not expected to act on it this year, present indications are that it will do so at the next session—unless there are tremendous changes in the labor-capital picture.

Labor's Drive Got It

And here we come to the nub of the matter. Quite apart from its specific provisions, HR 6000 is mighty interesting. Fourteen years have passed without substantial amendment of the original law, which was passed during the depression period. Repeated demands and arguments for an improvement of the old-age pension system have gone unheeded. All of a sudden—boom!—the House passes the measure after what the New York Times described as an "undramatic" debate. Why?

The answer is clear enough: LABOR'S PENSION DRIVE.

It is as simple as that. We were preparing to give that as our interpretation, but in the days that have intervened before our publication date we have noticed that just about everyone—from as knowledgeable a capitalist source as the Times to as knowledgeable a union source as the UAW's Walter Reuther—has made essentially the same explanation.

Labor is determined to get pensions. Almost every major union has made it a plank in its immediate program. No matter what the arrogance of the employers may be, no matter how emboldened by the comforts of the Taft-Hartley Law, they realize that they cannot

withstand the pressure for long. Especially after the steel fact-finding board has held that steel workers are entitled to \$100 a month.

In the light of this it is easy to see why Congress, which had stalled for fourteen years, jumped to act now. Pensions are in the cards; therefore, take the pressure off industry by making it a government responsibility and by making it financed in part by the workers themselves.

The employers as a class recognize what is inevitable, and they would rather not have it come out of their pockets. Ford is a case in point. The Ford management is well pleased with its contract settlement with the union. It has agreed to pay pensions, with the stipulation that its contribution shall decrease as the government's increases. No wonder the Ford negotiators were given credit in management circles for being exceptionally wily! From management's point of view the Ford contract established the important contributory principle—that workers are obliged to contribute either directly or through the operation of the social-security system. And the cost to Ford will be inconsequential.

Let the Employers Pay for It!

All together, it is easy to see why Congress acted at this moment. Many people were undoubtedly benefited, but it is not a case of overflowing altruism.

The "undramatic" acceptance of HR 6000 sheds considerable light, also, on the impulses behind the steel industry's position. These have been set forth in last week's issue, and need not be repeated here. Where pensions are so obviously in the cards, and where the sum involved represents relatively small potatoes to such titans of profit as the big steel bosses, they cannot be the real stumbling block to negotiation of a contract. (Some small steel bosses, who make profits enough to be sure but who are still not in the big league, have not found the steel union's terms impossible.) Big Steel is not battling against pensions so much as it is battling against the union as an instrument of labor's offensive strength.

HR 6000 is progress, but progress in one sphere is no excuse for suspending it in others. Labor is entitled to pensions which are employer-financed and which are adequate for decent living. \$100 a month for an aged couple is preposterously low. It is better than nothing, but it is not enough to allow the worker who is discarded because of his age to live in comfortable retirement.

Industry owes its billions to the toils of labor. That is a simple ABC statement. It OWES the aged worker the promise of security.

From where we sit, therefore, employer-financed pension plans are still on the order of business—along with such other economic and social demands as labor has need of now.

Dewey's Fact-Finding Board Is a Maneuver for Bell Corp.

By MICHAEL FERRIS

BUFFALO, Oct. 8—This past week, the Bell Aircraft Corporation took the final step in its union-busting drive. The company has sent out a call to private employment agencies to send new workers out to Bell, where Local 501 of the United Auto Workers is on strike.

In addition, a letter was sent to workers who had at one time applied for a job at Bell, but who had been turned down, telling them that a job was now ready for them. Talking out of the other side of its mouth, the Bell Corporation hailed the appointment of a fact-finding board as a means of adjusting the strike to the benefit of both sides.

The fact-finding board was set up by Thomas Dewey, governor of New York, after both federal and state mediators were forced to admit that

they could do nothing to get the strike settled. Company representatives had repeatedly walked out of mediation sessions. Finally, they announced that they would never come back.

When the Bell Corporation terminated mediation sessions, it launched a physical attack with clubs and tear gas on Local 501. But the ranks did not buckle. Instead, 501 members, their wives, friends and sympathizers just got mad—and more determined to win.

The strength of the union and the possibility that despite complete control of the press, public opinion might see through the Bell Company tactics, caused Bell to seek the fact-finding board. Governor Dewey responded by appointing such a board composed of Dr. Samuel Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo; Dr. Ezra

Day, chancellor of Cornell University; Paul Shipman Andrews, dean of the Syracuse University Law School; Col. Charles Garside, New York attorney and trustee of the State University; and Mrs. Elinore Morehouse Herrick, personnel expert, one time DuPont executive, and former New York regional NLRB director.

LOOKING FOR SCABS

The Buffalo Evening News did all in its power to convince the public that Mrs. Herrick was at one time a "laborer in a paperbox and shoe factory" and therefore one who should "understand" the workers' problems. But it is plain to see that the board is hand-picked and carefully chosen by Dewey, who is certainly not noted for his partiality to labor. Two important questions must be asked and answered with respect to the fact-finding board: (1) Why does Bell want it? (2) Can an honorable settlement of the strike issues be achieved through it?

From the beginning of the strike, Bell management has called upon the man they consider to be their governor for aid in smashing Local 501. Bell asked Dewey for state police and state militia. Dewey was afraid to give them such open and unpopular aid. He gave them the fact-finding board.

It remains to be seen whether the board will operate on the company's terms. But Bell is not relying on it

(Continued on page 4)

France Faces New Wave of Strikes for Workers' Demands

By SAUL BERG

PARIS, Oct. 3—After a lengthy period of quiescence, since the disastrous defeat of the coal miners' strike a year ago, the signs once more point to an outbreak of strikes in France on a large scale.

The miners' strike, based on legitimate economic demands, was discredited by its Stalinist leadership which, for the sake of disrupting the French economy in obedience to orders from its Kremlin masters, rejected all possible compromises and even took the unprecedented step of abandoning the mine pumps which keep the mines from flooding.

As a result of the dense fog of pro-Russian propaganda that surrounded the conduct of the strike by the CGT (Stalinist-led federation of labor) and the obvious subordination of the workers' interests to considerations of Moscow's foreign policy, no really strong display of labor solidarity took place in the face of the use of troops by Interior Minister Jules Moch to break the strike. Nevertheless, the strikebreaking role of the "socialist" Moch and of his party colleagues in the cabinet—and Moch's speeches about "foreign agitators" in the plans, sounding for all the world like Hearst editorials—did nothing to turn the workers away from the Stalinists.

Left with this treacherous void, which only a militant socialist leadership could fill, between government "socialists" on the one hand and Stalinists on the other, the workers continued to drift out of all the unions

and to turn a cynical back on all the politicians of all the parties that had so often led them up a tree.

SP VEGETATES

The Socialist Party was, in a sense, almost content with such a situation. Its social base today consists of a considerable portion of the peasantry, of the civil service, and of the hangers-on of its thousands of municipal and district councilors. Its party "sections" are essentially Tammany clubs, only more sophisticated, with commemorative dinners for Jean Jaurès instead of Thomas Jefferson.

Their hope is that, if only the economic situation improves, maybe even the party's working-class following will return. Not as active militants (heaven forbid!) but, again like Tammany's supporters, as voting sheep to be led to the polls, to be used as pressure when the party negotiates its cabinet coalitions with its conservative partners in the government. Thus the fortunes of this woe-begone Socialist Party depend on the success of CAPITALISM in solving its problems.

(Continued on page 4)

The Civil Rights Picture — 1949 Truman Program Shelved, but Pressures Continue

By KATE LEONARD

No major civil-rights bill passed the 81st Congress.

Eastland of Mississippi—senatorial seniority, Bilbo ideology and all—is ensconced at the head of the civil-rights subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The South sees a recurrence of the rape charge. The "sovereign" states of Virginia and Florida prepare the legal lynching of the Martinsville seven and the Groveland three—who-are-left. The Klan, if not in the saddle, rides again.

The Dixiecrats are split between those in the Democratic Party and those on its fringe. The Republicans and the Dixiecrats are political bed-fellows. The Democrats seemingly are capable of nothing except to insist that their minds are on weightier matters than civil rights. Labor's leaders, with a still, small voice, whis-

per in their master's ear. Civil rights are filibustered off the agenda and President Truman finally admits this in public, as of October 3.

