

Work for a Workers World;
Join the Workers Party!

LABOR ACTION

MAY 17, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Palestine Deadline Near; UN, Russia Play Power Politics With Jews, Arabs

By AL FINDLEY

While the UN Assembly talks and talks, the fateful day of May 15 nears for Palestine. On that day Britain will legally relinquish its mandate and it is doubtful that the UN will be able to forge a new foreign rule for Palestine by then.

The Jews will declare their independence and the existence of a Jewish state. There is still some disagreement in the leading circles of the Jewish Agency on whether to declare a "de facto" state and leave the door open for some form of UN "neutral emergency administration" or declare a full-fledged independent state. Unlike the propaganda declarations, official statements are guarded on this point. Should Jewish military success continue in Palestine, the chances are that a "de jure" (legal) state will be created.

The U. S. is putting the utmost pressure on the Jewish Agency not to declare an independent state. On the other hand, it is reported that three countries in the Russian bloc will recognize the Jewish state as soon as it is declared. England too is reported ready to give "de facto" recognition to a Jewish state.

LULL IN FIGHTING

As soon as the mandate ends, the Jews hope to get considerable arms, now waiting in European ports. Jewish officials hope to bring in 150,000 Jewish refugees in the next twelve months, whether fighting continues or not.

In the last two weeks, there has been a lull in the Palestine fighting. A cease-fire has been arranged for Jerusalem, which may become a truce. The British, with about a quarter of the force they previously had in Palestine, are now keeping some order. In practice, what the present British order amounts to is guaranteeing to the Arabs those portions of Palestine assigned to them by the UN. This once again proves that had there been any will, there would have been little bloodshed in Palestine.

All reports of Arab countries invading Palestine have not materialized. The United States is exerting pressure to prevent open warfare in order to keep Russia from intervening. While organized warfare by the Arab League is unlikely, continued incursion of Arab "volunteers" can be expected. The war council of the Arab League has broken up with the withdrawal of Abdullah. To forestall Abdullah, the Syrian and Lebanese who had favored large-scale "guerrilla" warfare as soon as partition was voted, are now taking a pessimistic view and have declared that it is now too late for invasion, since a "Jewish state has already arisen." They are trying to place the blame for this on Abdullah, for waiting until May 15.

Abdullah threatens to invade all of Palestine. There seems little doubt that he will march. The question is how far he will go. There are still many who hope and believe that Abdullah, under the guidance of the British, will take only the Arab section. This may take place, but only after an attempt, or at least a pretense, at the conquest of all of Palestine.

POWER POLITICS

In the UN the game of power politics continues. The U. S. has given

up its plan for trusteeship, since it could not get British and French troops to patrol Palestine. Instead, the State Department is now supporting the British proposal for a "non-political emergency administration" to carry out the essential minimum functions that are needed by both sections of Palestine and the economic union. The aim of the United States is not to preserve the peace and to save lives, but to maintain the Anglo-American domination of the Near East, and above all, to prevent Russia from moving in. In their haste—and with supreme confidence in their power to dictate any solution—they failed to work out a plan that was feasible even from their OWN imperialist point of view.

Russia is playing a dual game. On one hand, in the UN Russia supports partition. On the other hand her stooges, the Arabian Stalinist parties, continue to oppose a Jewish state; her satellite, Czechoslovakia, sells arms to the Arabs, and Yugoslavia officially allows recruiting for the Mufti forces. Yet these governments will be the first to recognize the Jewish state.

Like the U. S., Russia is not interested in the Jews or Arabs, but in the military and strategic advantage to herself. Russia is primarily interested in getting English troops out of Palestine. At the same time she is maintaining her contacts with the Mufti elements and may in the near future repeat the inglorious performance of 1929, when the Stalinists supported the Mufti pogroms.

UNITY ESSENTIAL

Now that the formation of the Jewish state in Palestine seems to be in the bag, it is especially important to remember that for the Jews all over the world there will be little improvement over their present insecurity and weakness. Palestine will be able to accommodate only 6 to 10 per cent of the Jews. About 90 per cent of the Jews will remain outside of Palestine. In the last analysis, the 6 to 10 per cent will not be

(Continued on page 2)

Natalia Trotsky Charges New GPU Slander Drive Is in the Making

By NATALIA SEDOFF TROTSKY

The French weekly France Dimanche presented to its readers on March 21 of this year a testament supposedly drawn up by Trotsky on May 20, 1940. (See LABOR ACTION, April 19—Ed.) This political will attributes to Trotsky a change of heart regarding the socialist revolution and his faith in the working class. The editors of the paper hasten to attest to their complete objectivity in publishing this "sensational document." They did not bother, however, to question me on the subject. They found it more objective to refer to their interview of December 8, 1946 with the assassin "Jacques-Mornard," whom they designate, repeating the lie of the GPU, as a collaborator of Trotsky's. This fact alone suffices to brand them as paid hirelings of the Stalin apparatus. The unscrupulous

gangsters of the pen cite the gangsters of the pick-ax and the knife.

The so-called "Mornard" interview supplemented by his "confessions" concerning the crime committed by him eight years previously, give a new version of the murder. The "sensational document" is but a continuation of a long chain of forgeries exposed by the Dewey commission in 1937. The completely fabricated will bears the usual inept and clumsy hall-marks of the dull police mind. It should occasion no surprise that having the complete confidence of the assassin, "France-Dimanche" is also in the confidence of his masters in Moscow.

THE BIGGER THE LIE . . .

The origin of the document is just as mythical as the document itself. According to France-Dimanche the testament was drawn up in July, 1940 and that same month a Soviet agent succeeded in procuring a copy and sending it to Moscow. What speed is so delicate a matter! A second copy came into possession of France-Dimanche editors a short time back, presumably through the recently deceased Victor Serge (Kilblich). In this case the GPU manifested an incredible sluggishness. It provided itself with a copy so as to confirm therewith if necessary the existence of the France-Dimanche document. Thus, eight years of significant silence were broken in the venal press. The Stalinist apparatus manufactures not only the document, but the proper occasion for its revelation.

The Soviet agent presumably procured a copy at the end of July from a "close friend" of Trotsky's. France-Dimanche mistakenly places the date of the assassination on July 20, 1940, so that the document, according to their calendar, was stolen soon after the assassination. But Trotsky was murdered a full month later. It must now be explained how the theft went unnoticed during an entire month. Neither I, nor any of the friends-coworkers of Trotsky ever saw or heard of such a testament. But THREE (!) copies somehow came into the possession of the writer Victor Serge. How? Victor Serge left Paris

Rail Strike Broken -- Twice in Two Years!

UAW Is Set for Showdown Fight with Chrysler Corp.

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—Chrysler corporation got its first surprise last week when the UAW-CIO brushed aside the farce of negotiations which the company was trying to get away with, and announced a break-off in talks with the corporation until it got down to business.

Instead of wasting its time listening to the insults poured on the union negotiators by Chrysler officials, the union leadership went to the rank and file with an explanation of the basic issues and why a strike showdown seemed inevitable.

Of course, the rank and file responded to the situation. Confusion, uncertainty and worry began to give way to determination. In the shops a change in sentiment was noticeable and serious strike preparations began.

EXPLAIN COMPANY TALK

At many local meetings, UAW leaders explained why members were being called upon again to make the sacrifices necessary in a strike struggle. In essence, the UAW said:

"Chrysler corporation believes that the workers are so demoralized, dumb and willing to work under present conditions, that the union can't get their backing. Only the union leadership is agitating for a wage increase. The men in the shops are afraid a wage increase means higher prices, so they don't want it. The union might be able to force the men out on strike but can't keep

them out very long. If the union wants to do something for the men, it would cut union dues, and give the men \$1.50 a month more in wages. Only the dumb clucks can't get along on the wages we pay.

"Pension plan? What the hell do you think we are running? A charity institution? Profits? Sure, we made a lot. Next year we intend to double them. It is none of your business. That's what we are in business for. To make profits!"

