

Work for a Workers World;
Join the Workers Party!

LABOR ACTION

MARCH 15, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Labor Leaders Play Two-Faced Game

LABOR PARTY TIME IS NOW!

Political Issues Skirted Deftly By UAW Board

By KEN HILLIER

CHICAGO, Mar. 8.—The International Executive Board of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, closed its quarterly meeting in Chicago on March 5 leaving much to be asked from a union that has gained the reputation of being the most progressive in the country.

Faced with the economic and political problems of the workers in the shop, the Board ran through the reports of the General Motors and Chrysler negotiations and awaited further developments after negotiations begin at GM to determine a course of action.

The political problem was handled deftly but shamefully. Confronted with the Wallace question and the lack of enthusiasm in the ranks for a policy of rewarding friends and punishing enemies, the Board came out with a resolution for a new party based upon workers, farmers, small business men and professionals—AF-TER THE 1948 ELECTIONS!

The resolution is an attempt to pacify all those workers who are fed up with supporting the Democratic Party by telling them that this is the last time. Just one more chance, etc., etc. It is a means of clearing the way to endorse Truman and other Democratic candidates as "lesser evils" in November of this year.

MANY CONTRADICTIONS

The resolution has many contradictory paragraphs: "The lack of a genuine independent political party committed to the interests of the majority of the people encourages such 'fly-by-night' misleading political movements such as this manipulation [Wallace], as well as exposes labor to the self-defeating course of supporting false friends in order to prevent the election of declared enemies." In contradiction to this is the resolution to back PAC and its candidates in order to defeat the reactionaries in Congress.

The resolution characterizes the Wallace movement as a "CP maneuver designed to advance the foreign policy interests of the Soviet Union at the expense of democracy and freedom throughout the world." It points out that it does not have the support of organized labor, the basic philosophy, etc. But it uses the reactionary argument that this "third party" will aid and abet the reelection of those Congressmen who voted for the T-H law.

Later, the resolution says that the Wallace movement is "an obstacle in the way of establishment of a successful and genuine progressive political party in the U. S." From this paragraph it proceeds to lay down the principles of the new party. It shall:

1. Welcome every group committed to winning economic security without surrendering fundamental freedoms.
2. Stand for civil rights and against discrimination.
3. Hold human rights above property rights.

4. Be a popular movement built from grass roots upward.

Then it declares itself in favor of working with all labor and the progressive non-labor organizations. Finally, it authorizes the Educational Department to implement the resolution, "looking forward to the time when its practical implementation is possible."

Although the resolution is a neat evasion of responsibility for 1948, it offers the Labor Party advocates in UAW the opportunity to continue to push for independent political action NOW. It further puts the Board on (Continued on page 2)

Local Auto Union Votes Show Militants on the Alert

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—The conclusion of a series of important local union elections in the United Auto Workers-CIO in this area revealed that there were no significant changes in the factional situation in this union.

Pro-Reuther forces won elections in key local unions which are usually considered weathervanes of the political temper and trends in the UAW. In Local 155, long a Stalinist stronghold, the Reuther forces succeeded in ousting John Anderson, leading Stalinist unionist, from his post as president. Last year Anderson survived a pro-Reuther victory that saw Nat Ganley, member of the national committee of the Stalinist party, defeated as business agent. This year Russell Leach, the pro-Reuther candidate, defeated Anderson by a few hundred votes.

At Dodge Local 3, Mike Novak and his slate were returned to office and in Chrysler Local 7 the Joe Hatley administration easily defeated the anti-Reuther bloc.

TEST MAZEY STRENGTH

The election at Briggs Local 212 was closely watched by the entire UAW for it represented a major test of strength for supporters of Emil Mazezy, UAW secretary-treasurer, against a combination of Stalinist and Socialist Workers Party supporters. In spite of the fact that a dirty Jew-baiting campaign against Ken Morris, the pro-Mazezy candidate for president, featured the campaign, the slate headed by Morris won handily. It was a triumph for just decent unionism against the irresponsible factionalism of the unprincipled bloc of Stalinists and SWPers. At no time did the anti-Mazezy bloc repudiate the vicious anti-Semitism which prevailed among the backward workers who followed them.

At Ford Local 400, two groups, both part of the Reuther tendency, fought for control of the local in the elections. The Musilli slate failed to obtain a majority by a slight margin, and run-offs for important posts are scheduled.

ISSUES OF THE DAY AND LABOR ACTION

In the last two issues of LABOR ACTION we featured the developments in Europe, notably in Czechoslovakia. It was our intention to emphasize the latter again this week.

There is much in the international situation that should be covered in this issue of LABOR ACTION—elections in Italy, the reported suicide of Jan Masaryk, for example, etc. However, we feel that the political situation in the United States, which is vitally related with the situation in Europe, the duplicity of the labor leaders, the danger of the Wallace-Stalinist movement and so forth, are so urgent as to demand that we devote the greatest part of this issue to domestic issues. We cannot cover everything that ought to be discussed in a four-page LABOR ACTION. We therefore advise our readers to follow LABOR ACTION week to week for the best there is in analysis of the domestic and international scene.

President Truman's stock has sunk as low as it could sink for any man who actually holds the office of President and is a candidate for re-election.

The press reports that influential Democratic Party leaders are urging Truman to withdraw from the race.

Nobody seems to want him.

His basic troubles do not come from the Southern "rebellion." There is every reason to expect that the South will remain pretty much solid in November. The "rebel yell" will likely prove so much wind.

What has undermined the Truman campaign is the sweeping revulsion against him among the people of this country.

The Henry Wallace-Stalinist Party is gaining sympathy, particularly among workers who, whatever their opinion of the make-up and program of this party, see it as a way of voting their opposition to the Democratic and Republican bosses. (See page 3 for an examination of the Wallace-Stalinist Party.)

In this situation the labor leaders, who a few weeks ago were speaking unabashedly of their plans to support Truman, have changed their tactics a little. If anything, however, the "change" is a greater condemnation of their policy. For with this "change" they are perpetrating a shameful fraud.

They know that the people have little confidence in Boss Pendergast's gift to

politics. While they may try to hush it up, workers have not forgotten that Truman dared to reimpose government by injunction and government by judiciary.

There are enough people who understand that Truman's injunctions in the railroad and coal strikes are, in fact, as hateful as anything in the Taft-Hartley law.

Concern is widespread over the drift toward war, and the consequences of imperialist policy. Increasing numbers are turning against the daily demonstrated ineptness of Truman—as in the Palestine issue.

Millions are convinced that under the direction of capitalist politicians, whether Democratic or Republican, they can look forward only to economic disaster or the greater disaster of atomic war.

Sensing this, the labor leaders are playing it cagey. Almost all of them are staging a comic-tragedy, play-acting that their minds are not made up, that they may support anybody come November.

That goes for the leaders of the AFL and the CIO (with Whitney of the Railroad Brotherhoods still speaking out for Truman, despite the millions he set so long ago threatened to use to defeat Truman). It goes for Murray, for Green and for such as Reuther, too. (See story on UAW Board meeting on page 1.)

The times call loudly for a LABOR PARTY. And the play-acting of the labor leaders is designed to undermine that demand.

They are trying to meet the Wallace problem by pretense. A LABOR PARTY would not only cut the Wallace-Stalinist

movement to ribbons, it would be a major step in cracking the capitalist political machine—in laying the groundwork for genuine economic security, for meeting the danger of war.

Most of the labor leaders want no part of a Labor Party, not even to talk about it.

Some, however, are playing the game of promising a Labor Party, or something like it, AFTER November. WHY NOT NOW?

While it is virtually certain that Truman will be the Democratic candidate, the labor leaders Playing Games? are hoping the Democrats will choose another. IF THERE IS ANOTHER CANDIDATE, IT WILL NOT BE ONE WHIT DIFFERENT OR BETTER.

Another candidate will still be a capitalist candidate, perhaps slightly more intelligent or capable, but essentially committed to the same policy, just as Republicans and Democrats are fundamentally indistinguishable in program.

The labor leaders' stand is fakery from beginning to end. They have made up their minds. They will support Truman. And if it is another Democrat they support, it will make small difference.

That fakery must be exposed. Questions must be asked on union floors and in the shops. There is no reason at all to permit them to put over the fraud.

The need is for a LABOR PARTY. The time is NOW!



Who Wants Him?



Playing Games?

Abuses Under Present Rent Law Grow

Rent Control Office Aids Gougers

BY SUSAN GREEN

Court reports appearing in the press give some slight indication of the abuses practiced under present rent control laws.

For instance, there was the case in Brooklyn where a landlord raised a tenant's rent \$6 a month because of the addition of a baby to the family. Moreover, the landlord was not acting on his own. The Office of Rent Control, which you may have supposed looks after the interests of tenants, actually okayed the boost. The tenant, a Navy veteran, had just paid an increase of \$2.75 a month allowed the landlord as a "hardship" increase. When it came to being penalized for having a baby, the tenant balked and took the case to court. The Municipal Court Judge was moved to comment: "Shall we have birth control in New York because the expediter puts a penalty on babies?"

One wonders how many similar abuses are absorbed by tenants throughout the country who haven't the information or the means to protect themselves — to protect themselves not only against landlords but also against the Office of Rent Control.

Though it is expected that existing federal rent control will be continued for another year, no improvement in the law for the protection of tenants

can be hoped for. The stop-gap bill passed by both House and Senate and signed by the President extended present controls till the end of March. Some time in March Congress will again take the matter up. Substantially the same law will be passed to run to 1949. As a matter of fact, the Senate already voted to extend controls till April 30, 1949, but because there wasn't time to resubmit the matter to the House before the February 29 deadline, the stop-gap law was also passed. The Senate's renewal bill permits the same 15 per cent increase by "mutual agreement." And the Senate took the teeth out of the bill by eliminating punishment for violators of rent regulations.