It doesn't make a pretty picture. But it would be wrong to assume that this picture is the sum total of the history of the civil-rights struggle. Some aspects of these problems need discussing.

Today—and we may date "today" from December, 1947, when the report of the president's committee ("To Secure These Rights") saw the light of day—has been called the time "when the American people think, read and talk about civil rights more than they ever have since the Civil War and Reconstruction." The flood of newsprint, books, commentary and even movies out of Hollywood only testifies to the truth of this. This Niagara demonstrates the vitality of

the issue, and it can only grow.

It was not the labor movement that advanced the civil-rights program. Better if it had been! American labor would be a head taller now had it been capable of addressing to the nation this elementary democratic proclamation in its own name. To say this is not water under the bridge, but relevant to understanding the present and future fortunes of this issue. The civil-rights impasse is directly linked to the fact that the labor movement is not yet grown up. Politically speaking, it still thinks it has to ask the president if it can stay out late at night.

BEHIND THE PROGRAM

The program was advanced, through its representative in a high governmental place, President Truman, by

(Continued on page 2)

Army Invades Washington Schools With 'Cadet Corps' Military Program

The following was published as an editorial in Labor, the weekly of the railroad brotherhoods, October 1:

What happens when military men invade the people's schools is illustrated by recent developments in Washington.

The capital's high schools have a "cadet corps," provided with army officers and equipment. This "cadet training" is supposed to strengthen "national defense." Actually, the training is all "front," laughable to anyone who knows anything about war.

The "cadets" spend long hours in "close order drill," and once a year compete on the parade ground, to show which high school has the "best-drilled company." That's just about the whole "military training" program.

Yet the program is supposed to be compulsory, and the "cadets" have to

buy their own \$40 uniforms unless they are excused by the school authorities.

Despite this "peacetime conscription" of schoolboys, the enrollment in the "cadet corps" has fallen off since the war from 1,005 to 700, and the army is "putting the heat on" the Washington schools.

Lieut.-Col. William E. Barkham, who has a soft job as "head of the department of military science" in the capital school system, brazenly charged the high school principals and athletic coaches with "interfering with his military program." Still more impudently, he criticized the "organization" of the Washington schools, which is certainly none of his business.

When militarism gets its "camel's nose in the tent" of education, one of two things must happen. Either the camel will be kicked out, or it will move in and occupy the whole tent, crowding out the educators.

Civil Rights Picture, 1949 - -

(Continued from page 1)

a section of the bourgeoisie. In advancing it, Truman did not have the united support of his own class, any more than Roosevelt had when he rescued the same class with the New Deal lifeline. In proposing it, Truman exercised one of the traditional functions of the "executive committee of the ruling class."

In advancing it, bluntly stated reasons were given in the report of the president's committee: Is national unity desirable from the standpoint of the ruling class in the impending war with Russia? And more particularly, what can that section of the bourgeoisie which "regrets the loss of the Southern market" do except to hold up Truman's arms while it waits for a mandate from the "people"?

The "international" reason was not stated as boldly as "We look foul in the eyes of the world," but it was stated thus: "We cannot escape the fact that our civil rights has been an issue in world politics. The USA is not so strong, the final triumph of the democratic ideal is not so inevitable that we can ignore what the world thinks of us or of our record." This reason with variations continued to be duplicated again and again in speeches and writings.

W. W. Waymack, late of the Atomic Energy Commission, said upon the occasion of accepting the chairman-

Love That Guy!

"General Francisco Franco, Spanish rebel leader, telegraphed Fuehrer Adolf Hitler, heartfelt congratulations on assuming supreme command of the German army and hoping that the move will contribute to strengthening the ties between Spain and your great country." Hitler replied: "Thanks for the kind wishes and reciprocating with best wishes for the welfare of Nationalist Spain."—United Press release, February 7, 1938.

Representative James J. Murphy, Democrat, N. Y., had a 40-minute conversation with Generalissimo Franco today and was deeply impressed. Said Murphy afterward, "I was very favorably impressed by General Franco. He is a very, very lovely and lovable character."—Associated Press release, September 30, 1949.

ship of the National Citizens Council on Civil Rights: "There are pressures within our country—a national awareness of what's right, along with what's necessary. There is also a set of external pressures. They have to do with America's new role in the world situation—the power we have and the responsibility that goes with it. If we're to succeed we have to put our house in order."

Mrs. Roosevelt said, speaking in the South without benefit of office: "The most important thing we have to realize in the U. S. today is that we are the spearhead in the fight between democracy and communism." Barkley today (not Lincoln) put it: "Civilization cannot endure half free and half slave."

This "international" motivation is more, not less, compulsive two years after it was first formulated, if only because "our record" remains an open book. It is more compulsive if only because atom bombs are democratic in the same way that bacteria are broadminded.

The "international" reason was stated in this way: "One of the principal problems facing us and the rest of the world is achieving maximum production and continuing prosperity. The loss of a huge, potential market for goods is a direct result of the economic discrimination which is practiced against many of our minority groups. . . . As a result their purchasing power is curtailed and markets are reduced. Reduced markets result in reduced production. While the dream of "continuing prosperity" is a fool's paradise, the proposal to raise the Southern standard of living to, or nearer to, the Northern level makes good sense from the point of view of the capitalist economic needs today."

WHY THE SIST KILLED IT

Civil rights is not a humanitarian flight of fancy, or just a vote-catching device. Civil rights is a part of Truman's economic program. That civil rights are a part of Truman's economic program is a fundamental reason why the program cannot be scrapped for long by those who injected it into the political scene.

But scrap it they did in this 81st Congress. The bourgeois press has shown some comprehension of the situation in its comments on the situation—comprehension at least of the meaning and the weight of bureau-

cracy on a big scale in a big country. Government by the two-party system, legislation by administration, administration expanded to the point of qualitative change, a jealous and a sectional Congress, all these have operated to the hilt in the 81st Congress.

The bald fact is that the 1948 elections did not return a Congress committed to the civil rights program. Congress is well aware that if Truman succeeded in the last election only with a mandate from the people, there is a distinction between his position and theirs. Within the Democratic Party it is asked and answered: Does the party program (and it is civil rights and Taft-Hartley repeal they mean) apply to the party as a whole? Administration Democrats denied the mandate on T-H by conceding in advance an unwritten injunction power for the president. The Dixiecrats can ask this question even with a certain justice, for if their party is in power by the people's vote, they themselves are not. Considerations of this type are enhanced in this Congress which emerged out of an election which resulted in no clear majority for labor's program.

LABOR LAY DOWN

An equally fundamental factor in the present status of the civil rights legislation is that these proposals are only a part of the Democratic program. This is what is behind the excuses about weightier matters, and this is the base of the bipartisan "must" legislation.

Not only are civil rights only a part of the Truman program. On civil rights the issue is not yet joined. If this is obvious for the South, it is equally true at the national level. Had labor had its own party it could have hastened the joining of the issue. But labor's endorsement of the civil-rights program at the national level is akin to its fight for Taft-Hartley repeal. It follows, and projects into the future, the "reward your friends and punish your enemies" policy, while in practice going along with Democratic strategy.

The situation in 1949—and to all indications in 1950—is analogous in a way to the situation at the time of the Civil War. It is basically the same in place—the South—but with differences in time and in degree. Slavery in its day checked the expansion of the economy. Today the depressed land of Jim Crow can only hinder the economy. In circumstances when the growing industrial capitalist class was checked, emancipation was not the program of the young Republican Party, and it be-

came its program only in the third year of the war, a war which in its first two years gave every evidence of going the wrong way. Emancipation came when it was recognized—late but still recognized—that it was necessary to the winning of the war.

The situation today differs from this. A more rapid expansion is not yet of vital urgency. It is rather projected—in Truman's phrase: "The national economy must continue to expand." Added to this is the fact that the nation is not now engaged, or about to engage, in the Third World War. It is in the stage of cold preparation. These conditions, as well as the political dependence of labor, place the joining of the issue in the future.

GAINS CAN BE MADE

The indications are that the coming Congressional elections in 1950 and the presidential election of 1952 will again be fought on this issue. 1950 will be the sounding board, and it is far from ruled out that with labor following its present course, which coincides with the Democratic Party strategy, some gains can be made.