When the men in the shops hear of the attitude Chrysler has taken during negotiations, they respond with anger. At various local meetings you can see the difference in reaction between the start and the end of the speeches. No one is "rabble-rousing" the workers. The facts speak plainly for themselves. There is no choice but to fight back. And the workers see it.

The fact that the UAW-CIO has announced its strike deadline, and is not letting anything detract from it, also has its effect. On May 12, the plants go down, unless Chrysler comes across.

IGNORE STATE BOARD

One element of uncertainty was removed from the situation when the union ignored the lay-offs at Chrysler this past Friday and Monday. As a matter of fact, everyone in the shops recognized that these lay-offs were phony, that steel was available and that the corporation was merely trying to weaken the workers finan-

cially before the strike began. This move of the corporation boomeranged, for it merely exposed Chrysler.

Another confusing angle was cleared up by the union when it bluntly told the Michigan State Mediation officials that it intended to ignore those petty politicians and their attempt to apply the Bonine-Tripp law against the Chrysler workers.

(Continued on page 2)

Two years almost to the day after breaking the last railroad strike, President Truman again came to the rescue of the railroad corporations and slapped a seizure-injunction order on the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen and the Switchmen's Union of North America who were preparing to strike for a 30-cent raise and 25 rules changes.

Using a law passed in 1916 which gives the President the right to seize the railroads in time of war, and acting on the technicality that he has never declared World War II over, Truman ordered the Secretary of War to run the railroads, and secured a court order (from Judge Alan T. Goldsborough of anti-mine union fame) directing the men to stay at their jobs.

What is supposed to make that different from an ordinary injunction is that it is based upon the phony theory that strikes are outlawed where the government is the employer (why?!); two phony theories, in fact, for it also pretends that the government now owns the railroads.

The whole business reduces itself to out-and-out strikebreaking, the kind Truman used two years ago against the railroad workers, the kind he used against the mine workers. Little is changed so far as the railroad corporations are concerned, even to the detail of who will actually direct railroad operations.

Technically assigned to the army, the actual "army" directors are railroad executives. For example, Gustav Metzner, president of New York Central was made a colonel by ap-

Letter to Chrysler . . .

Herman L. Weckler
Vice-President and General Manager
Chrysler Corporation
Mr. Weckler:

Two days after you gave a copy of a letter to me, as a Chrysler worker, to the newspapers, I received the letter. Which leads me to believe that you were more interested in making the "public record," than in talking cold turkey with me.

After reading your letter, my suspicions were verified. Only some one who never worked in the shop, who doesn't know what goes on, could possibly be taken in by the baloney you passed out.

Whom are you trying to kid, Mr. Weckler? I'm glad to see that you recognize the power of our union. Yes, we can shut her down, and keep her down, if you don't come across. That's about the only point in your letter we agree on.

You are worried about the cost of a strike, about the sacrifices it means for us? So are we. But we also remember something you forgot to mention. It took a strike to convince you management people that we wanted our own union. Remember 1937?

As for your concern for us, quit kidding. We remember how many union men you fired who tried to organize the shops. We remember the thousands of dollars you spent on spies, and stool-pigeons. Even now we fight every day in the shops against your attempts to break down union standards.

You write that you are sympathetic to our problems of purchasing power. Mr. Weckler, you are a liar. Only last week you called us a bunch of dumb clucks, and said our trouble was we spent our money on beer! Didn't you?

Well, we may not be the smartest people in the world, but we know a liar and a scoundrel when we see or hear one. So a third round of wage increases won't solve the problem, Mr. Weckler? Who said it would? It would just BEGIN to solve the problem, as far as we are concerned. But to get anywhere you have to begin somewhere. We want to begin to solve our problems by getting a wage increase.

You try to make a clever answer to this, Mr. Weckler. You say, but it didn't work before. You got wage increases and prices went up. That's right. Your Congress, Mr. Weckler, the one controlled by you and the other big industrial interests killed OPA. That is one reason prices went up.

Another reason, Mr. Weckler, was that you raised prices! There was no law saying you had to. You did it to make more profit, at our expense.

Our union proposes something different right now. We say, take the wage increase out of profits, and cut the price of your cars. You'll still make enough money, to satisfy any ordinary hog. Didn't you read the advertisements our union published in the daily papers? I'll bet you a buck even you can't answer any of those figures or arguments for higher wages without prices increases!

Your feelings are hurt because you say the union is challenging your "good faith"? You claim you have been bargaining seriously? I'll believe you when you announce you are proving good faith by giving us any wage raise agreed to, RETROACTIVE to the day negotiations began. How about it, Mr. Weckler?

As a matter of fact, you haven't bargained in good faith. You've insulted our negotiators, you've sneered and laughed at us, you've told us you don't give a damn about us, by the phony "steel shortage" lay-off you gave us Friday and today.

The simple truth of the matter is, Mr. Weckler, that you and the men behind you on Wall Street, are determined to test us and our union. You want to see how much you can get away with now.

Well, the UAW-CIO was built through struggle in 1936-37, it will be kept strong through struggle. We accept the challenge.

A LOCAL 7-MEMBER.

**NATIONALIZE
RAILS UNDER
WORKERS'
CONTROL!**

pointment on Monday, May 10, and took charge of all eastern railroads. Six other regional directors, equally appointed, are big shot railroad executives.

More important than that, however, is the fact that there is no change, no change whatsoever, in the financial structure of the roads. The profits still go to the real owners. The real owners direct every physical and financial aspect of the railroads. So as to make it absolutely clear, Secretary of War Royall emphasized this point in his directives.

The seizure is clearly nothing else but a way of breaking the strike, as industry seizures have proved to be in the past. It is not in any way a move towards government ownership of an industry that is probably the most backward, the most mis-managed of major capitalist industries.

The owners of this gigantic industry upon which the nation depends heavily have demonstrated their complete bankruptcy time and again, demonstrated it in their relations with the workers, demonstrated it in the infinitesimal progress they have made in modern road operation.

A recent article in LABOR ACTION by Gordon Haskell showed how the railroad worker was the low man on the wage totem pole. The

(Continued on page 2)

Open the Doors

Conflicting reports have issued from Germany this past week about the desire of the Jewish people to emigrate to the United States. One observer claimed that, where a year ago, the majority of Jews wished to enter Palestine, the majority of them now wished to rebuild their lives in the United States. This claim was immediately contested by other observers and officials. Whichever side of the controversy is right numerically, whether 100,000 or 100 wish to enter the United States, there is only one correct stand on the matter politically: OPEN THE DOORS OF THE UNITED STATES!

Such, in our view, must be the essential position of the labor movement in this country. It is proper to defend the right of the Jews to emigrate to Palestine, to denounce and to circumvent the British blockade. The first requirement, however, not only for socialists, but for all those who have the slightest regard for democratic concepts, is to demand that the government of this country end its despicable barriers on immigration.

We suspect that great numbers would elect to come here if they were permitted to. We suspect also that a great many among those who say they wish to go to Palestine do so because they feel it is hopeless to attempt to come here. Be that as it may, be we wrong or right, it is still a fundamental obligation to insist upon the freedom of the Jews, of any people, to migrate as they wish to the country of their choice.

It means nothing, however, to uphold that general right if we do not act to make it real here where we live and work. It is therefore incumbent upon us to demand of the U. S. government that it lift its foul restrictions on immigration. Halfway measures are an insult; and such a measure as is now before Congress to provide for "cheap labor" importation of domestics and farm workers is worse than an insult. OPEN THE DOORS OF THE UNITED STATES!

Fitzgerald Stops Local 101 Strike Vote

Motion Withdrawn, But Membership Determined to Win Wage Raise

LYNN, Mass.—It took some mighty fast talking and many promises by national president Albert J. Fitzgerald and the local officers to halt a strike vote at the meeting of GE Local 201 of the United Electric, Radio, and Machine Workers (CIO).