Certainly this law will give no relief to tenants such, for instance, as those occupying a squalid two-story frame house in the Bronx at 660 East 175th Street. The case of these victims of rent gouging became public when the landlord attempted an eviction of one of the tenants. Court testimony revealed that the tenant was paying \$125 a month for four rooms which could not be called an apartment, because they are four rooms in a one-family house. The tenant, his wife and four children have to use a basement toilet and share the second-floor bath with the seven adults and a child living in the four second-

floor rooms—rental \$160. Two attic rooms were shared by four adults paying \$100 a month. The Municipal Court judge before whom the case came personally investigated the house and found cracked and plasterless walls, just one kitchen for the second and attic floors, and no fire escapes for these nineteen human beings occupying ten rooms; the furnace was cold and there was no oil. Said the judge: "I was shocked at conditions in that house. Human rights are being trampled upon." Not only there, judge!

The underlying housing shortage which makes such robbery possible is being handled by the politicians with a ten-foot pole. They don't go near it. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which has some good features, slumbers on in the Congressional hopper. There's another bill introduced by Senator McCarthy (Rep., Wis.) which places more emphasis on "encourag-

ing" private enterprise and less on public projects—but no action. The last politician to grasp the ten-foot pole and make some gestures with it is President Truman.

TRUMAN'S RECOMMENDATIONS

From his blissful vacation in the sunny Caribbean—just to show the poor suckers shivering in crowded rooms at home that he hasn't forgotten them—he sent a message to Congress on housing. He said things about the desperate housing situation that many of us already know. Two and a half million married couples are forced to live with other families. Five million houses are no longer habitable. Of the new houses being built only a small percentage are apartment dwellings and the great majority are private homes built for sale at prices far above the means of those most in need of housing. Where existing law has decontrolled living (Continued on page 2)

Undermine Progressive Program of UE Local 107

PHILADELPHIA, March 6.—The progressive and militant political program of Westinghouse Local 107, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, was dealt a body blow by an alliance of the Stalinists and the opportunistic local union leadership at a Political Action Committee meeting on Tuesday, March 2. At this meeting, the temporary organizing committee recommended approval of a resolution authorizing the body to send 17 delegates to the Pennsylvania Third Party Conference in York on Sunday, March 7. This partial endorsement of the Stalinist-Wallace movement is a violation of the Es-sington local's official position in favor of an independent Labor Party.

The Tuesday meeting was the first regular one for the newly formed PAC unit. There was no discussion of program; there was no organizational report; there was only presentation of a resolution agreed to beforehand by the leadership of the local and the Stalinists which, in reality, made Local 107 part of the Wallace party. The resolution denounced the Republican and Democratic parties for being tools of Wall Street monopoly capital, re-

iterated Local 107's support of independent political action and then stated that "since the Wallace third party is the nearest thing to an independent Labor Party that exists today," it should be resolved that the local send delegates to the York convention.

The union leadership defended the resolution on the basis that it "was any group's democratic right to send delegates to the Wallace convention," but the burden of support for the motion fell on the shoulders of those who have consistently followed the Communist Party line. These spokesmen claimed that the "Gideon's Army" of Wallace was their concept of an independent Labor Party. When the "people are on the march" it is foolish to talk of a restricted party based only on the labor unions. Such demagoguery was followed by red baiting of socialist groups "which desire to build mass parties of socialism." The exponents of the Labor Party were also blamed for the failure to set up such a party when the local was on record for independent political action. (Continued on page 2)

Hit Wallace Line at UE District Meeting

Ford Instrument Delegate Calls for Immediate Steps to Form Labor Party—Lash Secessionists and Union Raiders

NEW YORK—Taking their cue from the statement made by General President Albert J. Fitzgerald and General Secretary-Treasurer Julius Emspak at the last meeting of the CIO Executive Board, the officers of District Council 4, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, CIO, endorsed the position that each international and local union may proceed autonomously in support or non-support of the Henry Wallace third party candidacy.

As the third largest union (and the largest international following the CP line), the UE is providing a large share of the manpower, if not the funds, for the Wallace boom. While the international has not approved

Wallace officially, all UE officers and staffers are voicing their "personal" opinion for him.

Taking the floor at the February 26 meeting of the District Council, Long Island City Local 425 delegates observed that while recognition of local and international autonomy by the UE spokesmen was a maneuver to avoid an outright pro-Wallace stand, it had always been the position of 425 that the local unions as well as internationals had autonomous rights on these and other questions. Pointing out that the Wallace party was a creature of the CP formed as a result of the crack-up of the Democratic Party-Stalinist coalition, one delegate reported the action taken by Local

425's membership.

At a meeting attended by several hundred members earlier the same evening, the Ford Instrument workers had turned down the Wallace bid unanimously. Quoting the resolution adopted there the delegate went on to add that it called for the UE and the CIO to take immediate steps to organize "a truly independent Labor Party, based on the trade unions, with a labor program and labor candidates."

Coupled with the discussion on the third party, the Newark meeting heard a report on the bolt from UE ranks of a number of New York and New Jersey locals. Ostensibly forced to secede from UE because of the

unions' failure to sign the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavits, they formerly were supporters of the minority opposition, UE Members for Democratic Action. One of the group, Local 1237, employs as its business agent James Conroy, who has had a brief but checkered career as a union official, company labor relations man and a House Un-American Affairs Committee witness since January 1946 when he transferred his allegiance from the Communist Party to the Association of Catholic Trades Union-

Delegates of the progressive opposition voiced their disapproval of the secessionists since the net result is to weaken the Members for Democratic

Action, who intend to continue the fight against the Stalinist domination of the UE.

Minority speakers spoke against the attempt by UAW Local 365 to raid the UE at the Schraeder plant in Brooklyn. While no results were known at the time of the meeting, it is known now that the Schraeder company extended its agreement with UE, plus a wage boost of nine cents. The Local 365 attempt marks the first instance of one CIO union raiding another in this area in a long time, and it remains to be seen what follows as a result of the many deep and thoroughgoing differences that divide the CIO majority from the pro-Stalinist "left" wing.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Run Independent Candidate in Seattle

SEATTLE—Except for the presence of one candidate who ran as a labor candidate, there was little to distinguish the recent city election from its predecessors. The majority candidates represented various sections of business (one the shipowners, one the Chamber of Commerce, one the "open town" interests). The councilmanic race had twenty-six contestants, scratching and clawing one another over such life-and-death questions as the towing racket, traffic congestion, nine o'clock closing, all of which made little or no difference to the tens of thousands of working people in Seattle.

Only one candidate, Bob Ferguson, represented any kind of step forward. Ferguson offered old programmatic innovations and generally reflected the political backwardness of workers in this period. However, his candidacy did mark opposition to labor lobbying and petitioning in favor of a direct labor spokesman in the council. Ferguson is not just the usual card-packing politician. In his case, a group of union delegates drew up a program in conference, selected Ferguson to file and run on that program, as labor's candidate and formed the United Labor Committee for Political Action to campaign for him.

The story behind this committee is a heartbreaking one—including the indifference of the official labor movement to the call of the typographical

union, the reluctance of the logical labor leaders to run as candidates, the attempt of the Communist Party to use it as a springboard for their candidates and to capture it for Wallace.

PRINTERS ISSUE CALL

A month before the elections, the Seattle Typographical Union sent out a call to all Seattle unions and auxiliaries to send delegates to a conference to draw up a platform and choose candidates for the city elections. Some twenty unions were officially or unofficially represented. The type delegation of Ray Stark, Bill Dungan, Art Syrtstad, Charley Hickey and Charley Taylor tried to set the tone for the campaign by advising the delegates that, despite the small number of unions represented, the conference must try to represent all of labor by putting forth candidates and a program that all of Seattle labor can unite on. The conference chose a program committee and a committee to interview possible candidates.

The Stalinists tried to maneuver the committee into supporting Parry and Brooks. Before the nominating meeting, which took place three days later, the type delegation made it plain to the Stalinists that they would withdraw if there was so much as a question of Stalinist candidates. Thus, the committee had to report almost no success in getting candi-

dates to run. Among those who refused were McLaren of the Metal Trades, Metrin of the Meat Cutters, Clancy of the Boilermakers, Duncan and Gibson of the Machinists, Atkinson of the CIO. Only Ferguson of the Steel Workers accepted. A motion was made to endorse Ferguson and work for his election.

At this point the Stalinists threw in a monkey wrench. E. M. Tangent of the MCS-CIO explained that if the committee endorsed Ferguson the CIO would have to withdraw, because Ferguson had not asked for an endorsement from PAC before he filed. Ferguson then explained that he did not want the PAC endorsement since every one in Seattle knew that it represented no one but the Communist Party, and that a PAC endorsement was a "kiss of death." If the vote had been taken then Ferguson would have been endorsed, the Stalinists would have left and the way would have been opened for such union support as had shied away from Stalinist front organizations. However, a well intentioned delegate moved adjournment, thinking that unity might result after a cooling-off period. In the confusion the motion carried.

Even with these meager forces, and the fact that only a fraction of the labor movement could have any way of knowing that Ferguson was a labor candidate, he was able to qualify for the final election.

Here is a real demonstration of the appeal that a labor candidate has. His victory will depend on the committee's ability in the next two weeks to rally the unions behind the candidate.

Rent Gougers --

(Continued from page 1)

quarters, rents have risen more than 60 per cent.

So the President makes some recommendations. He thinks one million new houses and apartments should be erected annually for the next ten years in urban areas. He covered in his message everything from increased production methods, wages, legislation authorizing federal funds for local housing authorities and for slum clearance, to giving aid to capital and insurance of investment returns. Nobody is to be offended, everybody is to be pleased, and houses are to be built. Such messages read well in an election year. Actually there's still that ten-foot pole.

Incidentally, the President is very much off on his facts where it is important to be right—either he is off or the National Housing Committee is. The President said that 15 per cent of the new housing built in 1947 was rental housing. Henry M. Propper of the National Housing Committee, testifying before a Congressional committee on housing, reported that only eight per cent of the new houses started in 1947 were multi-family apartments for rent. That's quite a difference. Again, the President spoke of one million units added in 1947, while Mr. Propper's figure was only 850,000 units started in 1947. That also is quite a difference, when you think of people having or not having a decent place to live in.