It is POSSIBLE that the 1950 Congress will pass a national FEPC bill, the legislation which civil rights groups have agreed to give priority, or an anti-poll-tax bill. The latter has the advantage that it would swell the vote in the South and thereby forecast the return of the two-party system to the South.

These measures or other legislation are possibilities. The criticism of the policy of labor's leaders is not that

this could not happen under the policy outlined, but is to be made precisely on the ground that they see no further than this. They believe that they know what political pressure means, but demonstrate that they do not have the ability or the desire to grasp the meaning of independent pressure. And pressure upon them from their own ranks is not crystallized and will not be crystallized in 1950. This means that what happens in the civil rights field will happen at Truman's speed.

There are two places to look for advances in the civil rights field. The first of these places is within the labor movement. To see this clearly involves a recognition of such events as the Rubber Workers' adoption at their last convention of an FEPC of their own, labor's support for the state FEPCs which have been enacted in the last period, and an analysis of the political activity of the trade unions in the South, where the "non-partisan" policy is less at variance with the requirements of the political scene for the same reasons that the Negro in the South establishes his right to vote within the Democratic Party, or in local election on a non-party basis.

The second place, contrary to popular opinion, is in the South. Suffice it now to say that it is a Dixie which is in transition. Vardaman, an earlier Bilbo, was not speaking for the 20th century when he laid down his arrogant edict: "As it is in Mississippi, so will it be in all the states ultimately." The movement proceeds in the other direction.

UE Westinghouse Local in Philly Backs Pro-CP Slate by Close Vote

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 6.—At the monthly meeting here on October 2, the delegates to District 1 Council, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (CIO) re-elected a pro-UE administration slate to the council office by a narrow margin. The average margin was 20 votes out of about 373 cast.

But for the office of secretary, Charles Dorsey defeated Harry Block, a leader of the Opposition Caucus, by the infinitesimal margin of two-sevenths of one vote. Because of dues arrears the three votes of Local 109 were not opened or counted. These three were probably cast for Block.

The Carey caucus entered a "Keep the UE in the CIO" slate, nominating Clarence Felker, a chief steward from Westinghouse Local 107, for president and Harry Block for secretary. The placing of Felker on the slate in opposition to Price was a move to involve Local 107 pro-CIO forces in the contest that has been going on in the district for the last several years between the UE administration and opposition forces. This move, while failing to swing any appreciable number of the Westinghouse local's large bloc of votes to the pro-CIO slate, did sharpen the division of opinion in Local 107 on the UE split issue.

The administration group also adjusted its slate to attract as wide a following as possible by limiting the number of known Stalinist spokesmen. The incumbent secretary, Tom Delahney, was withdrawn in favor of Dorsey. Delahney would probably have lost to Harry Block. However, the chief Stalinist spokesman, Dave Davis, business agent for Local 155, was the choice for one of the trustee posts.

Jack Sablich, in making the report on the results for the Election Committee, announced that the votes from Local 109 had not been opened because the local had paid no dues since July, thereby placing itself in bad standing, in accordance with constitutional provisions. The Carey caucus announced it would challenge this decision on the ground that it was inconsistent to distribute ballots to Local 109 and then refuse to count them.

A resolution submitted by James B. Carey of Local 101 in support of the steel strike, praising Murray's effort in behalf of the steel workers, was refused recognition on procedural grounds. (Resolutions must first be sent to the Resolutions Committee.) However, the Stalinists then hastened to introduce a brief motion in support of the steel strike and voted to donate \$100 to the Steel Workers Union strike fund.

S. F. BAY AREA NOTES

East Bay AFL Declares War on Raiding by Beck, Teamster Czar

By ARLENE WILLIAMS

SAN FRANCISCO, October 9.—A declaration of war was issued in the East Bay Area this past week by Einar Mohn, acting for his boss Dave Beck of the Teamsters' Union, against the Retail Clerks Union and ultimately against the whole AFL in the area.

Members of Food Clerks Local 870 in Alameda County and of 1179 in Contra Costa County struck all the major chain and independent grocers in the area for a \$2.50 weekly increase and their picket lines remained firm and unbroken with success virtually guaranteed. Several independent stores broke with the employers' association and signed with the Clerks and some of the weaker chains were starting to conduct individual negotiations. Then the first gun was fired by the Teamsters in line with their master plan of raiding any and all vulnerable unions in the area for the purpose of perpetuating and extending the iron-fist control of Dave Beck, West Coast boss of that outfit.

Beck's outfit announced: "Teamsters Union has jurisdiction over all stock handling in the food stores and will insist that the stores remain in operation to prevent the laying off of our men. Employees now out of work will be urged to return to their jobs under the jurisdiction of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and any vacancy in jobs under the Teamsters jurisdiction will be manned by the local AFL Warehousemen's Union and Local Retail Service Union [Teamster affiliates]." Thus the Teamsters paved the way for breaking the strike and for signing a back-door agreement with the bosses at a lower wage scale than already prevails in the industry. They proceeded to man three of the struck stores with their own men and evidently thought they had the situation well in hand.

PREPARE FOR ALL-OUT FIGHT

However, what they did not count on was the unanimous solidarity of the whole AFL in the area with the just fight being conducted by the Clerks. In violation of a national constitutional regulation, the Alameda Central Labor Council and all local union executive boards affiliated to that body and the Building Trades Council voted to a man to stand firm in their support of the Clerks against management and the Teamsters.

At a mass meeting on October 3, they adopted a series of motions which in turn vehemently condemned the role of the Teamster leadership, declaring their actions to be "strike-breaking and union-busting"; gave their full and unequivocal support to the "finish" to the Clerks; established a Coordinating Committee to be at the constant call of the Clerks for aid and support; and appealed to individual members of the Teamsters' Union to rebel against this move by their leadership that was made without their consultation or consent.

During the discussion at this meeting, it was recalled that in previous years the Teamsters had made sim-

ilar attempts to raid in the area as well as to break the back of the general strike conducted less than three years ago.

The body finally went on record stating that should the Teamsters not desist in their efforts to break the Clerks' strike, October 15 would be set as the deadline when all deliveries by teamsters in both counties would be branded as "hot"—which would mean that all affiliated locals would not handle any merchandise delivered by teamsters. As was correctly pointed out by CLC Secretary Robert Ash and other speakers, the step would ultimately lead to a creeping paralysis in the East Bay business community and eventually a general strike would result.

As a result of the adamant stand taken by the Central Labor Council, several independent stores broke with the employers' association and signed contracts granting a \$2 weekly wage increase. The Hagstrom stores, one of the larger chains, finally broke the united stand of the remaining group and also signed a similar contract on the 7th of October.

That was the signal for all-out open warfare by the Teamsters. In retaliation, the Teamsters' Union refuses to deliver any goods to any stores signing with the Clerks' Union. This policy was instituted October 8.

GREEN BACKS BECK

The local union movement's appeal to William Green and Daniel Tobin to intervene and order the Teamsters to desist from their "scab-herding" campaign met with a vitriolic reply from Green to the effect that the CLC would have its charter revoked unless they took a "hands off" attitude in the fight between the Teamsters and the Clerks!

So far, the CLC has not backtracked an inch on their original position despite Green's threats; but it is possible that some of the weaker locals might lose heart and pull out. If Green accomplishes this maneuver, he will have only a few of the more militant unions isolated and ready for reprisal action. The leadership of these unions, though politically they are down-the-line LPE'ers, are nevertheless a militant group who learned the lessons of their first general strike and in their own words "enter this struggle with the background of experience gained three years ago."

At this point, it is impossible to predict exactly what the outcome of this situation will be. This is the first time that any really serious threat to combat the growing strength of Beck and his bureaucracy on the Coast has occurred. If the labor movement remains unified and aggressive, as it has been up to this point, it stands a good chance of ridding the area of Beck and Beckism for the coming period. If they submit to the pressure of Green, Tobin & Co. to adopt a "hands off" policy, the whole labor movement will be subjected to the vicious policies of raiding, back-door agreements and the goon-squad tactics of the Beck regime.

Four Freedoms for America!

FREEDOM FROM:
 1 - LYNCHING
 2 - INDUSTRIAL DISCRIMINATION
 3 - POLL TAXES
 4 - JIM CROWISM



Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

A London Letter Reports on the Debate on Devaluation in the British House of Commons

To the Editor:
A body of about twenty people called the British cabinet has decided to devalue the British pound sterling. This took place, as have many important decisions, during a holiday recess.