At a well attended meeting, Frederick M. Kelly, business agent of the Local, gave his report of the wage talks between the UE and the General Electric Company. He told the membership that the GE would not grant a wage increase. He was hardly through with his speech when a motion was made to have a strike vote. Several hundred members immediately seconded the motion. This was the membership's answer to the company that has been stalling for months and now says: it will not

grant an increase because it wants to halt "inflation."

Albert J. Fitzgerald was present at this meeting because the local officers felt they needed him there to prevent the meeting from getting out of their hands. He took the floor and asked that the strike motion be withdrawn. He said, "I know how you feel, but we still have hopes that the company will recognize the needs of its people and their aroused feelings on this issue. I do not believe such an extreme measure is necessary, at this time.

Hugh A. Joyce, president of the Local, asked that the motion be withdrawn and that the negotiating committee be given "another opportunity to talk to 'top' GE management."

After considerable debate the motion was withdrawn. But the members made it clear that they were seeking a substantial wage increase and other economic demands—and the leaders may as well realize that the strike motion will not be withdrawn at the next meeting, if there is any need for making it.

The membership also refused to go along with the gag that they sign petitions to show how outraged they were at the company. They know that these petitions impress no one. The Schenectady GE Local 301 had a petition with 10,000 names only the week before—but it cut no ice with anybody. The UE leaders are on the spot. The membership is watching them very closely.

It is evident that a new campaign (Continued on page 4)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

UAW Ranks Set for Showdown—

(Continued from page 1)

Phillip Weiss, State Mediation Board chairman, announced the Chrysler strike would have to be postponed until a secret vote among employees was taken. The daily press here screamed in its headlines, "Chrysler Strike Postponed."

Only, they forgot to ask the union. Speaking for the international executive board, Emil Mazey, acting president, announced that the UAW-CIO challenged the right of the state board to intervene since the law didn't apply to a nation-wide strike, and that the UAW-CIO was going ahead as per schedule. It had taken its own strike vote, and it had announced its intentions under the Taft-Hartley 60 day notice clause.

When the state officials mentioned court action, fines and imprisonment, the UAW leadership attitude was that they'd have to take their chances. After all, even if the Bonine Tripp law were found to be constitutional, the maximum penalty is six months in jail and a thousand dollars fine! And in any strike settlement, dismissal of court action against the union is likely to be one of the first things agreed upon.

The whole point of this intervention by the corporation-minded politicians is to build up a barrage of anti-union propaganda by saying the strike is "illegal."

GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE

Besides explaining the corporation's attitude, and showing that the union means business, the union leadership has also done a pretty fair job of indicating the significance of the Chrysler strike to all organized labor. Again, a summary of the kind of speeches made would be along these lines:

"Wall Street bankers, who own Chrysler, are determined to crush labor. They are trying it in the packinghouse strike; they refused the steel workers a raise and they are turning thumbs down on our demands. The reason is that they think they have us on the run. They want to see how far they can go. Our job is to stop them. Our victory would set a pattern for other unions to follow. Wall Street wants to go back to the pre-CIO days. They want to destroy the unions eventually. This is the first test."

On the economic issue involved, the union leaders keep explaining how the corporation could pay higher wages without price increases. In fact they could lower prices and still make a profit.

AID FROM LOCAL 212

Unfortunately, the organization and leadership in some local unions in the Chrysler set-up are not up to par, in comparison, for example, with an outstanding local union, like 7, which has put on a real campaign among the rank and file, and where a real solid spirit exists. Some local unions are far behind in having division meetings. At Dodge Local 3, the Stalinists tried to get a resolution through postponing the strike. Two of the out of town local unions in the Chrysler set-up need bolstering. But all these things are known, and steps are being taken to remedy any weaknesses. All strikes develop in uneven tempo. The militants inspire the conservatives. The strong aid the weak. This strike will be no different.

The Chrysler Locals in the Detroit area are going to obtain some first rate assistance from the militant Briggs Local 212, whose thousands of members will be unemployed due to the Chrysler shutdown, but who

will get their unemployment compensation because they are not directly involved in the strike! Ken Morris, Local 212 president, already has announced plans for picket lines and other forms of assistance to the Chrysler workers.

Certainly, with the reactionary atmosphere prevailing even in Detroit,

the UAW is going to find some tough obstacles ahead in the Chrysler strike. Police Commissioner Toy hasn't yet tried out his notorious "riot squads." The Congressional committees in Washington are known to be watching for a chance to come into the strike and make anti-union propaganda. A real fight is looming.

Housewives Can Help Labor Win Strikes

By SUSAN GREEN

An isolationist in foreign affairs is today a rare phenomenon. Due to fear of another war, most people know that what goes on in Italy or Korea is of vital importance right here. Unfortunately, the people generally founder about behind the foreign policy of American imperialism; while those who disapprove of it misguidedly follow Wallace on the Moscow-made road to Russian imperialism. Only a handful wish to apply the international socialist solution in foreign affairs. But it might be said there is, at least, some progress in that isolationism has been abandoned and in that it is increasingly recognized that foreign affairs are the affair of all people.

Can it be said that even that much progress away from "isolationism" has been made in domestic affairs? The "isolationist" sentiment in the present crucial wage struggle seems to flourish like a weed.

PRICES AND WAGES

Next to the veterans, the workers have emerged from World War II as

the forgotten men and women. Wartime wage freeze kept a wide gap between wages and the mounting cost of living. To close the gap union demands after the war were for around 30 cents an hour increase. It was then proved by the United Auto Workers that in that industry wages could be raised, the cost of cars could be reduced, and the companies would still net higher than pre-war profits. Government investigators, also, reported that the manufacturing industries as a whole could increase wages about 25 cents an hour, and without raising prices, could maintain better than pre-war profits. But the workers got nowhere near a 25 cents or 30 cents an hour boost. The most fortunate received around 18 1/2 cents. Again labor was left behind in the race with prices. The next so-called round of wage increases, which again by no means reached all workers, was only 15 cents an hour—this to meet the terrific price rise that followed the end of OPA. Once more the workers lagged behind.

Now, in face of another 7.4 percent cost of living increase from June 1947 to January 1948, according to Consumers Price Index, the packinghouse companies, without batting an eyelash, offer their workers a 9 cents an hour raise, and Chrysler's generosity results in an offer of 6 cents. The laborer to whom should flow the full benefit of his toil, holds the dirty end of the stick. The present wage struggles in many industries are the result—with the pre-arranged, concerted plan of the bosses to keep wages down and the determination of the workers to correct accrued injustices.

Workers, like stock exchange employees, who do not easily resort to striking, now do. Packinghouse workers carry on a bitter struggle for almost two months. Miners strike for an old-age pension and are penalized by the capitalist courts. The supposedly staid and conservative railroad workers are on the verge of walking out. On the other hand steel and electrical companies refuse even to negotiate a wage increase. And such offers as bosses do make are far short of the workers' needs.

Yet many groups of working people feel all this is none of their business. The vital issue of workers fighting for a decent standard of living, leaves them indifferent. They are more concerned about the inconveniences of strikes. There is indeed, in large measure, a vague sense of sympathy for the strikers, and that is all.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

This kind of "isolationism" is harmful to the very people who practise it. All sectors of the working population, including white collar workers, small business people, farmers and housewives—all are deeply involved in the wage battle now raging between capital and labor. The outcome of this struggle will determine the standard of living not only for the workers directly embattled, but for all of us. The success or failure of the workers who step out in front to challenge the corporations, sets the level of pay for all employees.

Primarily, of course, success or failure lies in how labor will carry on this fight. Will each union go to bat on its own, or will the whole labor movement do the sane and sensible thing, namely, join in a well worked out, unified strategy against the industrialists, who definitely are acting on a pre-arranged, unified plan not to raise wages to any appreciable ex-

SWP Is Silent on WP Request To Debate the Czech Events

NEW YORK—On March 23, the City Committee of the New York Local of the Workers Party sent a letter to the City Committee of the Socialist Workers Party requesting a public debate on the problems raised by the Stalinist coup in Czechoslovakia.