The housing problem was reported the number one worry of the mayors of 250 cities who recently met in New York for their seventeenth annual conference. In cities in Michigan and in Kentucky, in the East and in the West, the crying need is for housing. However, the mayors' worry did not materialize into anything tangible. They too have that ten-foot pole.

JOB FOR LABOR PARTY

People like the steamfitter who was up for eviction from his four-room substandard home for which he was paying \$125 a month until his plant struck and he could no longer pay that extortion, will have to come forth and press for a solution of the housing crisis. The working people will have to raise their voices and demand an adequate building program—and rent control that really protects the tenants! But to whom can such demands be made?

Certainly not to the capitalist politicians schooled in the art of evading

the people's most vital needs. On the contrary, labor must write its demands into the platform of its own party, an independent Labor Party, opposed to the capitalist Democratic and Republican Parties and also to the Stalinoid Wallace party.

UAW Bd.--

(Continued from page 1)

the spot as to their conduct after November. The Board members themselves realize that the UAW members will take their resolution seriously and demand action NOW.

REPORT LARGE BALANCE

The other sessions of the Board were loaded down with administrative details, constitutional interpretations of local election issues. (UAW local elections take place in February and March.)

An interesting report was submitted by Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey when he reported a balance of \$300,000 over expenditures since the convention. The report revealed such insights as: the past administration paid the rent of their factional headquarters, mimeo paper, mailings, etc., out of union funds; that a couple of Ades men had a good racket on waste paper sales, returned buttons, etc.

The CIO resolution on the ERP (Marshall Plan) was passed.

The Board did not take a position on the problems of UE, Mine, Mill & Smelter locals, Farm Equipment plants that are faced with losing contracts because of failing to sign the Taft-Hartley affidavits. However, it is understood that where an AFL or independent union petitions for an NLRB election, and the workers come to the UAW, the UAW will step in to represent the CIO.

The Board, loaded down with details, did not discuss the coming economic struggle for a third round of wage increases and the danger of the Steel Workers or UE making an agreement as they have in the past.

The economic and political questions will not allow these important questions of the day to remain unanswered. What is needed, and there is still time for it, is A UNIFIED CIO STRATEGY FOR WAGE INCREASES and an immediate fight for a LABOR PARTY—NOW!

Ask National CIO Name Administrators For Calif. Councils

LOS ANGELES—A caucus meeting of delegates to CIO Los Angeles Council who followed the main officers when they walked out of the last Council meeting (see last week's LABOR ACTION—Ed.) met on March 1 to set up its own body in opposition to the Stalinist-dominated Council.

In a resolution presented by the leading officers of the state and local councils, these delegates voted that the national CIO appoint administrators for the California councils which have voted against CIO policy and for the Stalinist line.

The resolution also called upon those unions present to sever all relations with the Lawrence-Connelly Council, thus effecting the split in the Los Angeles CIO.

Local 107--

(Continued from page 1)

Speakers in favor of an independent Labor Party and against the Wallace-Stalinist third party explained that a group professing a pro-labor program, but controlled by a combination of pro-capitalist and Stalinist interests, cannot be for the workers of the country. Labor unions entering into the Wallace camp will not be able to change its policies or program since they are dictatorially handed down from the top. Moreover, any candidates elected will not be responsible to the union membership and their interests, but to the interests of the real organizers, agents of the Russian ruling class and a segment of the American exploiters.

Some opposition was voiced on the narrower basis that support of the Wallace machine was introducing company unionism into labor politics. This viewpoint does not distinguish clearly enough the uniqueness of the PCA-Wallace grouping and its demagogic popular appeal as contrasted to the sterile formulas of the Republican and Democratic Parties.

The resolution to send delegates to York was passed by a vote of four to one with some of the dissenting votes coming from those in favor of the Murray-National CIO-PAC policy of supporting Truman.

The local leadership has gotten promises from PCA that they will be the third party candidates in local elections. This is not the first time that the leadership has flaunted the independent political action mandate. Not only have they failed to take steps to build an independent Labor Party on even a local scale, but they have repeatedly played the most opportunistic role in running in Democratic and Republican primaries in Delaware County. For them, no doubt, this current honeymoon with the Stalinists and the national UE leadership seems to be but another "political adventure." But this time their collaborators are playing for keeps.

MOVE AGAINST LOCAL

The national UE leadership, Stalinist to the core, was a bit frightened by the display of discontent expressed by Local 107 at a recent District 1 meeting. They are making a bid to get this large and militant local within the fold. The assignment of a national organizer to the scene when the Pattern Makers, AFL, made a bid to raid the local was part of a policy to line up the local. Their proposal on sending delegates to York is another move. This current "political adventure" may break the local's back.

It is well that the local's leadership is politically conscious but it is not well that this consciousness manifests itself in an effort to obtain political office at the price of making deals with anti-working class parties, the Republicans, the Democrats and the Stalinists, and other elements of the third party group.

News of West Coast Labor Movement...

Vet Conference

By WILLIAM BARTON

SANTA BARBARA, Calif., Feb. 23—Despite a drop in officially represented membership, several thousand, the third annual convention of the California American Veterans Committee, held in this city during the week-end of February 21, marked some improvement over last year's assemblage. This convention, far more democratic in character, revealed a more definite pro-labor orientation, showed a decline in Stalinist domination of the state organization, took a positive stand for a state bonus, vigorously opposed Universal Military Training, and planned a series of campaigns for the post-convention period.

The membership figures presented were confusing. Only those who had paid their state dues were included in this year's figures; last year's calculations were less definite. It is known that several chapters did not submit their state assessment. Yet it was admitted in the official report of "stewardship" by the State Executive Committee that the renewal rate has been below expectations. It was this background, as well as the entire national picture, that produced the different type of meeting held this year.

The character of the proceedings was a signal victory for those who had fought the tightly-knit machine of last year in its railroading and opposition-squashing tactics. The rules provided for at least a minimum of adequate debate on all issues. The formal organization allowed for the proper agenda appearance of controversial items. No business was left unfinished, and there was little heckling or name-calling. The Stalinist machine was considerably weakened and its representation on the State Executive Committee seriously diminished.

OPPOSITION TO SLATE

For the first time, there was serious election opposition to the victorious SEC slate. Ben Rinaldo of Hollywood, an open member of the Stalinist "Unity" caucus, and a former member of the National Committee, was overwhelmingly elected chairman. However, he received last-minute opposition from Rex Mainord, UAW-CIO organizer and former veterans' director of the State CIO.

Although he strongly denied that he was running on any caucus basis, Mainord had cooperated with the Independent Progressive Caucus, allied with the national leadership, and was so accused. He only received some three hundred votes out of 3,000 cast, but, considering the difficulties he had to surmount, it was considered satisfactory by most of his supporters.

The organized Stalinist apparatus was most in evidence on this question, hitting Mainord hard on his IP caucus affiliation, his lack of significant activity in AVC compared to Rinaldo, and on the peculiarity of his status in the organization arising from his moving around according to the demands of his union work. They were greatly aided by the collection of Hollywood characters who were his principal advisors. These dragged him very suddenly from San Diego, without any information on what to expect or any briefing on the true situation at the convention. They did their best to make him straddle any controversial question. Their big ace in the hole was a wired nominating speech by Melvyn Douglas.

Although caucuses were not official, they were everywhere. The "Unity" group, with its domination of the large Los Angeles area chapters, remained most powerful, though much less so than formerly. The "Build AVC" people made their usual deals with "Unity" on candidates; ironically, some of the people they bargained for are old-time Stalinist fellow-travelers. The only important contest, besides the race for chairmanship, was for San Francisco representative on the State Committee. Noreen Aubrey, exceptionally active member of the old SEC, was dumped by her own

delegation for Ralph Dawson, party-line hack from the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. Despite her willingness to accept this maneuver a draft movement was instituted in the rest of the Northern California delegation that narrowly missed success by a couple of hundred votes. Miss Aubrey has been a supporter of the Build AVC Caucus.

APPROVE BONUS STAND

The state bonus, to run to a maximum of \$600, was passed by a two to one vote. Most of the opposition came from the student chapters, some of which are preparing a referendum to reverse the policy. The opposition's argument was based upon the usual charge of "handout." This was effectively answered by many delegates.

Standard AVC positions against the Taft-Hartley Act, for price control and adequate housing, in opposition to Universal Military Training, for the termination of witch-hunting investigating committees and loyalty oaths were almost unanimously approved. Important state plans adopted were: support of the state initiative proposal for an appropriation to construct 100,000 dwelling units, endorsement of a State Senate reappointment initiative, continuation of child-care centers, and the development of the Central Valley Authority with a 160 acre limitation on users of its irrigation. With little opposition, the convention proposed an amendment to the National AVC constitution removing merchant mariners from membership, a move occasioned by the State Legislature's act in barring the use of Veterans' Memorial Buildings to any organization which included them.

The convention opposed the National Committee's support of the Marshall Plan and approved a Stalinist resolution for aid through UN with priority on "nations which suffered most from Axis aggression." Significantly, the vote against the Marshall Plan was about 3 to 1, while that for the victorious resolution was only 3 to 2. Speeches attacking all imperialisms and calling for popularly administered aid programs were given in committee sessions and on the floor, but no motion to that effect was presented. It is interesting that National Chairman Patterson declared himself opposed to any program designed primarily to "stop communism," but he declared that the Marshall Plan was the "best" to be expected from this Congress.

The necessity for a strong pro-labor orientation, fought for by several delegates at last year's state and national convention, evidently had an effect. Patterson emphasized it in his convention address.

The convention revealed that AVC remains an organization with tremendous potentialities. To realize its possibilities in the state, it now needs: more militant activity, a deeper pro-labor orientation, appeals to the average veteran on issues like the bonus, proper functioning of the two service offices established and planned for AVC in the Los Angeles and San Francisco Veterans Administration offices respectively, a vigorous campaign on the housing initiative and the move to register all veterans for election, and more of the spirit shown in the housing motorcade to Sacramento last spring.