They did not call Parliament, in true democratic style, before their decision to see whether they would agree. Instead they presented the country with an accomplished fact. And when Parliament was eventually called, on the demand of the opposition, the debate was not on the merits and demerits of devaluation, but on a motion of confidence in the twenty men who had carried it out.

Opening the debate, Cripps explained the sorry plight in which Britain finds itself and tried to explain why he had devalued the pound. He then assured the workers that the devaluation will not raise the cost of living by more than one point before the end of the year—a beautiful evasion of the truth by "St." Stafford Cripps.

As a last-minute gesture to the workers, Cripps increased the tax on distributed profits from 25 to 30 per cent and brandished a warning finger against those wicked capitalists who are not complying with his request to restrict their dividends. And as a final sop to those middle-class voters who love to chatter about Whitehall costliness, he promised to cut down governmental expenditure—how much that will save of our dollar imports is problematic.

After the two opening speeches and one or two by lesser fry, the Churchill-Bevan tussle added a bit of light relief. To both of them the impending election was more important than

the subject under discussion, and devaluation was ignored.

NOT ON DEVALUATION

Churchill took the opportunity for a full-blooded harangue against the Labor government which, he alleged, had brought us to our present hazardous position, in spite of the generous gifts given to us by the members of the commonwealth.

Bevan jumped to the defense of the Labor government and in what was undoubtedly a brilliant oration defended it admirably against the Churchill attack; Bevan got the better of the duel—but he didn't talk about devaluation. He proved with a masterful array of figures that the Labor government was a better administrator of British capitalism than the Tories. He stated that the Labor government had inherited a bankrupt nation and was pulling it out of a nasty mess.

"We inherited in 1945 that situation. We managed by the last half of 1948, for the first time since 1935, to show a favorable balance of 30,000,000 pounds. In other words, this nation, as described by Mr. Churchill, had devoted itself with such industry, persistence and skill to the task of national recovery that we had more than made up for the consequences of the war.

"We had already brought the nation back to a more favorable situation than it was in 1935. Taking the whole of 1948, if we had been enjoying the same terms of trade as the Conservative government had enjoyed in 1937, we would have had an over-all surplus and we were doing that at the same time as we were providing our people with full employment.

"Those two facts of themselves, without any supports, constitute a complete rebuttal of all the flutulent generalities of yesterday's speeches."

He then went on to quote the figures of the increase of British productivity compared with other countries of Europe in which, apart from Sweden and Denmark, Britain was in the lead, and the extent to which Britain had increased dollar exports and reduced dollar imports.

The record of the Labor government was incomparably better than that of the Tories after World War I.

"Mr. Churchill gave us his inspiring leadership from 1920 to 1926. They had had only one war. We had the result of two wars. What was the result? Of all the nations of Europe, Great Britain, proud Great Britain, was at the bottom of the league. Every nation in Europe had increased its production better than Great Britain—except Poland. She had a war on."

Although Mr. Bevan never spoke about devaluation in the devaluation debate, his speech was received with rapturous delight by Labor members and when he had finished Cripps and Attlee patted him on the back.

After this, the debate did not again reach histrionic heights.

"REBELS" LINE UP

Lytleton began by reminding Bevan of his socialist past when he (Bevan) had written:

"By some twist of the Tory mind it is good trade to persuade someone in a remote part of the world to buy our goods, but wrong to allow the same goods to be consumed by our own people. We are told by some peo-

ple who ought to know better that we shall have to increase our exports after the war by some 50 per cent."

One or two suggestions for getting over Britain's difficulties were put forward. Eden suggested a concerted trade policy by Britain, Western Europe and the Commonwealth—a suggestion which had already been put forward at Strasbourg. On the Labor side, Albu suggested a further subsidy on bread and the pruning of high salaries; Mikardo that defense expenses should be pruned; Ellis Smith pointed to the inequalities between the workers and the inhabitants of the Dorchester, Savoy and Grosvenor, and demanded that the next budget be a radical people's budget and include a capital levy.

But although some dissatisfaction with devaluation was expressed on the Labor side, the whole affair was admirably stage-managed to prevent this dissatisfaction becoming manifest. Instead of a straight debate on devaluation, the debate was on a motion of confidence in the government.

Although some Labor MPs may have opposed devaluation, they had, as Maxton said on a previous occasion, a thousand good reasons a year for not opposing the government. The expulsion of the "independents" and the nearness of the election are bound to make these thousand good reasons extremely important in their calculations.

By this confidence-motion trick, by a three-line whip and ably assisted by "left-winger" Bevan, Cripps got a solid Labor vote in support of devaluation. All the Labor "rebels"—with the exception of Tom Braddock—dutifully entered the government lobby.

As a result of devaluation and the devaluation debate, the date of the election has become problematic. Previously it seemed certain that the Labor government would finish its term of office, but repeated demands for an early election by supporters of both parties make an early election seem possible.

EARLY ELECTION?

An early election is demanded by some trade unionists in order to know whether they will have to work devaluation under a Tory or a Labor government. The Tories are demanding an early election because they believe they can cash in on the discontent with devaluation, and make capital out of the present sorry state of the British economy.

As for the Labor Party itself, an early election would probably be better than a later one. Cripps has stated that the rise in the cost of living before the end of the year will be only slight. Next year, however, when the indirect effects of devaluation on the cost of living begin to be felt, there will be an increasing struggle between the Labor government and the workers, and the government may lose working-class support, perhaps to the Stalinists.

It therefore seems possible that an election will take place this year. The only thing which will postpone it is the desire of the government to finish its term of office, and also to fight the election on the issue of the House of Lords and the steel bill—their biggest electioneering stunt and an issue on which they will be fighting on more favorable ground.

London Ken EATON

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 of Labor Action, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1949.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the state and county aforesaid, personally appeared Max Shachtman, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is one of the owners of Labor Action and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semi-weekly or tri-weekly newspaper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are: Publisher, Max Shachtman; Editor, Hal Draper; Managing Editor, none; business manager, Joseph Roan, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

2. That the owners are: Labor Action Publishing Co., Emanuel Garrett Geltman, Max Shachtman, Albert Gates, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is 4,578.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of September, 1949.

ABE. WASSERBERGER, Notary Public, N. Y. Co. C.R. No. 41-4164400. My commission expires March 30, 1951.

WARREN'S "CLASSES"

PROF. DESCRIBES SOCIETY
A LA CHOLLY KNICKERBOCKER

By HAL DRAPER

Are there classes in America? It used to be fashionable for respectable sociologists to meet this question with a vigorous denial, accompanied by an equally vigorous denunciation of Marxism for "importing" the concept from Europe to these shores. In Europe, they told us, there is a class stratification as a hangover from older times. When an English workman tips his hat to a toff and says "Sir" to a clean collar (and that is no doubt getting outdated also), you have evidence of the existence of classes. When an American taxi driver says: "OK, bud, climb in," to a top hat, you have evidence of the democratic non-class society which blesses these shores.

The denunciation of Marxism is still with us, but the denial of class stratification has shifted from indignant rejection to harmless reinterpretation. The leading American sociologist who, with a group of associates, has been carrying on research on the question of the class structure of American society has recently published the results of his work over a score of years or so, and Life magazine has given it a spread complete with real-life photos of class specimens. The professor is W. Lloyd Warner, his book is "Social Class in America," and his results are—a cutting commentary on bourgeois sociological theory.

The reader would, of course, be perfectly right in assuming that this comment is "prejudiced"—that is, we confess to approaching Warner's thesis with a previously held view on the subject—but even so, this is not incompatible with some expectation of enlightenment. There is no Marxist principle which says that a group of serious scholars who have spent nearly 20 years on a research project cannot come up with interesting and even valuable contributions just because they do not operate on the basis of the Marxist view. On the contrary; we do not know whether Professor Robert Lynd considers himself a Marxist in any sense, or so considered himself when he produced "Middletown," but there can be no doubt that from anyone's point of view that study of an American community was an exceedingly important contribution to the subject.

To a Trivial Question, Trivial Answers

The reason is of importance for estimating Warner's work. The Lynds' book was significant, to Marxists among others, not necessarily because it gave answers palatable to them, but because it asked the relevant questions. Warner apparently began his project with a question which doomed his researches to triviality from the beginning.