As is well known to the readers of LABOR ACTION, the WP and SWP differ fundamentally on the question of the nature of the Russian state and therefore the nature of Stalinism. These problems, we felt, were made much clearer in the light of the Czech events, and the differences drawn even more sharply. A public debate, or series of debates, before the radical and working class public keenly interested in the problem, would have served a useful function.

In its usual cowardly fashion, the SWP did not even display the minimal socialist courtesy of replying to the WP communication. They have maintained a most indiscreet silence, one easily interpreted.

Deadline Near In Palestine War Crisis—

(Continued from page 1)

able to stand alone. The fate of the Jewish state is dependent on the fate of the world in general and the fate of the Jews of the world in particular.

The Jews of the world face the danger of modern anti-Semitism, a new and special form of minority oppression. Ancient anti-Semitism wanted to force the assimilation of the Jews. It offered them the choice of expulsion or adoption of the dominant culture. Modern anti-Semitism, flourishing in the rotten soil of decaying capitalism and used as a "stimulant" to keep capitalism alive—rejects the Jews even as abject slaves.

Thus, in a fundamental sense and in a very real personal sense, the survival of the Jews is dependent on the overthrow of capitalism. "The Jewish proletariat is in need of revolution more than any other." The Jewish middle class and intellectuals have no choice but to fight for socialism if they want to live, either as a people or as individuals.

The establishment of a Jewish state does not by itself solve the Palestine problem nor does it eliminate the need for Arab-Jewish cooperation. The sizable Arab minority in the Jewish state, the braided borders of the Jewish and Arab states, the economic interdependence of the two areas only pose the question of Arab-Jewish rapprochement in a new form.

Not only the Jews but Arabs too have a stake in the fight for Arab-Jewish unity. War or irredentism on the part of the Arabs can only lead to the strengthening of the reactionary forces in both communities—the Mufti among the Arabs and the fascist Irgun-Stern groups among the Jews. War between the Arabs and Jews will lead to a reimposition of foreign rule through a protectorate or an "emergency administration." The Arab labor movement can and will realize that the road to a united Palestine leads through the acceptance of the right of the Jews to self-determination, and from that basis work towards a federation that will guarantee the NATIONAL rights of both peoples.

The American labor movement—which is in the position to affect the policy of the American government, must take upon itself a large share of the fight for a people's solution of the problems of Palestine. It must call for:

- (1) Immediate independence for all of Palestine—no form of foreign rule, whether emergency authority or Hashemite dynasty for any portion of Palestine.
- (2) Recognition of the Jewish state.
- (3) Lifting of the embargo on arms to the Hagannah.
- (4) Independent economic union of Jewish and Arab Palestine without the meddling of the UN.
- (5) Reunification of Palestine through Arab-Jewish cooperation into a federal union.
- (6) For a Socialist United States of the Near East.

BENNETT ADDRESSES CHICAGO U. CLUB ON COMMUNISM

CHICAGO, May 7—A near capacity crowd of about 200 students this evening attended a lecture and movie sponsored by the Politics Club of the University of Chicago. Lydia Bennett, a member of the Workers Party and veteran of over 20 years in the socialist movement, delivered a short talk entitled "The Communist Movement—Then and Now." She briefly discussed the achievements of the communist movement in the days of Lenin, its subsequent degeneration, and the task that falls upon revolutionary socialists to build a new communist international.

The talk was followed by the showing of the movie "Czar to Lenin," the only documentary film ever made of the Russian Revolution. An admission of thirty-five cents was charged.

Copies of the spring issue of the "Student Partisan," quarterly organ of the Politics Club, which contains a debate between Irving Howe, LABOR ACTION writer, and Herman Finer, UofC professor, were sold.

ACEWR Social Will Feature "Kameradschaft" Showing

The American Committee for European Workers Relief will present the foreign film KAMERADSCHAFT (with English subtitles) on Sunday evening, May 23, 7:30 P. M. at Caravan Hall, 110 E. 59th St. In addition to the main feature, Robert Benchley's THE TREASURER'S REPORT will be shown, and to round out a full evening's entertainment, there will be square dancing with a professional caller.

KAMERADSCHAFT (Comradeship) is a thrilling story of a mine disaster in a French-German boundary mine in 1919. Fire breaks out in the French section of the mine and 250 miners are trapped. The story of the rescue of the trapped miners by their German brothers from across the boundary is more than a story of an heroic rescue. The German workers are portrayed as humans, as filled with national hatreds as their trapped French brothers. The breaking down of these hatreds, the realization that the real enemies of min-

ers, the world over, are the same, this is the real story.

International working class solidarity is the theme of KAMERADSCHAFT and this makes it an especially fitting film to be shown by the ACEWR. For this same theme is the motivation for all of the Committee's work—sending food, clothing and medicine to anti-fascist workers in Europe. All proceeds from this affair will be used to further this work.

Subscription is \$1.20, including tax. Tickets may be purchased at the ACEWR headquarters at 130 W. 23rd St. (CH. 2-5884) or at the door. Everyone is urged to take advantage of the opportunity to see this unusual film.

Coming Next Week: THE RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN NOTES

by Henry Judd

Railroad Strike Broken—

(Continued from page 1)

railroad owners have proved that they cannot operate the roads in such a way as to pay labor a decent wage for work done under decent conditions, and they have proved that they cannot operate the roads, in the full public interest.

REAL NATIONALIZATION

There is only one real solution, and that is NATIONALIZATION, government ownership, UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL! The seizure is a pretense at government ownership. It leaves everything that is rotten in the railroad picture intact. We repeat, the bankrupts remain the owners, in every sense. The only ones who are hit are the workers.

The government will probably continue its seizure order until the railroad workers accept the decision of the fact-finding board which held 15 1/2 cents to be an adequate increase. The intervention of the fact-finding board is especially interesting. Designated a fact-finding board it is evidently given the authority of a compulsory arbitration board. Accept its findings . . . or else! That is, where the findings are suitable to the owners. In other cases, where workers in an industry were satisfied with the board's figures, there was no attempt to pressure industry into accepting the findings!

The situation raises a number of important questions. First of these, of course, is the necessity of nationalization under workers' control.

It equally raises the question of the government, and labor's relations

with it. If proof were needed that the government is the servant of the capitalist class, it is here provided again. If proof were needed that the Trumans and the Tafts, the Democrats and Republicans, are brothers under the skin, it is here provided, again. If proof were needed that a labor party is indispensable, a party which can move towards the organization of a labor government and thus make nationalization real, it is here provided, again.

And if proof were needed that the structure and leadership of the railroad unions are as archaic as the corporations they oppose, it is here also provided. Two years ago the position of the railroad workers was weakened by the division in the unions. Each brotherhood was out for itself, and each brotherhood was directed by as fossilized a leadership as is anywhere to be found in the labor movement. The pattern repeats itself. This time, most of the railroad unions accepted the government board management verdict. Three unions held out, and at that not too certainly. Alvanley Johnston, the museum piece who runs the Locomotive Engineers with an iron hand, was willing to take the 15 1/2 cent increase, but demanded more rules changes than the companies were willing to grant.

The pattern repeats itself in another way. After the last strike was broken, Whitney, Brotherhood of Trainmen president, screamed strikebreaker and declared he would mobilize four million or four billion dollars, we forget which, to defeat Truman. Well, Whitney has lately been real chummy with Truman, in and out of the White House, all differences patched up.

This time the heads of the unions effected are screaming "strike-breaker." But we attach as much significance to what a Johnston, or a Robertson of the Firemen and Enginemen, or a Glover of the Switchmen's union says, as to what a Whitney says.

Glover is reported to have said: "If the government is going to step in as a strikebreaking agency, it is about time the people start thinking of what they are going to do for the workingman deprived of his bargaining rights."