Come Listen Discuss

At the Open Forum

"WHEN THIEVES FALL OUT—WHY THE STATE DEPARTMENT EXPOSED THE NAZI-SOVIET DEALS NOW"

To Be Held

THURS., MARCH 25 8:15 P. M.
Fellowship House, 21 W. Preston St.
Baltimore, Maryland

Ausp. Baltimore Br. Workers Party

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

On AFL Politics And Union Foremen

Friends:

With Jack Dimon, Capone and Dilinger dead and Luciano deported, Joe Fay, Bove, Nuzzo, Scalise and others in the penitentiary, William Green, the mysterious shielder of gangsters and racketeers in the House of Labor, and his executive council find themselves in a political dilemma. Their conference a few weeks ago in Miami, at which they set up the "League for Political—" What? Education? Oh! I thought Theyery—as an AFL counter part of PAC, has so far (except for their eyes on the one dollar assessment on 7,200,000 members) not given them much hope. They were unable to find any one among their skeletons mentally or politically qualified to take the lead. Shipping among the Republican and Democratic politicians brought them nothing. They even sneezed at the

annual 20 grand as chickenfeed. So their cry to heaven and all the gods goes on for a leader, a leader. Leader of what?

Big Bill Hutchison, also, with one eye on the coin, sized them up by his own yardstick. He shook his head, "no, no confidence." He appointed his own leader and said: "There will be no assessment. That's illegal!" He notified his 600,000 members, to voluntarily have two bucks ready. In the meantime his committee will decide where and how this "stickup" is to take place. "It's not to be entered in our books. . . . The receipt you will get is not from our organization." So it may be in a nearby dark alley, or over the wall of the Woodlawn Cemetery. It is also possible, for safety's sake, that we may have to cross the Canadian or Mexican borders. "Remember, that under the T-H Law we are not allowed to collect this money."

Strange as it may be, the editors of LABOR ACTION are guilty of letting a calamitous tragedy of this sort slip

by without making a holler. As in another incident, the editors owe their readers an explanation as to why they were so silent, when recently 6800 of the "union-conscious foremen" according to LABOR ACTION (May 7, 1947) who "enjoyed the support of LABOR ACTION as well as the Workers Party" have prostituted their way back into the folds of Henry Ford & Co. Well, that is where these bastards belong in the first place. Only dilettantes who have never seen the inside of a plant, can bring such confusion into the minds of workers, by classifying the foremen as workers. To what extent does the performance of the foremen differ from that of the bosses? There may be a choice in language when the one shouts "mache schnell" or the other "hurry up." But, as far as a worker is concerned about either, they can both go to H E L L.

We had a case during the miners' strike, in 1922, in Illinois. After the

miners were already out for a week, the maintenance men walked out, too. The foremen then had to do their work, such as keep the pumps going, the air circulated, and the mules to look after. They did not mind staying on the job to watch the maintenance men do the work, no. But, when they had to take over, that was terrible, so they walked out, too. Whereupon the company fired them. Some of the diggers (piece workers) had a side racket. They had been in shady deals with the foremen for months, maybe for years. They always had the dry entries, the rock tops, the high coal veins, etc., which enabled them to more than double their daily output, at the expense of their fellowmen. They played these foremen up as martyrs. They sneaked up to Farrington who in turn ordered the maintenance men back to work. Farrington further proclaimed that these foremen had come out in sympathy with us, therefore, to protect their jobs. The local was ordered to take

them in as members, free of initiation fees.

The peculiar thing was that these very foremen whom the company had fired for going on strike were in constant contact with the company during the strike. And one week before the four months' strike was ended, all these fired foremen had been back in their places and ready to put the mine in operation. What a joke that was.

Then came the pay-off. The members at meetings became suspicious, the attendance dwindled down to about one-fourth, the mine operating system was reorganized, and the progressive elements who had fought and improved conditions were branded as trouble-shooters by these "union-conscious foremen" and slated for wet entries, loose rock tops, shallow veins, or on the road for jobs elsewhere.

Yours, as an occasional, friendly critic,

BILL, New York.



HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE
LABOR ACTION
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription to LABOR ACTION as follows:

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

Name (please print)

Address

City Zone State

Bill me Remittance enclosed

Henry Wallace -- And His Place in Stalin's Strategy

By EMANUEL GARRETT

There is little reason to doubt that the most important single political event in the United States during these past few months has been the development of the Henry A. Wallace-Stalinist Third Party movement. It is an importance which is not alone to be measured by the size of the vote Henry Wallace polls in November; and certainly not by its effects on the Truman campaign. It derives its importance, rather, from a multiplicity of factors, included in which are: its damaging effects upon the development of a genuine labor party; its place in Stalinist strategy.

The Wallace-Stalinist Third Party, under its various state names—American Labor Party, Progressive Party, etc.—owes its existence entirely to the demands of this strategy. Whoever fails to understand this, understands nothing—but, nothing!—about this Third Party. Traditionally the Third Party, at least as understood in recent years, is a third party of capitalism, that is to say, a party seeking to patch the rotten and fear-inspiring foundations of capitalism by liberal concessions to the people. However, to discuss this particular movement in terms of "traditional" Third Partyism, and to debate its inadequacies, its incompetence and its illusions in those terms is to discuss and debate something which does not exist at all, or exists at best as a tiny fraction of the reality.

In actual fact the Wallace Party is a combination of a few (very few!) New Dealers and Stalinists, with the latter acting as creative force and veto apparatus. The organizational impetus comes from the Stalinists. The mass support, such as it now is, comes from the Stalinists. The program reflects completely the exigencies of the Stalinist line at this moment in this country. To be sure, Wallace and the few New Dealers who came along with him (the greater number having run back to Truman at the very moment that their brash talk about a new party threatened to become concrete) represent a segment of U. S. capitalism who wish to salvage what they can of capitalism, by dividing the world between Russia and the U. S. whereas the Stalinists are exclusively loyal to the bureaucratic-collectivist totalitarianism of Russia. But that is only an apparent conflict, and an inconsequential one for the present. They can "uphold" capitalism either Wallace—1948 style or Roosevelt—1942 style (no-strike pledges, etc.), so long as their major objective of upholding the Russian tyranny is served.

Thus, ground down to its essence, the program of the Wallace-Stalinist Party is not at all a domestic program for "reforming" capitalism or "improving" the lot of the "common man," but an international program for the subjugation of the peoples of the world to the imperialisms of Russia and the United States. Therein is the real reason for its invention; therein is the clue to the Wallace candidacy.

"THE MAN AND THE MYTH"

If the movement derives its energy from the Stalinists, the relation of Wallace to it is nonetheless important. Wallace serves as banner-bearer of the Party; he is the front. The Party is dependent on him to the extent that it would be difficult for the Stalinists to find another candidate of equal national reputation. Hence, it is necessary to know something about the man, his history and his program which coincides so neatly with the Stalinist program. And for that we heartily recommend a book which recently appeared, "Henry Wallace—The Man and the Myth," by Dwight Macdonald. (Vanguard, 187 pp., \$2.50.)

Macdonald's book is not the final word to be written on Wallace; it has serious shortcomings on the side of political and theoretical interpretation, but it is the best and most detailed examination of Wallace yet composed. (For those who have not read it yet, we also recommend Jack Ranger's excellent study of Wallace in LA, Oct. 13, 1947.)

Willy-nilly the Stalinists are trying to sell the Third Party as the next best thing to a Labor Party, if not actually one; and trying to sell Wallace as the great champion of the people, hence a man fitted to head what is the next best thing to a Labor Party. Though the Party at its inception has only Stalinists behind it, hundreds of thousands of workers (possibly millions) will fall for this misleading trash—which can only serve the purpose of discrediting the Labor Party, apart from the service this Third Party does Russian imperialism. Therefore, we believe that no worker should fail to acquaint himself with Macdonald's book, the facts and fancies of the Wallace myth.

Macdonald dissects the Wallace myth with a scalpel of the finest journalistic calibre, and finds that "Wallace has made a career of supplying to liberals a commodity they crave: rhetoric which accomplishes in fantasy what cannot be accomplished in reality." Macdonald lists five fictions: "That Wallace is a man of integrity—That Wallace has great moral courage—That he is a dreamer, a visionary whose spirit moves in realms far above petty political considerations—That Wallace is rigid, even somewhat doctrinaire in his ideology—That Wallace has fought the good fight against privilege and injustice—and then cites the facts which disprove the myth. Thus, with respect to the last fiction:

"One of the most striking things about Wallace's career is how much talking he has done about fighting for the Common Man, and how little acting...."

"(a) During the filibuster of Southern Senators against the Poll Tax Bill in 1942, Wallace, as Vice-President, presided over the Senate. Certain liberal Senators, including the late George W. Norris, urged Wallace to dramatize the issue by not leaving the chair, sleeping there if necessary. This might have had some practical value as well: Parliamentary opportunities might have

occurred to end the filibuster. Wallace, however, refused to co-operate, turning the chair over to any handy Senator whenever he got tired.

"(b) One of Wallace's habitual strategies when confronted with a conflict is simply to be somewhere else. This was his tactic in the 1935 purge in the Department of Agriculture and in the controversy with Baruch about the atomic bomb. During the nation-wide effort to get a reprieve for Odell Waller, the Negro sharecropper who killed his white landlord in a fight and who was executed for what would normally have been a manslaughter case, a delegation of Negro and White liberals called on Wallace to ask him to intervene with Roosevelt. They were shown into the office of Wallace's lieutenant, Harold Young, who received them with his feet on the desk and a cigar in his mouth. Without removing either, he informed them, in a Southern drawl, that the Common Man's Friend was not in, and that, anyway, nothing could be done about their request. As they were filing out, they caught sight of Wallace leaving his office. Embarrassed, the tribune of the people put on speed. But the delegation included Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, a woman of considerable determination. Although she walks with difficulty, using a cane, she hobbled after him, calling out loudly, "Oh, Mr. Wallace, I want to talk to you!" At which Wallace walked even faster, saying over his shoulder, "There's nothing I can do in the matter, Mrs. Bethune." Stories differ as to whether the pursuit was successful or not, but in any case the delegation got no help or sympathy from Wallace. He was, officially and spiritually, elsewhere." (pp. 21-23.)