His project was to classify strata of society on the basis of their individual behavior patterns as seen through a number of selected factors such as: What part of town does the subject live in? What clubs does he belong to? Is his home an expensive new one or a family heirloom? Are his wife's dinner parties reported on the first or second page of the local newspaper's "society" section? etc. Even income is only one factor of many like the above. Source of income is also one of the factors but on a basis best described as "snobism." In fact, Warner's factors can be—every one of them—reduced to a single content: Who can afford to be snobbish to whom, and on what grounds?

On this basis—the order of snobbery—Warner distinguishes six classes. The names of these classes might just as well be: A, B, C, D, E, F, but they are in fact: lower-lower, upper-lower, lower-middle, upper-middle, lower-upper, and upper-upper. It is immediately apparent that, even from Warner's point of view, the number of classes and their differentiating criteria are purely arbitrary. By shifting the index cards around a bit, a division into four classes, or eight, or—well, pick a number from one to twenty—would be not only equally possible but equally meaningful and equally legitimate to carry Warner's results.

Warner, then, has not distinguished classes at all; he has merely reported on the existence of the same hierarchical setup which is the subject matter of the "society editor." It may sound nasty to say that his work is of more interest to Cholly Knickerbocker than to serious students of society, but the sad fact is that it is perfectly accurate.

The hierarchy is certainly there—and has been described by novelists long before Warner, though not as pedantically—but what do you do with it after it is all neatly classified? What does it explain?

What relation does it have to interpreting the dynamics of society? Will a member of the "upper middle" class (who is a skilled tool-and-die worker) and a member of the same "class" who is a grocery store tend to have the same attitudes and tend toward the same actions with regard to Taft-Hartley, Truman, free enterprise, racial democracy, or a score of other dynamic problems of the day?

Warner's original sin is his attempt to view class stratification solely in terms of superficial indices of behavior. The Marxist view takes, as the basis of class differences, the position in the economic structure, the relation to the ownership of the means of production and role in the process of production: the class of those who have to sell their labor power to make a living, and the class of those who live by owning and by exploiting the labor of others; these as the two most fundamental classes of capitalist society, other class groups being distinguishable on the same basis but not of the same fundamental importance.

Marxism and Class Attitudes

A reviewer in the New Republic, Professor Lipset, who takes Warner's book apart with some ease, takes care, however, to sideswipe Marxism also. His criticism of Warner, he writes—

"does not indicate that a theory of 'objective' class structure based solely on position in the economic structure will suffice by itself. Marxist sociology, which assumes an eventual clear-cut relationship between economic class position and behavior, has not proved adequate. The social status of many wage-workers, notably the white-collar workers and technicians, leads many of them to acquire attitudes similar to those of the controlling economic groups."

It is always amazing to us—perhaps because of remnants of naiveté—how sincere and undoubtedly otherwise conscientious scholars permit themselves to toss off dicta on Marxism on the basis of what is evidently a nodding acquaintance. As long as the dictum is unfavorable, there is, it seems, little chance that one's professional reputation may be hurt by a display of sheer ignorance . . .

Marxism "assumes" no "eventual clear-cut relationship between economic class position and behavior," if, as Lipset's further remark indicates, this means a one-to-one correspondence between class position and attitudes. Its proposition is merely this: that of the many factors determining attitudes at any particular time, the most weighty and the decisive one is class position—over the development of a period of time and for the mass of people in the given class. It is not a means of predicting a given individual's reaction but of describing the motive force for social trends. It is not a means, taken by itself, of accounting for all aspects of the thinking of a class group at any stage in its development but of accounting for the direction of development to be expected.

As such, even in America where class-consciousness has been long retarded by countervailing forces often analyzed by Marxists, the direction of developing class attitudes has been so clear that little to-do need be made about it here.

Lipset's concrete evidence for the "inadequacy" of Marxism is also based on a second confession of ignorance. According to Marxism, the class position of the "white-collar workers and technicians" is not the same as that of the industrial production worker—precisely his class position in the most "objective" and scientific sense. If the remark could be made without seeming too offensive, we would say that Professor Lipset is really not acquainted with the ABC of the view he criticizes in passing.

A Joint Statement by Three Socialist Tendencies in the U. S. - -

Stalinism Is Not Socialism!

LABOR ACTION herewith publishes the complete text of a statement on Stalinism which was drawn up for the signature of all organizations in the United States which, while opposing the Stalinist regime in Russia, proclaim their adherence to socialism.

The statement was originally submitted for the official signature of the Independent Socialist League, the Social-Democratic Federation, the Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Workers Party and the World Socialist Party. As may be seen from the statement, it was designed to emphasize the opposition of all socialist groups in this country to any claim that Stalinism makes to represent socialism, its ideals and its principles, without in any way concealing the fact that the signing organizations differ among themselves on numerous other questions which the statement is not intended to deal with.

The Independent Socialist League made it clear that it prefers to sign the statement together with all the other organizations. Unfortunately this proved to be impossible.

The Socialist Labor Party declined to sign the statement with the others on the ground that it does not acknowledge the claim of any organization except itself to the program of socialism, even though it took no particular exception to the validity of the statement as drafted. The Socialist Workers Party refused to sign it, either, although it will probably be very prudent about defending its decision in public. It did not take any exception to the characterization of Stalinism or to any of the specific terms in the statement. Still it refused to sign because the statement did not call for an uncompromising struggle against capitalism. It also objected because Social Democrats were among those invited to sign. The Social Democratic Federation also declined to sign its name officially to the statement. Its secretary, August Claessens, consented to the use of his signature in a personal capacity. The Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Party agreed to sign the statement officially.

No further comment on the statement is necessary, for the present.—Ed.

Preamble

The ultimate objective of socialists of all schools represented in the United States of America is the abolition of man's exploitation by man. The means to this end advocated by the several groups vary so widely that they cannot be reconciled; yet, with the single exception of the Communist Party, no American party, group or school which advocates socialism can see in the means by which the ruling coterie in the Soviet Union pretends to have implemented socialism, or in the results achieved, anything but a consistent and thoroughly cynical betrayal of traditional socialist ideals.

Besides their agreement upon socialism's ultimate objective, American socialists are also in complete agreement upon one other thesis, which is that Stalinism is not socialism. They therefore resent in common the more and more frequent assertion by the Kremlin's agencies in the United States and elsewhere that their mission is to "teach socialism."

Before going further it must be made clear that some of the groups in the United States which seek to abolish man's exploitation by man, by one means or another, are as hostile to capitalism, and hence to the American political institutions which are inextricably associated with the capitalist economy, and hence to the extension of American economic influence abroad, or capitalist imperialism, as they are to Stalinism. They steadfastly refuse to take sides in what they consider a conflict between evils.

These views are always presented as reservations, by several anti-capitalistic groups in their declarations of hostility to the pseudo-socialism of the Kremlin and such of its agencies as the American Communist Party. Their position is briefly stated here so as to make it unmistakably clear that they do not join in an indictment of Stalinism in the interest of capitalism or of capitalistic imperialism. With this reservation, those groups in the United States which strive towards socialism's ultimate objective by their several means and which endorse this statement agree that Stalinism is not socialism for the following reasons, among many others:

1. A totalitarian despotism is not consistent with socialism.

In the Stalin Constitution of 1936, the USSR is described as "a socialist state of workers and peasants." Workers, peasants and the state are certainly there; and the machinery set up certainly functions. But that machinery works to express the will of the most highly centralized, least responsible, least humane despotism that ever tyrannized a great human community.

2. Gross inequality in living standards and privileges is not consistent with socialism.

In no country on earth is there such a wide range of living standards and privileges, from slave laborer, through peasants, unskilled labor, skilled labor, bureaucrats, intellectuals and the commissariat, up to the ruling gang, as exists in Soviet Russia. At the end of only a few decades, educational and employment privileges for the children of the privileged give promise of a hereditary caste system.

3. The arbitrary administration of justice by the police is peculiarly repugnant to all socialists because of their historic conflict with the policing of ideas.

In Soviet Russia the thief, arsonist or murderer may have his day in court. The suspected political dissident is investigated, arrested, investigated again by torture, indicted, tried, sentenced, and the sentence executed by the police.

4. Judicial murder, through show trials and purges, for purely political purposes, have made forever false and shameful Stalin's claim to be a champion of socialist ideals.