Coming from a labor leader it would deserve more attention than

we are giving it, even if the labor leader in question did take a long time to discover that the government is a strikebreaker. But we have no reason to believe that his words are anything more than pap. Yet, it is about time to start thinking, and that exercise wouldn't hurt Glover either.

The railroad workers are NOT as backward as their leaders. For a long time they have been doing some serious thinking about their plight, and on several occasions have tried to do something about it in their unions. This situation again proves the necessity of making their weight felt in their unions so that they can make their weight felt properly in the nation.

But in the meantime, this is every workman's fight. Government by injunction is intolerable no matter how it is dressed up. Government strike-breaking is intolerable no matter what laws and theories are used to justify it. Every worker has a stake in the railroad man's fight. Everyone of us has to help, has to lend our encouragement to the railroad worker in his fight against the government and the management. Every one of our unions ought to denounce Truman's strikebreaking. And every one of our unions ought to discuss what can be done to help the railroad workers to beat down the seizure-injunction squeeze play.

We have to address ourselves to ending the ruinous division in the railroad unions. We have to address ourselves to building the weapons of political action so that we will not always confront a government ready to perform for the employers. And we have to address ourselves to effecting the demand for ousting the bankrupt owners of this essential industry, for NATIONALIZING THE RAILROADS UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL.

Our May 27, 1946 issue carried a long statement on nationalization of the coal and railroad industries. This is available in the 1946 Bound Volume which can be ordered from Labor Action, 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Something Worse Than Braggarts!

Dear Editor:

A letter in your April 26 issue (by Al Findley—Ed.) dealing with the Deir Yassin massacre, severely criticizes the Irgun-Stern group for irresponsible and provocative bragging about the number of its victims. "What actually took place," says this letter, "was a small battle, according to the British, in which a few houses were destroyed and there were not more than 10 casualties." This sounds a bit like combining

Sees Error in Judd Column

Dear Editor:

In Henry Judd's column on the Italian elections, LABOR ACTION, April 19, he wrote as follows: "The Italian Stalinists seek to come to power legally and constitutionally. Above all, they would like to gain 51 per cent of the votes, form a government under the new Constitution—perhaps invite a few Nenni Stalin-Socialists and even some liberals to participate—and having peacefully gained control of the state apparatus, set about their job

of building a totalitarian state in Italy. This was their road in Czechoslovakia."

Did Judd mean to say "this was NOT their road . . ." It seems strange to learn now, following the articles in LA, that the road to Stalinist power there was the "legal and constitutional" one. I am sure there must be some error.

Fraternally,
Albert GATES, Los Angeles

Comrade Gates is correct to imply that the above quotation appears somewhat contradictory. This is due to incomplete elaboration of its meaning on my part. In Czechoslova-

criticism with an apology. The Irgun-Stern group are dangerous and irresponsible braggarts—but, after all, just 'braggarts! A more important point is involved, however. The United Press reported that the Red Cross had counted 254 Arab 'bodies,' including those of 130 women and children. And apparently some of the bodies were mutilated. I should say that the Irgunists are something more than windbags.

H. D. Coleman, St. Louis

(For point of view of LABOR ACTION see editorial in April 19 issue. —Ed.)

of building a totalitarian state in Italy. This was their road in Czechoslovakia."

Did Judd mean to say "this was NOT their road . . ." It seems strange to learn now, following the articles in LA, that the road to Stalinist power there was the "legal and constitutional" one. I am sure there must be some error.

Fraternally,
Albert GATES, Los Angeles

Comrade Gates is correct to imply that the above quotation appears somewhat contradictory. This is due to incomplete elaboration of its meaning on my part. In Czechoslova-

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents.
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00.

NAME _____ (please print)
ADDRESS _____ APT. _____
CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____

Bill me Payment enclosed (Stamps, currency or Postal Note)

A STATEMENT OF OUR POSITION

Socialist Policy on the Marshall Plan

Elsewhere on this page appear two letters, by comrades Goldman and Farrell, offering views contrary to ours on the Marshall Plan. We propose in this editorial to state our position on the essentials of the issue, leaving elaboration on related matters—such as the problem of Stalinism and the impossibility of fighting it adequately, that is, without succumbing to the barbaric destruction of barbaric warfare by any other means than socialist policy—to future occasions.

LABOR ACTION and, together with it, the Workers Party stand for and unequivocally advocate the fullest material, economic and moral aid to Europe and its people. This has always been our attitude and naturally this remains our attitude. It has been stated many times in our press. If it is not clear to our readers, we shall repeat it over and over so that there may be no possible misunderstanding.

A workers' or socialist government in America, understanding its fundamental ties of solidarity with the workers and people of Europe, would pour aid and help into the war-ravaged lands of Europe with a generosity and effectiveness that would make Marshall Plan aid a trifle by contrast! American capitalism spent \$250 billion in three years of war, and now offers a piddling sum of \$5 billion for one year of aid to Europe. A workers' government of socialist planning and productivity could ship tens of billions worth of food and equipment to Europe, each year and really put the Continent back on its feet.

However, the urgency of aid exists now, while there is a capitalist and not a socialist government in Washington. We consequently favor exacting aid from this capitalist government for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Europe. Though the Marshall Plan embraces a measure of such aid, its essential nature is such as to make it impossible for socialists to support it.

Comrades Goldman and Farrell, have, so it seems to us, neither understood the nature and meaning of the Marshall Plan, nor—and this is more important—exactly in what sense LABOR ACTION opposes it. Both seem to believe we are merely "against" the ERP, for example. This, as we shall indicate, is not the case. Perhaps this misunderstanding has been a shortcoming on our part. If so, we will, in this editorial, and in editorials and articles to come, leave no room for misunderstanding.

THE PROGRAM OF U. S. IMPERIALISM

To begin with, what is the Marshall Plan? Both comrades give partial answers to this (which they then proceed to forget). Farrell says it is "... a plan for the capitalist reconstruction of Western Europe." Goldman says that "its basic aim is to reconstruct the economy of Europe as a weapon against Stalinist Russia. . . . make it more difficult for the Stalinist regime to gain control of Western Europe." All this is true, but clearly not sufficient since we draw different conclusions. Why?

Perhaps the key mistake of those who urge us to support or, at any rate, "not oppose" the Marshall Plan lies in their tendency to think of ERP merely as a bill passed by Congress appropriating so many billions of dollars, signifying so much food, materials and machinery, for 16 nations of Western Europe. Unfortunately, this is only one part—and not the most important part—of what is known as the Marshall Plan. Now, surely no one thinks we are against the shipment of this actual food, material and equipment to Europe! For the benefit of those who may still have doubts, we repeat that we stand for full (more and more) economic aid to Europe. Knowing the absolute necessity for the European people to reconstruct their ruined economies, and knowing that this aid can only come, at present, from America, we would be absolute idiots (or worse, Stalinists) to urge the European workers to reject such aid. We do not belong to the school of thought which thinks that increased misery ("the worse, the better for us") will bring socialism closer in Europe, or anywhere else. We know that economic revival is essential for the revival of Europe's revolutionary socialist movement.

But this hardly exhausts the problem, because we are still opposed to the Marshall Plan, while Farrell is not and Goldman neither supports it nor opposes it. And our opposition is based on other grounds than those of the inadequacy of its economic aid. Our opposition rests on solid political grounds.

The Marshall Plan is not a simple bill or a mere act of Congress. It is the strategic expression of American imperialism at the present stage of its development and, as such, embodies the aims, plans and intentions of this imperialism in clearly indicated political, economic and social terms. The Marshall Plan exists within a specific political framework of which economic aid is but one aspect. An attempt has been made to distinguish between the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine. The difference is one of time and place, not of purpose or direction. Both exist within the same strategic, imperialist framework. The Marshall Plan is simply the current implementation of the Truman Doctrine. Our opposition to the Marshall Plan, therefore, is nothing else than an extension of our general and consistent opposition to American imperialism, its plans and its aims. We oppose the Marshall plan, in principle, because of its political connotations and meanings. Any other course would obscure our opposition, in principle, to American imperialism.