Later in the book, Macdonald examines Wallace's record in backing the big farmer against the poor farmer in the Agricultural Adjustment Act days (AAA). Particularly interesting are those pages of Wallace's history which deal with the sharecroppers. In 1934 a committee, headed by Norman Thomas, prepared a report charging that the plight of the sharecroppers was becoming worse under AAA.

"Wallace's reactions," writes Macdonald, "were those of a Secretary of Agriculture rather than a Champion of the Common Man. He issued a counter-statement accusing Thomas of exaggerating, for political purposes, the plight of the sharecroppers; and he denied that AAA was affecting them adversely. When Mitchell (leader of the Southern anti Farmer's union) and Thomas tried, repeatedly, to get an appointment to see Wallace about the sharecroppers, the Secretary was somehow always busy or out of town."

In addition, Macdonald documents the conflict over whether Section 7 of the AAA should be interpreted for or against the eviction of recalcitrant sharecroppers, a conflict which was resolved by purging from the department the liberals who tried to pull a "fast one" by interpreting the Act as it was written.

There is much else in the book that completes the Wallace portrait: Wallace as mystic; Wallace as spokesman for the Common Man, but unable to speak with or understand "common men"; Wallace as scientist (the one field—agricultural experimentation—where he has done some good); Wallace as editor of the New Republic; Wallace as sucker for applause (something which the Stalinists can provide in ample quantity). We pick at random. All of these contribute to an understanding of Wallace, and hence of his connections with the Third Party. (Macdonald's cutting investigation of "Wallace," the empty, pontifical generalizations of the "Wallisian" liberals makes especially interesting reading. A neat job that helps to deflate the windbags.)

SLAVEMASTER AGREEMENT

With all of this, however, the main thing in the Wallace movement remains its tie with Stalinism, organizationally and programatically. (It is here that Macdonald is weakest, revealing his political limitations in grappling with the complexities of Stalinism and Stalinoids. Our readers will find Comrade Hal Draper's article on the "neo-Stalinist man" in the January, 1948, New Internationalist, very illuminating.)

The Wallace movement has many attractions for the people of the United States, above all for those workers who are thoroughly fed up with the endlessly hopeless choice between Democrats and Republicans. Wallace's ace in the hole is that he appears to offer a program of peace and security, based upon harmony between the big imperialist rivals. He seems to offer an end to the cold war which is driving towards eruption into "hot" war of battling armies. The Stalinists know that this "peace" program is a chimera. They hope to stymie, disrupt and blackmail the war policies of U. S. imperialism, notably the Marshall Plan as an instrument of that policy. And it fits their plans to have Wallace prattle about "peace."

Wallace's "peace" program is nothing less than agreement between slavemasters to jointly operate the world, each ruling in his own sphere. Whether or not the Stalinists hope for a world under the single slave domination of Stalin (as U. S. imperialism looks toward a world exclusively under its domination), it nevertheless serves their purpose to promote acquiescence in the enslavement of the east-European peoples, and others, right here and now. That is Wallace's great value to them. Let him, they reason, do so to save capitalism as he thinks he needs to be saved; no matter.

Such a "peace"—even were it more than a temporary truce pending final conquest, which it cannot be in an imperialist world—would be a peace based upon slavery, the slavery of the peoples of the world. Such a "peace" cannot be tolerated, even as an idea. It is inimical in every conceivable way to the working class and to the people of this country as of other countries. Every worker must be made to understand this, above all the worker who may yield to the lure of the pro-capitalist Wallace-Stalinist Party as a sign of his well-founded opposition to the two big capitalist parties. No worker must remain uninformed of this. We dare not permit the legitimate and healthy disgust which labor feels for the two big parties to be subverted into the reactionary channels of Stalinist strategy. And we dare not allow it to be beguiled by such types as Wallace. Whether Wallace sticks with "his" party, or switches (there is ample evidence in Macdonald's book to permit us to expect anything of the man), his kind has nothing to offer but disaster. "Henry Wallace—The Man and the Myth" is sufficient of a dossier on this score. The answer to the capitalist system, its political parties, its crises and its wars lies not in Stalinist reaction, or the scheming of their front men but in their very opposite: independent working class organization, socialist program.

WORLD POLITICS

The Downfall of "Dev"

After 15 years, the Fianna Fail party of de Valera came to an inglorious end in Eire and its famous leader was put out of office. Several of our friends and comrades in Dublin and Belfast have written to us about the recent general election in Ireland and its significance. Here we have put together extracts from these various letters to give our readers a clearer picture of precisely what did happen.

The policy of the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Irish Section of the Fourth International, was to lend critical support to the candidates of the National Labor Party. In a manifesto directed to the workers of Ireland, from which we give extracts below, this position was advocated:

"On the back of the world crises of capitalism (just emerging from its second bloody conflict in twenty years) Fianna Fail (de Valera's party) began its head-long dash to obscurity.

"So ends an epoch in the inglorious history of Irish capitalism. Fifteen years of Fianna Fail has meant to the working class both economic and political repression. Too well the organized workers remember the years of the Means Test. The anti-Trade Union bill; the offences against the State Act; the censorship of private correspondence and working class literature; the persecution of republican and working class interests; the terrorist methods of the Fianna Fail 'security' police and the host of chronicled and unchronicled acts of bribery, corruption, political gangsterism and the split engineered by Lemass in the working class movement with the connivance of the present leadership of the National Labor Party and the Congress of Irish Unions. Workers, ask these so-called labor leaders about the secret meetings with the Department of Industry and Commerce before the T. U. split and the Standstill Order and the anti-TU bill."

"Fianna Fail, Fine Gael, Clann and the National Laborers (that couldn't serve fish and chips) all are seeking to protect the faith, prestige and political integrity of this ancient nation."

COALITION OF FIVE GROUPS

Among other things, the Irish party is the first official section of the Fourth International to come out publicly, in a manifesto directed to workers, equally "Against support to capitalism and Stalinist totalitarianism," marking its break with the official policy of defense of Russia.

Our informant further writes, in describing the defeat of de Valera, the end of his political rule—for the time being, at least—that, "The General Election demonstrates a shift away from de Valera, mainly by sections of professional workers and the rural and urban middle classes. Clann na Poblacta, led by Sean McBride, ex-Chief-of-Staff of the Irish Republican Army and top-flight lawyer, personifies this tendency. The Clann's 'New Deal' politics and the all-inclusiveness of its appeal, made serious inroads on the regroupment of the Labor Party.

"However, the Labor Party did make some headway: it doubled its quota of first preference votes and almost doubled its parliamentary representation, in face of the morale shattering split engineered by de Valera in the unions. Petty-bourgeois influence is still the dominating factor in Ireland due to the nature of the economy. This type of thought has always permeated the

labor movement with the exception of the Connolly period.

"The outcome of the general election has displaced de Valera's Fianna Fail and has placed in power a coalition composed of five groups and 'Independents.' The line-up is as follows: the old-line Fine Gael, Labor, petty-bourgeois Clann na Poblacta, small-farmers Clann na Talham, National Labor—who denied their illegitimacy at the hands of de Valera and voted against him—and a group of independent operators that range from political boy-scouts to full-blown imperialists.

"The whole character of the coalition is shot through with irreconcilable class conflicts and can only last as long as their horse-deals remain discreet and maneuverable. All the coalition groups are attempting to do is to smash the de Valera hyndis and retrench financially for another election in the near future. The interim program of the coalition is a composite of programmatic points of the different groupings. Abolition of the recently imposed tax on beer, cigarettes, cinemas and greyhound racing. Improved health service and reforms in local government and education.

"Every party in the coalition has compromised itself in this attempt to discredit de Valera and to retain the prerogative—of the Prime Minister's—of calling another general election at the propitious moment."

HANG TOGETHER—OR SEPARATELY!

And finally, writing from Belfast in Northern Ireland, our correspondent Bob Armstrong summarizes the election in the following terms:

"The election underscores the fact that Eire still remains a conservative backwater amongst the nations. Social relations have become petrified. The peasants, despite their drab conditions, feel that their little farms give them a stake in the system. The influence of the church is terrific. Full employment, in Britain acts as a safety valve, drawing many of the potentially rebellious elements of the youth. Political adventurers of the stamp of McBride hardly exist in the more important countries. McBride is a former IRA (Irish Republican Army) figure. He formed Clann na Poblacta out of the disintegrating ranks of the IRA; and out of a crew of careerists who sensed the waning of de Valera's influence he formed the leadership. Overnight he abandoned his program—a mish-mash of contradictory reformist slogans, with the end of partition as a focal point—for the sake of a cabinet position.

"The Labor Party—which gained some seats, reflecting a modest left swing among the workers—has likewise been sold up the river by its leadership, greedy for the prestige of office. The coalition is easily explained. If de Valera had been permitted to form a cabinet he would have seized the first promising opportunity to go to the poll again, and he would in all probability have completely smashed the Clann; thus ensuring a stable Fianna Fail regime for a further period. Having been shut out of office for so long, the rival politicians couldn't bear to think of sitting in the opposition benches any longer. Hang together, or hang separately! There you have the whole meaning of the coalition.

"Immediately following the Eire election there was the special meeting of the Northern Labor Party to work out a policy on partition. Decision: To have no policy. Members will take a position in public according to the dictates of their own conscience."

A Line -- But What a Line!

SWP Makes Phenomenal Analysis in Rejecting Wallace Support

In a burst of virtuous candor, the Socialist Workers Party reports in The Militant of March 1 that the plenary session of the party considered the Wallace question and voted 22 to 1, with four abstentions, against supporting Wallace.

That something was afoot was obvious to all readers of The Militant who followed that paper's phenomenal coverage of the Wallace issue. (Of course, readers, or for that matter many of the SWP members, were not let in on the secret that there was a division of opinion on so important a matter.) Now that the matter has been decided by decision of the plenum, and democratically reported, the line is still... phenomenal.