The methods employed in Russia in the late '30s to clear Stalin's bloody path to power, and more recently employed in the satellite states to liquidate honest opposition to Stalinism, are not to be explained as foul means to a good end. They are means for the foul liquidation of the ideals of socialism.

5. The enslavement and exploitation of industrial labor in the Soviet Union, under a fantastic system of speedup, wage differentials, police control of the worker's choice of employment, with slave labor for the dissident, is the boldest possible repudiation of the basic elements of socialism.

Whatever one socialist group or another thinks that the function of unionism should be under established socialism, none has ever contemplated the preservation of the union as an instrument of state exploitation of the worker, which is the major function in the Soviet Union today.

6. The Russian peasant is today bound to the land in a condition of closely policed and harshly ex-

ploited state serfdom, which was never contemplated by any teacher of socialism.

Upon the question of whether or not the land should be nationalized and farming collectivized, American socialists differ. They differ not at all, however, in their feeling that mass liquidations, mass deportations to slave camps, and man-made famines, leading to state serfdom, are not implementations of socialist ideals, but a singularly savage form of the exploitation of man by man.

7. For many decades in many lands socialists have fought for freedom of expression; but never has any tyranny, political or ecclesiastical, so completely blanketed non-conformist expression through espionage and terror, or so completely quarantined a great mass of humanity against world news and trends of thought elsewhere, as has the Stalin dictatorship in what it has the effrontery to describe as "the land of socialism."

8. There is now a mass of evidence available to prove that slave labor, made up largely of political dissidents, according to arbitrary police standards, from which there is no possible appeal, under barbarous and debasing conditions, using up millions of "expensibles" at minimum cost, has become an essential feature in the Soviet Union's economic planning.

Stalinism this certainly is; socialism it certainly is not.

9. The utterly cynical Stalinist effort to follow upon the Kremlin's use of the subservient Russian Orthodox Church as an instrument of policy by setting up state churches in the satellites, supported and patronized by the agencies of a frankly atheistic dictatorship, as new mediums for the extension of Stalin's will, is abominable in the sight of all socialists, irrespective of their attitude towards religion or clericalism.

There has never been a school of socialism that has not championed freedom of religion and conscience. All American socialist groups insist upon the separation of church and state. There is, therefore, none that can take note with anything but loathing of these recent Stalinist aspirations to establish in the Kremlin a kind of godless Soviet Russian foreign policy in support of world papacy, using all complacent priesthoods as subsidized agents of tyranny.

10. Socialism is as staunchly opposed to the conquest and exploitation, by whatever means, of race by race, nation by nation, or state by state, as it is to the exploitation of man by man.

Socialism and imperialism are irreconcilable. Soviet Russian foreign policy in support of world revolution once enjoyed the support of many socialist groups in all countries and the sympathetic interest of many others. But the extension of Stalinist imperialism to neighboring peoples and their conversion into police states is viewed with horror by all American socialists.

Finally, it must be said with emphasis that, for these several reasons, no group of socialists in the United States collaborate with Stalinists politically or believes that such collaboration anywhere can possibly serve the socialist cause or do socialism credit.

Endorsed through independent official action by:
The Socialist Party, Harry Fleischman, national secretary, signing;
The Independent Socialist League, Max Shachtman, national chairman, signing;
August Claessens, secretary of the Social Democratic Federation.

SPARKS in the NEWS

Good Indian?

In September, the U. S. Senate approved a bill to authorize the erection of a memorial to Gandhi in the nation's capital.

In Another Part of the Forest, the government is sending to jail Larry Gara, other followers of Gandhi in this country, and conscientious objectors whose crime is that of acting on Gandhi's teachings.

Apparently another version of: The only good Indian is a dead 'un.

Too Many Dummies

The members of the American Contract Bridge League have voted 7 to 5 to ban Negroes from their organization.

There is an unsubstantiated rumor that they also protested the use of black (and red) for printing decks of cards.

'Blood and Guts' Hook

"I speak in the first person only for purposes of expository emphasis. Give me a hundred million dollars and a thousand dedicated people, and I will guarantee to generate such a wave of democratic unrest among the masses—yes, even among the soldiers—of Stalin's own empire, that all of his problems for a long time to come will be internal. I can find the people . . ."

Sidney Hook, in Winter 1949 issue of *Politics*, page 36. (Italics in original.)

"Sidney Hook had a rough summer. His well ran dry at his South Wardsboro, Vt., summerplace, so he had to lug water from miles away. By the way, the NYU philosopher has a .22 rifle range on his farm and practices regularly."
("Heard on the Left" in the *New Leader*, October 1, 1949.)

With Bated Breath

"In our trade union policy and practice, the time has come to say that unofficial strikes must be outlawed. Union discipline must be enforced against those who promote, organize and lead unofficial strikes" . . . Sir William Lawther, veteran British Mine Union leader, told his organization during a recent meeting in London.—Dispatch from England in the *Reading Labor Advocate*, September 30.

The *Advocate*, which is the Socialist Party organ in Reading, goes on to report that Lawther gave the existence of a Labor government in office as a basic reason for outlawing "unofficial" strikes.

We are waiting for Norman Thomas or the SP, who so often claim that Lenin's Russia suppressed the right to strike and that "Stalinism flows from Leninism," to express their horror and indignation at the line of their friends in the leadership of the British Labor Party. But then—we also waited for them to say something about Atlee's use of troops to break the London dock workers' strike. . . .

A Brief Essay On Capitalism

"Cornelius La Roy, 39-year-old Lansing, Mich., machinist, was held for mental observation today because he gave away \$15,000 to 'some poor people I thought needed it.' . . . 'I just wanted to help some poor people,' he apologized. He said he had no family and thought he could do with his money as he pleased.—N. Y. Herald Tribune, September 30 (UP) from Washington, D. C.

Austerity

"Who has made money out of devaluation? Pretty nearly everyone on the Stock Exchange has made some profit."—London Evening Standard, September 19.

This and That

Michael Straight, editor of the *New Republic*, and now an ex-Stalinoid, has made his peace with the Democratic Party and Truman. Forced writer of a piece on Tammany to rewrite it three times, taking the guts out before it was printed. . . . The reactionary "Catholic World" says that "The Life of Leon Trotsky" is being prepared for publication by one of its writers. Anybody is allowed to guess that it will be the most scholarly job since Lizzy Dilling's "The Red Network." . . . Burt Cochran of the Socialist Workers Party has been working out a review of the Howe-Widick book "The UAW and Walter Reuther" for the past month and a half; and the ribbing he's been taking from friends and acquaintances isn't keeping him happy. . . . Sales of the pro-Stalinist *Daily Compass* of New York are at a new low. Same for the *Daily Worker*. . . . David Brown, a high-powered publicity man for the reactionary American Medical Association, has resigned his job with a hot letter to his boss protesting that the AMA's propaganda against health insurance is too crooked for his stomach. He agrees with the AMA's position on the question but won't peddle their lies.

New York ISL Fall Festival and Dance

Featuring Rex Clayton and his Jumping Jive Band

First N. Y. Performance by Leon Del Monte

"Debate between Thomas Norman and Shack Maxman"

FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 4
CARAVAN HALL, 110 East 59 Street, N.Y.C.
Admission \$1.25

Just arrived!

No. 3 (September-October Issue)

CONFRONTATION INTERNATIONALE

Revue Internationale de Discussion

Valeurs, Chances et Perspectives du Syndicalisme Ouvrier

Pierre Monatte: Destin du Syndicalisme

Paul Barton: Les Syndicats Tchécoslovaques sous la Démocratie Populaire

Z.: Les Syndicats en URSS

Juan Andrade: L'Intervention des Syndicats dans la Révolution Espagnole

Et Ben Hall, Farri-Bravo, Farhat Hached, C. François, etc.

Léon Trotsky sur Jean Jaurès

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE Single copy: 50 cents
4 COURT SQUARE 1-year sub (6 issues): \$2.50
LONG ISLAND CITY 1, N. Y.

More Reviews Praise Howe-Widick

"Anyone," writes Aldric Revell in the October issue of *The Progressive*, "who has had to labor through pedestrian expositions on labor unions . . . will welcome this exciting, swift-moving and well-documented story of one of America's most vital unions." He is referring, as LABOR ACTION readers might guess, to *The UAW and Walter Reuther* by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick, the new labor book which has received enthusiastic reviews throughout the country.