That is the main thing. However, our opposition is not limited to the above political "abstractions," valid as they are. We are also opposed to specific details, the conditions and "strings" attached to the concrete ERP Bill itself. A forthcoming article in THE NEW INTERNATIONAL will analyze this in detail. Here

we limit ourselves to indicating what we mean by "conditions and strings."

(1) The limited amount of aid to be sent—enough to stimulate only a recovery within the bounds desired by the American government, but not enough to really set Europe back on its feet. Even Administrator Hoffman has expressed grave doubts about the smallness of help to be given.

(2) The obvious dumping and getting rid of worthless or inferior goods which will and is being practised. The *New York Times* (April 21, 1948), for example, reports that "None but horse meat is scheduled for shipment from this country under the program and the bulk of shipments would consist of canned beef from Latin America"! On the same plane is the victory of the tobacco lobby in including vast tobacco shipments as reported in LA some weeks ago.

(3) The demand, contained in the act itself, that each benefiting country set aside currency equivalent to the grants of America dollar aid "to be used in a manner mutually agreed between the two governments." If this is not a move to tie each foreign currency to the American dollar and, as indicated elsewhere, to force the disgorging by these countries of raw materials in short supply in America, then what is it?

(4) The insistence that each of the 16 nations sign a declaration of intent to abide by all the conditions set forth in the act, to be followed by a detailed treaty providing for supervision of aid administration, a repayment agreement and, where possible, standardization of military equipment. The declaration of intent also gives Truman the right to halt aid at will, when he objects to anything.

(5) The elaborate administrative and supervision machinery which, in effect, gives American imperialism veto power—that is, absolute control—over the application of the plan.

These are but some of the specific objections we have. Does anyone doubt that, if the plan is effected, exclusively as America would like to see it effected (something which we strongly doubt), the net result would be a Western European economy dominated—in market terms, in financial and commercial terms—exclusively by America? American imperialism has already advanced far on this road—five years of the Marshall Plan would complete the process.

Furthermore, there are problems that follow from support to the plan which those who urge us to endorse it cannot afford to ignore. Last week's *LABOR ACTION* (World Politics column) indicated the plans for military endorsement and backing which must inevitably come and which are now in active preparation. There is much we can learn in this connection from examining the nature of U. S. intervention in Greece (or China) where a foul, reactionary regime is propped by American dollars and military support. Greece, it is true, supposedly falls under the Truman Doctrine and not the Marshall Plan. But, as we have noted, the political distance between the two is easily spanned, and the plans for military additions to the Marshall Plan are proof of it.

Sherman tanks follow the Truman dollar. Here the bourgeoisie is perfectly consistent and serious. Since one of the objectives of the plan is the creation of a stable military base in Western Europe (based upon a rebuilt French army which, in turn, will be rebuilt by revival of the heavy industries of Lorraine, Northern France, the Saar and the Ruhr) in preparation for war with Russia, plans for military pacts are logical. Can anyone seriously propose that we, revolutionary socialists whose anti-war struggle is based on the slogan of "Neither Washington nor Moscow" endorse this military plan along with ERP? Whoever would do so cannot possibly have thought the problem over in all its implications—not merely from the point of view of socialist policy but simply from the point of view of humanity riddled by atomic war.

NO CONFIDENCE IN CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT

Comrade Goldman challenges us on the question of how we would have voted in Congress, if LABOR ACTION had been fortunate enough to have a spokesman there. In the first place, it is to be assumed that had we socialist representatives in Congress, there would be a socialist movement big enough to put them there; hence, a socialist movement able to make its views known widely, able to interfere concretely and actively on behalf of the European working class. Suppose we overlook that, however, Goldman says he would have abstained. We would have made our own proposals based upon OUR motivations.

Why? In the circumstances, a vote for the bill itself would have been nothing less than a vote of confidence in the American government, in American imperialism and its intentions—veiled or alleged. Do we accept the alleged humanitarian declarations of the bill, or its proud boasts that it will reconstruct Europe and bring peace and order? We know this is cant and imperialist hypocrisy. Nor do we have the slightest confidence in the ability of this act to accomplish even what it claims it will accomplish. Thus we would wish to signify by our vote no confidence in the government of the American capitalist class, no trust in its proposals, no faith in its ability to maintain peace or resurrect the Europe it helped destroy.

But would not a "No" vote tie us up with Stalinist opposition to the plan? How would our representative distinguish himself from, let us say, Marcantonio? This is no serious problem. The Stalinists are "against" the Marshall Plan entirely—that is true. But their opposition and ours have literally nothing in common! They are against any kind of aid, in any shape or form, to Europe and they will conduct a campaign of deliberate sabotage to halt aid. Stalinism does not want the slightest European economic recovery since it plans to ride to power throughout the Continent by prolonging the present misery—in fact, intensifying it. Our point of view is exactly the opposite—namely, that economic recovery is of the essence if Stalinism is to be defeated by the working class of Europe. Farrell is absolutely right in saying that "The proposals of Wallace . . . are merely demagoguery which helps Stalinism."

How distinguish ourselves then from the Stalinists? Simple. We would offer our own plan—either as bill or amendment, depending upon parliamentary expediency, for full material and economic aid to Europe with no imperialist strings attached. Our bill would provide for inspection of the program, examination of the books, so to speak, by the union movement. Our bill would make our purposes clear, and by so doing would encourage the people of Europe to seek control of re-constructed industry, to resolve their own destiny in socialist action.

Furthermore, we would introduce amendments to each "condition and string" attached

to the bill actually adopted, the effect of which would be to negate these conditions. And we would seek to introduce clauses making it impossible to couple aid with any measures directed against the labor movement, such as a ban on strikes.

Let us not apply the formula of being against something simply because the capitalists are for it, urges Comrade Goldman. Well, even though this "rule of thumb" form of politics is often a pretty accurate criterion, we readily accept this advice and assure our readers that such is not our general method of deciding policy. In fact, if we had used this formula we might very well have been for the Marshall Plan, or at least had a divided policy on it. It is a well-known fact that considerable numbers of individual American capitalists, notorious for their blindness and narrowness even in their own behalf, were dead set against the risky proposition of pouring billions into Europe. If they had been consulted as individuals, we warrant a great many would have said "no loan."

We'll go even further and readily grant that American capitalism, as a whole, will not make money out of these loans; in fact, stands little chance of even regaining its capital! Except for individuals, corporations, shippers and exporters who will make enormous profits, the billions to be spent will be a dead loss. This is not the traditional investment of idle, surplus capital in richly rewarding overseas markets and backward countries. We know this, yet it does not change the imperialist essence of the plan one iota. Why? It is a sacrifice on the part of American imperialism, an unavoidable sacrifice, to achieve a greater and more vital goal than immediate profits—namely, control over the European market and a strategic base from which to conquer its one last obstacle to world rule, Stalinist Russia. It is in such terms that the plan must be assessed.

It will still be objected: there is no present alternative to this plan of American capitalism. Your anti-imperialist plan, good as it is, is an impossibility now and perhaps for a long time. Furthermore, on the other side of the Marshall Plan boundary looms the ever-menacing figure of Stalinist Russia, feeding on economic stagnation and hunger, ready to advance over prostrate nations. We recognize all this; in fact we say modestly that perhaps no other publication has posed the threatening catastrophe as clearly as *LABOR ACTION*.