When the Wallace candidacy story first "broke," The Militant responded with an article that made some sense.

From the Opium Den

"STALINISTS UTILIZE MASS PRESSURE TO MAKE DEAL WITH CZECH CAPITALISTS"

—Headline in The Militant, March 8, 1948.

That is, it related the Wallace Party to Stalinist plans for manipulation of the working class. Thereafter, however, The Militant diligently covered the Wallace news each week and achieved the miraculous in so doing. For it managed to report the Wallace campaign with, in some cases, no reference at all, in other cases, passing, incidental reference to the Stalinists. As we observe elsewhere in this issue, to discuss the Wallace movement without constant and repeated reference to the Stalinists who conceived it, is indeed an achievement... like reporting Czechoslovakia without reference to what the Stalinists are actually doing there. (And The Militant has accomplished that feat as well.)

FACTS WITHOUT FACTS

From The Militant a reader could learn that Wallace was a demagogue and that he's "to the left" of Truman, and "even" of the trade union leaders. But a reader could not learn anything about Wallace's connection with Stalinism. In The Militant, a reader could see a certain amount of criticism of the Wallace party (as "third capitalist party" is "inadequate," has "weaknesses"). But very little of the kind of criticism which

would lead the reader not to support Wallace!

And the fact is that a great many people, including SWP members, had the impression that the SWP was supporting Wallace, which it was in effect. We had occasion to talk to some SWP members in various parts of the country recently, and encouraged by what seemed to be The Militant's line, they seemed to be drifting toward support of Wallace—if not toward advocating official party support (the party will run its own candidate), then individual support (like when the Stalinists ran Browder technically, but actually supported Roosevelt).

To be generous, and even if The Militant and SWP didn't let "outsiders" into the secret of dissent, we might assume that The Militant line was what it was because the National Committee of the SWP was still in the process of discussing the matter. We might, that is, if the statement by the NC, a statement which categorically and completely rejects support of Wallace, were very much better than what The Militant has had up to now. The NC statement tears Wallace apart as a capitalist candidate, says he is no good and that nobody should vote for him and that he can injure independent political labor action. But how does it do it? We quote:

"The liberal bourgeois politician, Wallace; personally dominates and directs it (the new party—Ed.), setting its tone and formulating its policy. He is subject to control by no one. The Stalinists, concerned solely with their pressure campaign for a compromise agreement between Washington and the Kremlin [what a polite way to put it—Ed.] obediently follow in his footsteps. The organized labor movement is absent. Actually the bourgeois and petty bourgeois liberals are in command; the Stalinists serve as their lieutenants and the ranks trail along."

IMPROVEMENT IS SMALL

There The Militant and the SWP have finally gotten around to bracketing Wallace with the Stalinists. But in what a way! So the Stalinists are merely "obediently following"? They are only the "lieutenants"? Most people seem to have the impression, based upon a compilation of facts, that the Stalinists generalised the movement and that whatever may happen to Wallace and his party later, it takes its orders from the Stalinists TODAY. (We are caught wondering: if the Stalinists were "captains" and

not "lieutenants," would it be an improvement, according to the SWP?)

That is pretty much the sum and substance of what The Militant and the SWP have to say about the Stalinists and this third party in an official NC statement! More than before perhaps; but, in reality, the addition is small improvement. Regardless of how accurate other things said in the statement may be, the whole of it adds up to a disgrace by the simple fact of its skirting what is most essential.

There are those who see the SWP behaving increasingly as the left wing of Stalinism—as in union policy, Wallace policy, etc. But what kind of wisdom on the Wallace movement can be expected from people who write that in Czechoslovakia the Stalinists are capitulating to Benes?

SWP and Unity

We've got to report it some place and this is as good a place as any. The same issue of The Militant which carries the SWP statement on Wallace, and their decision to run Farrell Dobbs for president, reports:

"Owing to the explicit repudiation of unity by the Nov. 1947 plenary decision of the Workers Party, the plenum [that is, the SWP's plenum—Ed.] in a special resolution recognized that the question of SWP-WP unity was terminated as a realistic possibility. The vote was unanimous, with two abstentions."

Readers who wish to know what the WP actually said in its November, 1947 plenary decision can read the full text of the WP resolution in the December, 1947, issue of The New Internationalist.

OFF LIMITS

By James M. Fenwick

THE WAC AND THE WAVE PROGRAM

In a recent article in which he raised a modest alarm at the growing militarization of the United States, Hanson W. Baldwin, the military analyst, made an acute observation.

"There are," he said, "some purely military measures which... give a few of our officers—particularly those of our 'civilian components'—some disquiet. We are, for instance, planning to perpetuate the wartime Wacs and Waves and to put women into uniform permanently as part of our armed forces—something that would have been unthinkable twenty years ago, and an act of far-reaching psychological importance."

Baldwin is of course right when he says that such a policy would have been unthinkable twenty years ago. The tide of post-World War I disillusion was then running high. No serious effort to increase the size of the army would have had the slightest chance of success—nor was one attempted. At that time the thought of proposing the addition of women's units hardly came within the realm even of speculation.

The army was very small, was entirely volunteer, and was largely composed of the fiftysam and jetsam of society. The size of the armed forces was governed in good part by the low esteem in which the military life was held, the availability of civilian jobs, and— from the point of view of ruling class—the geographical isolation from the smouldering fires in Europe, a false estimation of the entente forces, and a lack of understanding of the scale of the next war. The problem of augmenting the "manpower" of the army was not even posed.

There also existed at that time considerable respect for the disabilities of women caused by their physiological makeup, their role as bearers and nurturers of children, and their position as homemakers. That there was also a considerable portion of Male Superiority in all this goes without saying.

THE CHANGING TIMES

In the past twenty years all of these conditions which militated against the creation of such institutions as the Wacs and the Waves have largely disappeared.

Cynicism about war has been supplanted by cynicism-plus-numbed-acceptance. This has been indeed, on the one hand, by the monumental growth of the capitalist state's powers of physical, mental, and psychological coercion, and, on the other, by the decline of socialist opposition to war and its replacement by Stalinist methods. The inability to oppose war as a whole means the inability to oppose its constituent elements such as the Wacs and the Waves, for instance.

The world-wide commitments of the United States have destroyed the small army concept. It is recognized that the next war will be more nearly total than the last. England and Germany established the pattern with women units in World War II. Since the manpower commitments promise to be so exceptionally large in World War III, it is important that at least a token Wac and Wave organization be set up now to facilitate the conscription of women which will be inevitable later.

One of the superiorities of capitalism over feudalism was the enhanced status of women which it permitted. The decline of capitalism in the past twenty years has undermined many of the good aspects of standards and practices in regard to women which have been set up. The establishment of the Wacs and the Waves is in part an example of this trend. To the extent which a rational intellectual, psychological, sexual, and marital life is possible under capitalism, institutions such as the Wacs and the Waves inhibit it. It is true that the military life destroys many old fetishes. But it offers little in return other than a brutalizing military atmosphere.

POSITIVE ASPECTS

There is a little matter of dialectics involved here, however. With all its iniquities, the factory system removed women from the stultifying company of children, stoves, husbands, and mops, and brought them in touch with the real world.

The Wacs and Waves performed the same service in World War II. Therein lies the reason why more than one girl with a taste for freedom joined the armed forces during the war. It allowed her to break out of a world of soap operas, dotting parents, hysteria, simple-mindedness, and "The Ladies' Home Journal." It gave her in some small measure what the women of Europe have experienced in tragic fullness: a sense of the provisional character of existence in our epoch. It raised their social awareness a little.

Life in the Wacs and the Waves will become even more instructive in the future—especially when these services are forced, as they will be, to resort to conscription. The smug complacency of so many American women, based on the unparalleled productive capacity of U. S. capitalism—and so revolting when contrasted with the fate of women abroad—will be submitted to rude shocks. Their social consciousness will be awakened as it never could be under normal conditions.

But these positive aspects of the Wac and Wave program have only latent value in themselves. For their force to be felt will require the intervention of socialist ideology. Otherwise the program will indeed be solely "an act of far-reaching psychological importance." That is to say, in proposing to establish the Wacs and the Waves as permanent institutions in the armed forces U. S. capital is clearly declaring its intention to draw the womanhood of the country into the next holocaust.

Everything, everywhere for the flames!

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

Vol. 12, No. 11 March 15, 1948
Emanuel Garrett, Editor
Editorial Board: Albert Gates,
Henry Judd, Irving Howe
Business Manager: Paul Bern

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

Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24,
1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879.

HENRY WALLACE
Man and Myth
By DWIGHT MACDONALD
\$2.50

Order your copy from
LABOR ACTION BOOK
SERVICE
4 Court Sq., L. C. C. 1, N. Y.
Price includes postage

Limited Number of Copies Available
The Permanent Revolution
By Leon Trotsky
New—Cloth—Complete Edition
Printed in India
\$3.50 Per Copy

Order From:
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Sq. Long Island City 1, N. Y.

SOME THINGS ARE SIMPLY UNTHINKABLE!

One of the reasons it is so difficult to play the unappetizing role of "liberal" front for Stalinism is that the Stalinists, especially as their masters in Europe become more powerful, are so ungrateful for services rendered. You'd think for example that the Stalinists would be all beatitude and beams toward Wallace and Taylor, who are helping them put across their main political plank for America: the defeat, at whatever cost, of the pro-Marshall plan forces—i.e., in this case the victory of Taft and the Republicans. But no, even though they provide the claque for Wallace's meetings, the political basis for the Wallace movement and the workers for his campaign, they are not ready to countenance everything Wallace and Taylor say. For, with their usual foresight, they anticipate a situation in which Wallace and Taylor might desert them; and they prepare for such an eventuality.

An amusing instance of this "ingratitude" is seen in the Daily Worker of March 1, 1948, where Joseph Starobin, Stalinist foreign affairs expert, takes Taylor to task for having dared to think that the Czech coup had anything to do with Russia. When asked about this by a Daily Worker reporter Taylor had replied, "I imagine it was the result of pressure by the Russians."