"With keen insight as well as excellent reportorial sense, the authors tell the story of the birthpangs of the UAW . . . The hero of the book is not so much Reuther—although his personality is brilliantly portrayed—but the UAW itself. . . . The authors, fortunately, do not seek to make this a eulogy of Reuther. . . . This book is successful because it presents a bio-personality of a union plus a candid-camera picture of its leaders which altogether results in something refreshing and vital even though it raises a number of questions about the future."

Indicative of the wide variety of notices *The UAW and Walter Reuther* has received is a review in *The Michigan Catholic* by Father George Higgins, who says: "This is an important book—almost indispensable, in fact, for anyone who wants to understand . . . Reuther."

"Like it or not, Reuther and the UAW are a force to be reckoned with in American society. We ourselves happen to like it, but even those who don't will profit from reading what a couple of discerning commentators have to say about it—not all of which, by any means, is particularly flattering to Reuther. . . ."

The bulk of the *Michigan Catholic* review is then devoted to a polemic against the book's criticism of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists which, the reviewer claims, is more radical than Howe and Widick say it is. The *South Bend (Ind.) Tribune* finds the book "a truly interesting and, in many ways, exceptionally informative study. It is, for the most part, devoid of even a trace of academic dullness, but in their efforts to achieve maximum readability the authors have not resorted to the use of 'color' to a distracting extent. . . . This really is an important book."

The *Tennessean* of Nashville, Tenn., finds the book an "intensely sympathetic study."
The UAW and Walter Reuther, which was published by Random House, can be obtained from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE, \$3.00.

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.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 42

October 17, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper

Editorial Board: Hal Draper,

Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett

Business Manager: Joseph Ross

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, 1879.

Mao Tze-tung Gives Russia a Hand in the UN—

China Stalinists Set Up a New State

By JACK BRAD
The assembly convened by the Chinese Communist Party has proclaimed a new state from the capital at Peiping.

Kong has taken over much of the trade formerly passing through Shanghai, which is under blockade. More than ever, Hong Kong is the entrepot and key port.

set up as an "autonomous area" with more connections to Russia than to China. For a long time the Russians have intrigued for a special position in Sinkiang.

These vast territories of almost one and three quarter million square miles and forty-five million people form a great arc from Tibet in Central Asia to the Japan Sea.

The manner in which a new state is established is usually a good indicator of its character. There is no attempt to obscure the domination of the Communist Party.

ism," whereby "the minority submit(s) itself to the decision passed by the majority," has been written into state law.

It should be noted that one of the chief accusations against Chiang Kai-shek was his claim for the monopoly rule of the Kuomintang during "a period of tutelage."

lected non-representative leaders of the peasantry, small landlords and petty bourgeoisie.

It may be objected that this is much too definitive a characterization for what exists in China today. Surely this state and the Russian state are not identical?

But these are differences of degree only. With the political power they have captured, the direction of the state is unmistakable.

Farmers Prosperous? 80 Per Cent Are in the Same Boat with Labor

By MIKE STEVENS

What farmers are they talking about? The newspapers have been writing in detail during the past few years about the terrific prosperity of the farmers of America.

The above may be a bit hard to swallow after the propaganda of the last few years, but here are some figures from the U. S. Census of Agriculture:

There are 5,851,581 farmers in this country. In terms of farm income, the farms can be divided into three groups—upper, middle and lower.

The middle group, representing 28 per cent of the farms, are just a little better off. The average farm income of each of these is only \$1,629.

The upper group, representing the remaining 33 per cent of the farms, have an annual farm income of \$2,500 and up. No breakdown is given of figures in the upper group to indicate how many farms are in the \$2,500 class and how many in the graduated scale "up."

The fact is that the working farmers in this country are in the same boat as the workers. Some of the farmers may not know it, and some of the workers may not be aware of it, but their problems are not far apart.

France Faces --

(Continued from page 1)

in the last year, while wages have remained fixed.

As a result, the end of the vacation period saw the opening of a big campaign by all the unions for a raise for all workers and for a return to free collective bargaining between unions and employers.

CABINET OR SOCIAL CRISIS?

Under such circumstances the announcement of devaluation came as a great shock. Emergency meetings of the bureaus of all the unions took place. Interviews with the socialist minister of labor, Daniel Mayer, followed.

But in any case, even these demands were too much for the other parties in the government. The result was similar to that of all previous government crises.

The last phrase is the joker, since only the day before, the finance minister had stated that he considered it to apply only to those receiving less than the legal minimum wage.

As for restoration of collective bargaining, it is promised within "several months," but is to be accompanied by provisions for arbitration, as yet unspecified.

The fighting capacity of the unions is seriously handicapped by their lack of unity. In France today there exist no less than five trade-union federations, plus many unaffiliated unions. The Stalinist CGT and the Catholic-led CFTC (there is now a strong left wing in the latter) united in demanding a raise in the minimum wage from 12,000 to 18,000 francs a month.

no less than five trade-union federations, plus many unaffiliated unions. The Stalinist CGT and the Catholic-led CFTC (there is now a strong left wing in the latter) united in demanding a raise in the minimum wage from 12,000 to 18,000 francs a month.

The reformist Force Ouvriere refused to go along with this program, advocating merely a bonus for all workers and a genuine effort at price reduction. Finally, the more radical non-Stalinist union movement, the Autonomous Federation, based especially on some 20,000 metal worker members in the Paris region, demanded a 19,000-franc minimum with a sliding scale.

Even in the force Ouvriere, however, a left wing has rapidly developed among the lower leaders, and the top leadership felt compelled to attack the Mayer proposals as inadequate.

All indications, therefore, point to a struggle by the unions and a resurgence of activity of the workers. The non-Stalinist left wing is strong, but it is dispersed in the various federations. Under the banner of unity of action in every shop and in every craft, they will have an unparalleled opportunity to lay the basis for uniting all the non-Stalinist unions under a militant leadership.

Quality of Mercy

"Henry Lustig, former president of New York's Longchamps restaurant chain, has been paroled after serving 22 months in a federal penitentiary for evading \$2,870,000 in taxes."—UP release, September 7.

After all, he isn't a hardened criminal, like people who steal pennies from cash registers.

God, Inc.

The September issue of the NAM's magazine Trends devotes its lead to R. G. LeTourneau, machinery company magnate, who says that "God runs my business" and is usually referred to as "God's partner."

This is the same man once exposed by the railroad unions' paper, Labor, as one of the country's labor-hating employers. His Peoria firm "tried to break nearly every effort of workers to organize and improve their sweatshop wage scales."

Following swiftly on the announcement, Russia recognized the CP regime, renouncing its treaty with the almost defunct Nationalists.

In speculations over these events most observers had agreed that the new state would be officially announced either at the fall of Canton, last toehold of the Nationalists on the continent, or on October 10, the so-called "double tenth" anniversary day of the 1911 Revolution which inaugurated the modern political era in China.

MARKED AT BIRTH
It is apparent now that the pronouncement was made to coincide with the opening days of the United Nations General Assembly with the object of strengthening the hand of Russian diplomacy.

With it they will not only be able to make extensive propaganda as defenders of an Asiatic people but will try to challenge Anglo-American control of the council by demanding replacement of the discredited Nationalists by the new government.

South Korea has been reduced to a helplessly surrounded island which can be overrun at will. Japan can be little more than a new Bataan and there are strong movements among all classes to reach an agreement on at least a modus vivendi with the Russians.

STALIN OVER ASIA
These developments explain the hysterical cries for help from the reactionaries in power in South Korea, from the Philippines and from Chiang Kai-shek in their pressure for a Pacific Pact.

Already the cautious wait-and-see of the White Paper is outdated, since the time for decision has arrived. Anglo-American discussions have been taking place for weeks without solution of the differences.

QUESTION OF RECOGNITION
In many ways the British have gained by the CP victories, replacing the U. S. as an exporter to China. Hong

It is difficult to see on what basis recognition can be put off indefinitely. It would be incredible for London alone to take the step. The most likely formula at this time appears to be de-facto recognition which would establish all the requisite conditions for trade but withhold de-jure recognition until after the UN session at least or longer.

In the larger framework of the international balance of power the problems are only becoming apparent and new ones will arise. The U. S. has been outflanked in the entire North Pacific, for example. With Manchuria under the Russian thumb, with connections to the industrial complex of Mukden and Changchun, and with rail, air and road connections to Siberia secure, the Russian bases in Dairen and Port Arthur are substantial fortresses.