This is why, in our material on the Marshall Plan, we have always stressed our advocacy of full aid to Europe and why we say now, again and again, that every bit of aid that goes to Europe even under this plan should be accepted by the workers there; and that, accepting this aid, they should struggle to see to it that it is made use of in their behalf. We reject the absurd position of certain Fourth Internationalist parties who, aping the slogans of the Stalinist movement, call for rejection of such aid. It would be absurdly itself for the European labor movement not to make use of the contradiction between American and Russian imperialism which compels the former to ship aid to Europe. Furthermore, we know that the effect of this aid will be to revive and re-stimulate the class struggle in Europe, since this struggle will take place over the question: Who shall benefit, American imperialism and its European allies or the proletariat?

Finally, then, let us summarize our attitude as tersely as possible in a series of propositions:

- (1) We are for the fullest economic aid to Europe.
- (2) We are opposed to the manipulation of this aid by the United States for its own imperialist purposes.
- (3) We oppose the Marshall Plan which seeks to fix the nations of Europe within the American orbit and gain domination over their commercial, financial, economic and productive life, as well as to prepare to contest militarily rival Russian imperialism for mastery of the Continent.
- (4) We oppose the Marshall Plan for its political connotations, imperialist in character, but we do not oppose the economic aid that goes to Europe as a part of this plan.
- (5) We advocate the full utilization by the European people of whatever economic aid is given to them, regardless of the purposes behind that aid. We urge the European people, together with the American labor movement, to defend themselves against intervention by imperialism, while availing themselves fully of the aid that comes.
- (6) We further urge the free trade unions of Europe to organize together for trade-union control of Marshall Plan expenditures, and to combat the use of this aid for war purposes and other purposes in the interests of capitalism.
- (7) We urge the American labor movement to assist the people of Europe in this struggle by demanding the right to inspect the books of the ERP administration and to mobilize their unions against any effort to utilize aid for war preparations, intervention in the national sovereignty of any European country or any other measure that is solely beneficial to American imperialism.

This is our position on the Marshall Plan.

Two Letters from Albert Goldman and James T. Farrell Presenting Their Views

Dear Friends:

I wish briefly to state my own view on the Marshall Plan. I am in favor of it. I support ERP with the proposal that one should demand trade union representation in the administration of the Plan (this is provided for) and the dispatch of aid to countries with a free labor movement and constitutional liberties. I think that aid to Western Europe is a prerequisite for any development, politically and economically. There is no practical alternative for the dispatch of aid other than that provided for in ERP. The proposals of Wallace, for aid through the United Nations, are merely demagoguery which helps Stalinism. The so-called Molotov Plan is an economic equivalent for NKVD rule. There is no immediate possibility of aid on a socialist basis. And if conditions further deteriorate in Western Europe, only Stalinism will gain. A deterioration of conditions will not, further, postpone war: it will hasten war.

I do not see the Marshall Plan as a purely military measure. It is, in my opinion, a plan for the capitalist reconstruction of Western Europe. The capitalist reconstruction of Western Europe is far, far better than no reconstruction. I also think that if the Marshall Plan can be partially successful, war might be postponed. I do not, therefore, think that the Marshall Plan at all makes the danger of war necessarily more imminent. The simple fact is that today, only American wealth and power stands in the road of Stalinist expansion. Stalinist expansion will not postpone war; it will, if anything, hasten it.

I think that the motives behind the Marshall Plan are secondary to this question—what will happen if there is no American aid for Western Europe? And is there any practical way whereby aid is likely to go to Europe other than through ERP? Also, there is the question—who will gain most if the Marshall Plan fails? Will it be socialism, or Stalinism? To ask this question is really to answer it. If the Marshall Plan fails, only Stalinism will gain. If anyone can convince me that I am wrong here, I will reject this view. But in the meantime, I am for support of ERP in the sense that I have stated it in this letter.

James T. FARRELL
April 29, 1948

Dear Editor:

I was indeed surprised when I read, in Comrade Bern's article in *LABOR ACTION* of April 12, that "we opposed the Marshall Plan." I presume that by "we" Bern means the Workers' Party, and I must confess that I do not remember having seen anything in the Party press which indicated that the Party had come out in opposition to the Marshall Plan.

It may be that the Party had adopted a resolution opposing the Plan and failed to publish it in the press. This would be bad because it was certainly our duty to publish a statement on such an important subject. It may also be that such a statement was published and escaped my attention. In either case I wish to go on record to the effect that in my opinion comrade Bern and all others who agree with him are committing a blunder.

BASIC AIM

Bern says that "we oppose the Marshall plan because of its fundamental nature and because of the strings attached to it." According to Bern its fundamental nature is "a military plan for the stabilization of Europe as the advanced base for American imperialism and its allies in the event of a shooting war against Russia."

It seems to me that the fundamental purpose of the Marshall proposal can be stated differently and more correctly. Its basic aim is to reconstruct the economy of Europe as a weapon against Stalinist Russia. The capitalist proponents of the plan hope that in case either of peace or war the rebuilding of ruined Europe will make it more difficult for the Stalinist regime to gain control of Western Europe.

It is of course to be taken for granted that the American representatives of the capitalist class have no altruistic motives in proposing to send help to the European people and to aid in rebuilding European economy. But surely we are not so mechanical as to permit the aims of those who propose to help Europe to be the only factor which determines our position.

Since we are not in agreement with that aim we are justified in not supporting the Plan. However, since we cannot possibly oppose sending help to the European people and aiding them in reconstructing their economy, it is impermissible for us to oppose the Plan.

It does not follow that if we cannot support the Marshall proposal we must therefore oppose it. Can we not simply explain the meaning of the Plan and why we do not support or oppose it?

POSITIVE PROPOSALS

Were we in the fortunate position of having a representative in Congress, his proper course would be to explain the meaning of the Plan, abstain from voting, and explain his abstention.

I shall go further and say that if our vote determined the defeat or adoption of the plan, it would be incumbent upon us to vote for it, with an explanation. For it is impossible for us to stand in the way of relief to the Europeans or to prevent the rebuilding of its ruined industries. (I do not claim that the Plan will succeed or that the relief will be properly given, but that is immaterial to the issue.)

We are not confronted by a situation where the alternative to the Marshall Plan is one for the reconstruction of Europe on a socialist basis. The alternative to the attempt to reconstruct Europe on a capitalist basis is to permit the industries of Europe to remain in ruins, to permit the people of Europe to remain hungry, and thus to aid the Stalinists. It must be remembered that were we in a position to defeat the Marshall Plan and proceeded to do so, the real beneficiaries would be the Stalinists.

Naturally it is our duty to make positive proposals with reference to the administration of the Plan, such as to have the European socialist parties play a dominant role in the control of the Plan. Also, we would be justified in opposing the Plan if conditions were attached to it which would harm the European working class, such as a condition to denationalize an industry. Bern speaks about the conditions attached to the Marshall Plan, but he mentions none, and I do not know of any of such a nature that opposition becomes mandatory upon us.

Socialism, comrade Bern should constantly remind himself, is not aided by ruined industries. Nor have we ever accepted the doctrine of "the worse the better."

It is time that we cease following the old and simple formula: If the capitalists are for it, we are against it.

Albert GOLDMAN
April 14, 1948

Taft-Hartley: Millions to Soak Miners But \$9 for a Miner's Life

By ANNE RUSSELL

The vicious intent of the Taft-Hartley Law to weaken and smash the labor movement has been most clearly evidenced to date by its utilization against the United Mine Workers.

The main links to chain labor were here tested, with an eye on the battles to come as the contracts in auto, steel, and shipping expire. Big business has given these unions notice that it intends to use every union-breaking clause in the law. An examination of how the law was applied in the mine workers' stoppage reveals the guns in the Taft-Hartley arsenal aimed at the heart of organized labor.

First, the background of the present dispute: One of the biggest gains embodied in the July 1947 contract, gained after years of battling, was that the UMW forced the operators to agree to a pension plan. The contract called for the pension plan to be set up as soon as possible under the direction of a welfare board of three: Lewis for the union, Van Horn for the operators, and Thomas Murray as the "neutral" trustee.