This Commissar Starobin cannot countenance. He informs Taylor that "the minute anyone 'imagines' that all progressive change is 'Soviet-inspired' he weakens himself as a fighter for progress." And while it is true, says Starobin, that "Nothing which is democratic and progressive can be anti-Soviet..." still "to grant for a moment, Czechoslovakia's changes are under Soviet pressure has the effect of robbing each people of their nationality, their specific character, their own inherent right to determine their own affairs..."

This late quote is precious. Starobin wants Wallace and Taylor not merely to help defeat the Marshall Plan, but also to condone each Stalinist move in Europe. Otherwise, there is danger for them. And mind you, if you admit that Russia had a hand in the Czech events, then you are "robbing each people of their nationality."

It would seem to most people that if you make such an admission—which even the mildest attention to facts requires—you are then suggesting that it is Stalinist Russia which "robs each people of their nationality," as in fact it does.

But no. Since such a thought cannot even be countenanced in the Stalinist mental concentration camp, it means that you—whoever you are,

Senator Taylor or an intelligent person—are "robbing each people of their nationality."

So each time Stalinist Russia forces another country into its orbit, those who notice that Russian pressure was involved are depriving the unfortunate victim of its "inherent right to determine (its) own affairs."

AND USEFULNESS MAY END

This sort of Stalinist logic, whatever momentary amusement it may afford, is, however, quite consistent with the entire Stalinist approach. No matter what you do, keep intoning certain words and phrases: "progressive, democratic, freedom-loving." In this way many are fooled and misled.

(What is truly tragic, however, is that there are some people who are fooled not by such words as "progressive" and "democratic" but by other words such as "nationalization of industry" and "degenerated workers' state" which lead to the support of Stalinist totalitarianism.)

In the meantime, however, let Wallace and Taylor observe: at the moment they are great heroes of the "progressive coalition." As soon as their usefulness to Stalinism is over, they will be dumped as unceremoniously as their European counterparts. Starobin's article is a first sign.

Conference Asks Commission Of Inquiry on Slave Labor

By EUGENE KELLER

NEW YORK—The Workers Defense League held an all-day conference on "Forced Labor—World Menace to Freedom" on February 28, including AFL and CIO unions. Among the speakers were: Jack Altman (United Wholesale, Retail and Department Store Employees, CIO), Martin Gerber (regional director, UAW-CIO), Israel Feinberg (International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL), H. L. Mitchell, president, National Farmers Union; Harold Isaacs, Eugene Lyons, James T. Farrell.

Designed not so much to cite the facts on slave labor in Russia and some colonial area, or peonage in the South, as to voice concern with the growing threat of slave labor, the conference attempted to counteract an apathy which abets the spread of slave labor.

While three simultaneous panels dealt with peonage in the U. S., slave

labor in the colonial areas and slave labor in Russia, it was only natural that conditions in so vast and powerful a country as Russia were regarded as the most dangerous threat.

ABETTED BY ALLIES

The WDL needs no apologies for "jumping on Russia," said James T. Farrell, adding that the Stalinists, the Henry Wallaces etc. are no less reactionary than the Rankins, Bilbos and the other members of the House "Un-American" Committee, for they blind themselves to the crimes of those whom they defend. In Russia, he said, a new social class has come into existence, a class without hope, with its humanity almost destroyed, serving as the economic base of a police state. Starvation and the absence of means to satisfy the most primitive needs are used to dehumanize and destroy the moral fiber of men and women. Only "blind monkeys"—the

Stalinists and their apologists—can, in the year 1948, equate industrial to social progress.

That all the Allies, specifically the U. S., share responsibility for slave labor in Russia was repeatedly brought out. Reference was made to the Yalta agreement, which permits the use of prisoners of war as slave laborers. Four million Germans remain unrepatriated, three years after the war's end; of them two million are still in Russia, the other two million in Western Europe. The Allied Control Council in its proclamation No. 2 (August 13, 1945) agreed to the drafting of manpower in its respective zones in Germany. Hull, in his memoirs, published in the New York Times of Feb. 27, repeatedly mentions Roosevelt's unreserved concurrence in the drafting and use of German manpower, which, in effect, is the equivalent of slave labor.

H. L. Mitchell, president of the National Farmers Union, stated that peonage was common in the U. S., where a sharecropper owed a debt to a landowner. The man's labor power becomes a lien on his debt. His creditor, if he chooses, can "sell" this debt to another landowner, and the sharecropper's labor power becomes this landowner's "property." Aother common abuse is suffered by Mexicans imported into the Southern border regions as farm and range laborers.

All speakers supported the struggles, past and projected, of the WDL against slave labor and peonage, no matter where it appeared. They also endorsed, and promised the aid of their organizations, in the specific actions proposed: the setting up of a commission of inquiry, consisting of prominent persons, and charged with taking testimony on slave labor in all major centers of the world, as well as the exhausting of all and any other channels of protest and information (including the United Nations), to make people conscious of the existence and danger of slave labor.

While the speakers evidenced a will to fight on this issue, we cannot fail to remark that most (not all) of them were not quite so militant in days past, when militancy might have "embarrassed" a war effort designed to serve and further the interests of the very forces which generate slave labor. If today a commission of inquiry is needed—and it is—to dramatize the facts on slave labor, it is not amiss to recall that many of those present at the conference contributed to the apathy and moral callousness against which they now inveigh.

A "world-wide abolitionist movement," called for by Rev. Donald Harrington, chairman of WDL, can be a progressive force only if it helps to organize the third camp of the world working class. For neither Russia nor the United States is capable of abolishing anything save humanity itself.

he adds, it is "to be" replaced by an American mandate—i.e., in the future. Perhaps. In the future, even the hysterically assimilationist New York Times, which frightens its readers with the bogey of a Russian foothold in Palestine, may be proved correct.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE?

But this has not happened yet. It is only one of the possible eventualities which may crystallize from the situation (in my opinion, an unlikely eventuality). What happens in the future will be determined by many unforeseeable factors, one of the most important of which is the question of whether the Jews get arms or not.

If the Jews get arms, it should be clear that this will deprive imperialists of any excuse to intervene. Even the sending in of outside troops would not necessarily change the situation basically (any more than the use of British force changed the situation in Syria and Lebanon). Barring a major imperialist war, the only possibility for a decisive change for the worse is the establishment of a new outright mandate by some other power, or by Britain. Neither of these will happen as long as the Jews are armed.

I shall discuss some of the other errors in Comrade Judd's presentation in a future article.

Leon SHIELDS, Feb. 21, 1948.

DISPUTE POSITION TAKEN BY LABOR ACTION

Contributions to the Discussion on the Palestine Issue

"Cease Fire!" Partition Slogan

Comrade Judd's elaborate defense of the "Editorial Tragedy" on Palestine fails, in my opinion, to clear that editorial of the basic charge leveled against it, namely, that it HEDGED on the partition question and evaded giving a POLITICALLY RELEVANT answer to the IMMEDIATE problem of Palestine.

For some mysterious reason Judd's brief compels him to resort to crude misrepresentations of Palestine realities.

As an example, Judd insists on speaking of the fighting in Palestine as if the Jewish nationalist movement has "gone to war to affect this partition."

Is this the case or is the reverse true?

The real situation can be briefly summarized thus: The Mufti-controlled Arab nationalist movement, directly abetted by the six Arab states and indirectly by Great Britain, is waging planned warfare against the Jewish population of Palestine.

The strategic aim of this war is to create unmanageable chaos and violence which will convince the UN that partition is not realizable without major armed intervention. This, it is hoped, will lead to a reopening of the question by the UN.

Thus understood, the interests of the anti-partition struggle run directly counter to the appeal to "Cease Fire."

On the other hand, no circumstance other than the cessation of the fratricidal hostilities can do more to insure the implementation of the partition plan.

"Cease Fire" is in essence a pro-partition slogan.

It is no surprise, therefore, for those acquainted with the Palestine situation (which unfortunately does not include Judd nor the writer of the disputed editorial) that appeals to "Cease Fire" have come ONLY from the pro-partitionist camp and not from the Arab nationalist camp.

Judd apparently has the delusion that LABOR ACTION is alone or was the first to issue the call to "Cease Fire."

Comrade Judd "discovers" a contradiction between Al Findley's support of the slogan "Cease Fire" and Leon Shields' demand to break the treacherous imperialist arms blockade against the Jews of Palestine.

Without claiming analogous situations but merely to illustrate a point, let us take a not too far-fetched instance of a prolonged race riot between Southern poor whites and Negroes.

Would we not, in such an instance, call for an immediate cessation of the fratricidal rioting, and at the same time vigorously oppose any governmental restrictions on the sale of arms to the Negroes for self-defense as playing into the hands of the lynchers.

Is there anything in the Palestine picture that would justify the denial of the right of self-defense to the Jewish population of that country? I hope we are not going to hear echoes of the Stalinist line of 1929 which placed the stamp of aggression on the legitimate defense efforts of the Jewish population.

RESULTS OF PARTITION DEFEAT

It must be apparent to even Judd that the war AGAINST partition could be waged only with the aid of foreign arms, the intervention by foreign recruits and with the almost direct diplomatic support and indirect military aid of the imperialist power occupying Palestine.

It should also be apparent that the strategic and oil interests of American imperialism are pushing the United States into support of British policy. The conjunctural election aspirations of the Truman administration and the Republican Party alone stand in the way of a complete reversal of U. S. policy.

At this point the defeat of partition can result in: (1) Continued British rule of Palestine under a Morrison-Grady plan; or (2) an Arab national state. Obviously, the former is the more probable eventuality.

Looked at in this way, the struggle against partition is, in effect, a struggle against the early independence of Palestine from continued Anglo-American rule. (This view is confirmed by Russia's support of partition, which stems from the realiza-

tion that partition is the only plan likely to tear strategic Palestine out of the tight control of Anglo-American imperialism.)

FOR CRITICAL SUPPORT

Partition is, unfortunately, the only way out of the impasse. It is admittedly a bad solution. It must, however, be accepted as the politically indicated transition stage to a truly democratic solution—a unified, bi-national Palestine.