South Korea has been reduced to a helplessly surrounded island which can be overrun at will. Japan can be little more than a new Bataan and there are strong movements among all classes to reach an agreement on at least a modus vivendi with the Russians.

STALIN OVER ASIA
These developments explain the hysterical cries for help from the reactionaries in power in South Korea, from the Philippines and from Chiang Kai-shek in their pressure for a Pacific Pact.

Already the cautious wait-and-see of the White Paper is outdated, since the time for decision has arrived. Anglo-American discussions have been taking place for weeks without solution of the differences.

QUESTION OF RECOGNITION
In many ways the British have gained by the CP victories, replacing the U. S. as an exporter to China. Hong

War by Terror --

(Continued from page 1)

ception? The concept of indiscriminate bombing attacks on nonmilitary targets undermines these accepted standards and if it is initiated may destroy them."

The picture, painted—we emphasize—by men among the highest VIPs in the armed services, albeit for their own group purposes, clearly underlines what so many of the people of Europe and so few of the people of this country understand:

per-means of mass slaughter, CAN-NOT save the world for civilization, democracy, the "American way of life," or any other shibboleth or fair-seeming aim such as justifies liberals, socialists or labor in looking upon it as a means of "stopping Stalinism."

Win or lose for Western imperialism, it can only help to speed up the forces of disintegration in the decaying capitalism of today making for an extension of the despair, disorientation and unoriented misery upon which Stalinism feeds.

If Secretary Johnson is afraid that the inquiry will "do grave damage to our national security," it is because the disclosures of the navy big shots can only make the Western European peoples more determined than ever to avoid being used as the cannon fodder and bombing grounds in the war between Russian and American imperialism.

There is no doubt that the Russian despotism of Stalin, within its means, is oriented in the same direction as Washington's war chiefs: a war of terror and destruction. More than ever, for the plain peoples of the world, to stop both the barbarism of Stalinism and the barbarism of capitalist decay, the fight for an independent socialist mobilization against both imperialist camps is the only way out, looking toward the reorganization of our world under socialist democracies independent of both the Kremlin and Washington.

For information about the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE Write to the ISL 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

(Continued from page 1)

to settle the strike. Bell intends to use the fact finding board hearings as a public cover, while it tries to settle the issue with Local 501 on a more practical basis.

While its lawyers will be presenting briefs to the board, Bell management will be scouring the countryside for scab workers. While the company declares to the public that it is waiting for the fact-finding decision, it is actually attempting to build up its working force with newly hired workers.

CAN BELL PULL IT OFF?
Bell trapped the union in the mediation sessions. The union welcomed the mediators. The union announced publicly its full willingness to work with the mediators, to hold up any actions until the mediators could function.

WHAT KIND OF STATE?
The PCC, far from being a democratically determined congress empowered to establish a new government, has more of the characteristics of a fabricated junta. What kind of state did it set up? Mao Tze-tung said: "The present Chinese People's PCC represents the people throughout the country. Therefore it exercises the powers of a national people's congress."

This plenary session of the PCC is given full powers of "framing and amending the organizational statute of the central people's government." This plenum elects a national council, which will be the actual state, exercising both legislative and executive functions.

Bell Fact-Finding Board --

(Continued from page 1)

to settle the strike. Bell intends to use the fact finding board hearings as a public cover, while it tries to settle the issue with Local 501 on a more practical basis.

While its lawyers will be presenting briefs to the board, Bell management will be scouring the countryside for scab workers. While the company declares to the public that it is waiting for the fact-finding decision, it is actually attempting to build up its working force with newly hired workers.

Quiet Steel Strike Contrasts with Bell Violence; City Council Pins Responsibility on Corporation

BUFFALO, October 8—While picketing steel workers gathered eagerly around company-supplied radios to listen to the world series game, Bell Aircraft pickets stared tensely at 200 armed guards and sheriff's deputies whose clubs and horses might go into action at any moment.

The management of the struck steel plant sent coffee and doughnuts every two hours to the picketing workers. The Bell management set up two more tear gas bomb towers so they could repeat their last week's performance more efficiently the next time.

This is a study in sharp contrasts, and something of an answer to the question: "Who is responsible for violence in a labor dispute?" There will be no violence in the Buffalo steel strike—so long as the company continues to live up to its pre-strike agreement with the union not to hire scabs or begin a back-to-work movement.

There was no violence in the Bell

self, against the union. It's a neat trick if it can be done. Bell is trying to do it.

Can an honorable settlement of the strike issues be achieved through the fact-finding board? It would be incorrect to declare in advance that the board, hand-picked though it is, will give nothing to the union. Fact-finding boards have made at least partially favorable decisions before.

But they have done so only when the union has been organized, strong and able to fight its battle on the picket line. It would be fatal for Local 501 to ease up on its fight. It would be fatal for the strikers to stand by and watch hundreds of newly hired scabs walk into Bell Aircraft plant every day, in the hopes that the fact-finding board will get them fired later on.

Quiet Steel Strike Contrasts with Bell Violence; City Council Pins Responsibility on Corporation

BUFFALO, October 8—While picketing steel workers gathered eagerly around company-supplied radios to listen to the world series game, Bell Aircraft pickets stared tensely at 200 armed guards and sheriff's deputies whose clubs and horses might go into action at any moment.

The management of the struck steel plant sent coffee and doughnuts every two hours to the picketing workers. The Bell management set up two more tear gas bomb towers so they could repeat their last week's performance more efficiently the next time.

This is a study in sharp contrasts, and something of an answer to the question: "Who is responsible for violence in a labor dispute?" There will be no violence in the Buffalo steel strike—so long as the company continues to live up to its pre-strike agreement with the union not to hire scabs or begin a back-to-work movement.

If Bell succeeds in getting production going, the fact-finding board decision will more than likely ratify the status quo. If Local 501 can keep the scabs out of the plant, the fact-finders will be more concerned with the union's just needs.

In any event, Local 501, actively organizing its picket lines, keeping its women's auxiliary at full strength, running strike relief desks, seeking support from community groups—and keeping all scabs out of the Bell plant—will be in a position to continue its fight no matter which way the decision goes.

Quiet Steel Strike Contrasts with Bell Violence; City Council Pins Responsibility on Corporation

BUFFALO, October 8—While picketing steel workers gathered eagerly around company-supplied radios to listen to the world series game, Bell Aircraft pickets stared tensely at 200 armed guards and sheriff's deputies whose clubs and horses might go into action at any moment.

The management of the struck steel plant sent coffee and doughnuts every two hours to the picketing workers. The Bell management set up two more tear gas bomb towers so they could repeat their last week's performance more efficiently the next time.

This is a study in sharp contrasts, and something of an answer to the question: "Who is responsible for violence in a labor dispute?" There will be no violence in the Buffalo steel strike—so long as the company continues to live up to its pre-strike agreement with the union not to hire scabs or begin a back-to-work movement.

ration has consistently resisted the efforts of arbitrating the difficulties in its strikebound plant, and

"Whereas fully informed persons are aware that reasonable and fair solution of the labor trouble prevailing at the Bell Aircraft Corporation plant has been blocked by management rather than labor; and

"Whereas the Bell Aircraft Corporation consistently has befogged and, more or less successfully, through its professional publicity methods, kept the general public in the dark at the behest of its absentee Wall Street ownership, now, therefore

"Be it resolved, that the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, regularly assembled, hereby publicly condemns the Bell Aircraft Corporation for the methods it has employed during this controversy and demands forthwith that the differences between labor and management be resolved so that the hardship which has ensued from this strike may be ended and that the strikebound workers be restored to their jobs."

Both the company and its kept press, the Buffalo Evening News and the Courier Express, hysterically denounced the Buffalo city councilmen, among whom is the present Republican candidate for mayor of Buffalo. They charged these councilmen with bias, prejudice, stupidity, radicalism. More news space was given to the one councilman who voted against the resolution than to the 14 who voted for it. But the councilmen have so far stood their ground.

WON'T TALK

On the University of Buffalo campus, a non-partisan club invited the company and the union to appear at the university to debate the issues in the strike. The union accepted at once and sent its representative.

The company did not show up. It could not face the union arguments on equal terms. It preferred to have the public hear the arguments as interpreted by the Buffalo Evening News.