Partition is the de jure recognition of the distrust engendered between the two peoples. The Arabs do not trust the Jews and the Jews do not trust the Arabs.

This means that two states in Palestine is the only way that BOTH peoples of Palestine can, TODAY, gain a measure of self-determination and independence.

The truth of this thesis is not diminished by pointing to imperialist forces that fish in the troubled waters. ANY solution offered today runs the danger of being messed up by imperialist meddling.

Partition IS realizable WITHOUT imperialist intervention if the active enlistment of Anglo-Arab League imperialism in the anti-partition war were ended by the progressive anti-imperialist forces of the world.

Judd insists that the right to self-determination can't be invoked even as a permissive justification of partition in Palestine. Why? Because the Arabs too are oppressed by imperialism and are struggling for national liberation. Hence they cannot be considered oppressors. If the Arabs are not oppressors, asks Judd, how can you invoke the right of self-determination against them?

Our honored editor must indeed be suffering from historical amnesia. Else how could he have ignored the many instances in modern history where several peoples fought to free themselves from a common imperialist oppressor and, yet, in the very moment of liberation, the more numerous people attempted to deprive the smaller people of its national rights.

Comrade Judd's masterful study in confusion deserves further consideration, but the 1,000 word limitation has been reached.

Ed Findley.

Charges Errors In Judd Article

The following are some of the errors in Comrade Judd's article on Palestine:

1) His conception of what is happening in the country is given most clearly in this analogy: "Suppose Britain had proposed an Indian division unacceptable to the Hindus but accepted by the Moslem League. And that then the Moslems, armed and supplied by British imperialism, had gone to war to support this partition? This... would be closer to the picture presented by Palestine." This means—if it means anything at all—that the British proposed the partition, that the Jews accepted it, and that the British are supplying the Jews with the weapons against the Arabs.

I shall not repeat the facts which I cited in my last article to show that the British are straining every ounce of strength at their command to block partition, and to impose unity under Arab domination upon the country. That this was the main reason why, during the war, they followed a policy of having as many Jews exterminated as possible is documented in almost so many words in the Morgenthau Diaries. During the past two weeks they have taken the following actions: (1) Intercepted another ship of Jewish refugees; (2) protested to Bulgaria against its permitting Jews to use Bulgarian ports; (3) bombed a Jewish newspaper (that this was done by British police was revealed by an Arab paper, which the British have since suspended); (4) warned, through Creech Jones, against lifting the arms embargo; (5) continued openly to supply the Arabs with arms.

Upon what single fact does Judd base his opinion that the British are for the partition of Palestine? What more could British imperialism possibly do, short of declaring war on the Jews, to make Comrade Judd understand that it is bent upon imposing unity upon the country?

2) Judd asks us: "Is it not obvious that it is intervening imperialism—who are stimulating the firing?" Of course this is obvious. To establish

an open flow of arms to one side, while maintaining a blockade and embargo against the other, certainly stimulates the first (the Arabs) to violence, while forcing the other side to defend itself (also by violence). Britain certainly gains from this. But there is nothing that the Jews can do to change this—the violence can be stopped only by the Arabs. It is thoroughly false to say smugly that both sides are equally reactionary. Don't we have a right to expect everyone to understand such a simple relationship?

3) Comrade Judd states that one of the reasons why he does not support partition in Palestine is that, unlike the situation in India, the Arabs did not agree to it. This implies that if the Hindus had not agreed to permit partition, he would not have supported Moslem right to it. Even the slightest reflection should show that to support self-determination only on the basis that the dominant nation agrees to it, is to oppose the right of self-determination. (However, whereas in India a nation has been partitioned, in Palestine only a geographic territory has been divided between two different nations.)

4) Comrade Judd tells us that before we can support a national struggle, "it must be carried on independently... of any third imperialist force." Until the triumph of socialism on an international scale, an imperialist force will never be absent from any colonial struggle anywhere on earth. A recent example is the case of Syria and Lebanon. Ever since World War I Britain has backed Arab nationalism in these two countries against France, and against the Jews in Palestine. The decisive pressure in forcing France to quit these countries was supplied by England. Yet no one would have refused to support the Arabs on that account, or demanded that the struggle be suspended until England and France composed their differences, so as to have a pure colonial revolution.

5) "Pray, do not tell us the British mandate is ending—yes, to be replaced by the UN mandate, controlled by America," says Comrade Judd. In this amazing sentence Comrade Judd himself recognizes that which he prays us not to tell him—i.e., that the British mandate IS ending. But,

98 Percent of Goal Reached in Fund Drive

By YETTA BARSH, Fund Drive Director

MARCH 8—Although this report is of all Fund Drive money received up to deadline time, and though we are compelled to report that with \$14,697.83 collected, we are \$302.17 short of our \$15,000 goal, we feel that we are so close to the \$15,000 that it is not unwarranted to say that the Fund Drive was successfully fulfilled. The Drive has officially ended; nevertheless, we have received assurances from a number of the participating units that they are still making collections and that they expect to be able to continue to send in money on the Drive during the next couple of weeks.

New York City, which has contributed a total of \$3845.98, or 96 percent of its quota, reports that it will not only be able to collect the balance of \$154.02 for 100 percent fulfillment, but that it will exceed its quota by a few hundred dollars in the next two or three weeks. San Francisco, which worked so systematically and energetically at the collection of its sizeable quota of \$1,000, missed out only by \$37; in all likelihood, it will be able to raise the remaining \$37 of its quota. Detroit reports that it is holding a social for the benefit of the Fund Drive on March 13, and that it expects that the profits of that affair, plus the additional pledges which are being collected, will raise its total Fund Drive contributions to over \$900

(quota: \$800). Cleveland too expects to be able to send in additional contributions.

We have not yet heard from Los Angeles as to the possibilities of it increasing its contributions which now total \$406.50 (81 percent). The National Office promises that it will be able to increase its total by at least \$200. As was reported in this column some weeks ago, circumstances beyond the control of the National Office make it impossible for it to come much closer to its large quota.

On the whole, the response of our various units in the Drive has been good. The performances of our new branches especially deserve commendation: Pittsburgh raised almost double its \$25 quota; West Virginia fulfilled completely its \$150 quota, despite many difficulties; San Diego increased its total pledges to \$26.25, despite the fact that it had no quota and was organized as a unit of our Party during the last month of the Drive.

As is so often the case, the youth led all of the units in this Drive in the rate of oversubscriptions; the Manhattan Unit of the Socialist Youth League had a quota of \$30 and succeeded in raising a total of \$72. Baltimore, Buffalo and Philadelphia have been mentioned in this column on numerous occasions for their early and sizable oversubscriptions in the Drive. St. Louis, Connecticut, Hibbing, San Pedro, Reading, Streator, Cleveland, Seattle, Akron and Newark also deserve mention for their oversubscriptions.

Despite their modest size, our Ohio branches have done remarkably well in this Drive. We would like our readers and friends to know that these branches made substantial contributions to our Party just prior to the commencement of the Drive. Our Akron Branch has been particularly generous, and when one considers that its quota was set prior to the transfer out of this branch of a number of its members and that it nevertheless went over its \$400 quota, only then is one able to appreciate the sacrifice and energy of our Akron comrades.

Since this marks the official end of our Fund Drive, our readers may be interested in the following recapitulation: Of the 28 units participating in the Drive from its very beginning, (the twenty-ninth unit, San Diego, never had a quota) 15 exceeded their respective quotas and 8 others fulfilled them completely; 5 participating units did not fulfill their quotas. New York City (which achieved 96 percent and which promises to go over its quota), San Francisco (which achieved 96 percent and which may fulfil its quota), Miscellaneous (93 percent),

Los Angeles (81 percent) and National Office (81 percent fulfillment with the likelihood of increasing its contributions).

In conclusion, we want to thank all of our members, friends and sympathizers who have contributed so generously to our Party and to our work. We hope to be able to prove to you our appreciation by continuation and improvement of our work and of our publication, program. We shall be happy to report to you at a later date the sum total collections in this Drive after all of the units have collected and sent to us their pledges outstanding.

Branch	Quota	Pct.
Manhattan SYL	\$30.00	\$72.00 240
Pittsburgh	25.00	45.00 180
St. Louis	35.00	56.00 160
Buffalo	600.00	800.00 133
Philadelphia	400.00	502.50 126
Baltimore	100.00	123.75 124
Connecticut	50.00	60.00 120
Hibbing	5.00	6.00 120
San Pedro	100.00	120.00 120
Reading	75.00	87.00 116
Streator	20.00	23.00 115
Cleveland	500.00	572.00 114
Seattle	400.00	440.00 110
Akron	400.00	435.75 109
Newark	400.00	408.84 102
Boston	60.00	60.00 100
Chicago	1,500.00	1,500.00 100
Detroit	800.00	802.00 100
Indiana	50.00	50.00 100
New York Misc.	20.00	20.00 100
Oregon	50.00	50.00 100
West Virginia	150.00	150.00 100
Youngstown	200.00	200.00 100
New York City	4,000.00	3,845.98 96
San Francisco	1,000.00	963.26 96
Miscellaneous	40.00	37.00 93
Los Angeles	500.00	406.50 81
National Office	3,500.00	2,835.00 81
San Diego	—	26.25 —
	\$15,000.00	\$14,697.83 98

Read and Subscribe to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

NOW OUT!

The NEW INTERNATIONAL February, 1948

NIGHTFALL OF CAPITALISM By Max Shachtman

INSIDE THE STALIN-HITLER DEAL by Ricky Saunders

WHAT MAKES HENRY RUN? by R. Faban

JAMES CONNOLLY ON DEMOCRACY by James T. Farrell

CHINESE TROTSKYISM IN THE WORLD WAR by Wang Ming-yuen

THE SECRET LIFE OF JAMES BURNHAM by Louis Cassel

703-C-1080

25 CENTS

The New INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

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

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

Enclosed is \$1.25 — \$2.00 for

Six Month — One Year Subscription to

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZONE NO. _____ STATE _____

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

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

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

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

Address.....

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