In August Lewis proposes his plan: \$100 a month pension for every miner over 60 with 20 years in the pits, even if he is currently employed by a non-contributing company. Month after month goes by. No plan is adopted because of the opposition of the operators' man, Van Horn.

HOW IT WORKS

His argument is that the Taft-Hartley Law forbids making payments out of a fund to employees of non-contributing companies. Dozens of unions now operate health, accident, and pension plans on this basis, but Van Horn has a legal technicality behind which he can stall forever, as is his intention. Under the new law he cannot be accused of an "unfair labor practice" and, of failing to uphold the "sanctity of the contract," since he is ready to discuss this issue forever; that's all the law requires.

In the meantime some \$30 million has accumulated in the pension fund but not a penny goes to any needy miner. The men see their hard-earned victory of July 1947 slipping away. Fed up with the stalling tactics of the mine owners, when Lewis informs them on March 12 that the mine operators have "dishonored" the contract by refusing to set up pensions, the miners stop work. The contract stipulates that they are to work

as long as they are "willing and able," and under these circumstances they are not willing.

Invoking the Taft-Hartley Law, President Truman declares that "national health and safety" are endangered and appoints a Board of Inquiry to make a fact-finding report. Truman of course does not concern himself with the fact that for eight months the health and safety of some half million miners and their dependents have been endangered by the stubbornness of the mine operators.

Under the law, the Board did not have the power to take sides or make recommendations; it was restricted to "fact-finding." But from start to finish the board was loaded against the miners. Its very composition guaranteed a biased report. Two of the three members had publicly and repeatedly blasted away at the UMW and were openly hostile toward the union. An impartial examination of facts by this stacked board was a sheer mockery.

This board dealt heavy blows against the miners. Their report stated that the stoppage "was not independent action by miners acting individually and separately"—precisely the point in dispute, since the union denied that it had called a strike and insisted that it had merely informed the members of the stalemate on the pension issue and that the miners then had drawn their own conclusions. In so many words this board, which according to law was not to make recommendations to take sides, condemned Lewis and the union for violating the law. They completely skirted discussion of the mine operators' responsibility in not proposing any counter-plan on pensions, and in effect whitewashed the operators' man whose sole contribution had been to veto every concrete proposal. This "neutral" board reported to the president that Lewis' report to the membership was the cause of the work stoppage and that the union must be held responsible. This is the impartial treatment that unions can expect!

INJUNCTION TO FINE

Armed with this report, Truman ordered the attorney general to seek an injunction against the mine union to order the men back to work. The court delivered the injunction with obedient speed.

The question might be raised: Why didn't the court issue an injunction

to halt the coal operators' stalling and obstruction tactics? Why didn't the court lay the law down to the operators and tell them: Comply with your agreement and set up a pension plan, or else! These questions did not concern the Board of Inquiry, much less the court. Instead, they lashed out at the victims who had been waiting for eight months for their pensions. The men, of course, had no assurance that pensions would be granted even if they went back to work.

The miners stayed out; after all they were free men and the U. S. Constitution said that "involuntary servitude" had been abolished. The miners had won their previous battles because of their solidarity and economic strength and they didn't intend to dig coal until they won their pensions. It was at this point that Lewis, with his own political ax to grind, accepted Republican Bridges as the third trustee on the pension Welfare Board, and the two of them quickly agreed to a pension plan over Van Horn's still unyielding opposition.

With the pensions in the bag (although Van Horn later applied for an injunction against the execution of the plan) the miners began entering the pits. What was there for the courts to take up then? "National health and safety" were no longer endangered now that the miners were underground. But the Taft-Hartley legal grab bag was not yet exhausted. Judge Goldsborough, who had fined the union and Lewis heavily in 1946, once more sat in judgment. He declared that Lewis and the union were in contempt of court for failing to end the strike. In 1948 his vicious attitude was demonstrated by the 3½ million dollar fine he slapped on the union; only the union's appeal to the Supreme Court reduced the fine to \$700,000. This time he doubled the union's fine to \$1,400,000 and Lewis' fine to \$20,000. Only government advice, he said, persuaded him not to send Lewis to jail.

COURT'S STANDARDS

What standards do the courts use in applying fines? Why is it that the courts fined the Centralia Coal Company only \$1,000 for "willful neglect" when their callous disregard for the safety of the miners resulted in a disaster which killed 111 men? What standards are used when a mine

(Continued on page 4)

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. Hltonside 6-5117
Vol. 12, No. 20 May 17, 1948
Emanuel Garrett, Editor
Editorial Board:
Hal Draper, Henry Judd
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

The Book Service
Now Has These
Hard To Get Items:
by Leon Trotsky
THE SOVIET ECONOMY IN DANGER. Expulsion of Zinoviev 50¢
THE SOVIETS AT WORK \$1.00
LESSONS OF OCTOBER (paper) 75¢
WHITHER FRANCE (paper) 75¢
WAR & THE 4th INTERNATIONAL 25¢
THE KIROV ASSASSINATION 50¢
THE SOVIET UNION & THE 4th INTERNATIONAL—The Class Nature of the Soviet State 75¢
by Krupskaya
MEMORIES OF LENIN (2 volumes) \$3.00
by Max Beer
LIFE & TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX \$2.00
by Judah L. Magnes
RUSSIA & GERMANY AT BREST-LITOVSK \$1.50
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York
Name.....
Address.....
City..... Zone..... State.....

Mr. Churchill Throws Bouquet To Vyshinsky in His Memoirs

By ERNEST ERBER

History's most colossal lie, the Moscow Trials, is afoot again. In Winston Churchill's million dollar memoirs, he recounts a story told him by Benes which appears to substantiate the Stalinist version of the trials and then adds his own cautious approval of this monstrous blood letting, with these words:

"Thereafter there followed the merciless, but perhaps not needless, military and political purge in Soviet Russia, and the series of trials in January, 1937, in which Vyshinsky, the Public Prosecutor, played so masterful a part."

Such an endorsement from an avowed enemy of Russia is of more value to the Stalinist propaganda machine than a thousand articles by fellow-travellers. We can be sure that it will be cited for years as the testimony of the star witness. For those "anti-Stalinists" who embrace every

reactionary opponent of Moscow, from Herbert Hoover to Chang-Kai-shek to Tsaidaris, as is the case with the New Leader school of anti-Stalinism, the opinion of Churchill on the Moscow Trials should serve as a crushing object lesson.

STALIN IS A MAN HE CAN UNDERSTAND

Churchill's views on this subject are astounding only to those who forget that enmity toward the Kremlin can be compounded out of the most varied factors, not the least among them being ignorance and ancient prejudices. Churchill assumed the

Kept Greatest Hate for Revolutionists



Taft-Hartley - -

(Continued from page 3)

owner is fined \$9 for each man killed because of his greed for profits? How can fines totaling over a million and a half dollars be exacted from the union? Are the needs of the employers for profits greater than the needs of the men for pensions? With these questions the court did not concern itself at all. It merely fulfilled its function as the court of the coal operators, as company-owned as the very houses that the miners live in.

The formula under the Taft-Hartley Law is simplicity itself. In the event of a dispute—be it over wages, hours or pensions—the employer, simply by being stubborn, leaves the union no alternative except strike. The government thereupon steps in, since national health or safety or prestige is involved; and from there on the employer leans back while the government mans the guns for him—free of charge. The government merely invokes all the injunction provisions against labor, and orders the strikers back to work. If they refuse, they can expect heavy fines and raids on the union treasuries—perhaps, when the honeymoon stage is over, jail sentences too if they don't march back promptly enough. The full machinery of the government is mobilized exclusively against labor in behalf of capital.

The Taft-Hartley Law, with its wholesale revival of the injunction evil, has stripped the impartial mask from the face of the government.

GPU Forgery —

(Continued from page 1)

of slander and calumny is being set in motion, first of all in France. France is today the critical testing ground for the proletariat. It is no accident that along with the forgery of a will, there is appearing in French the GPU book of the Stalinist henchmen, Kahn and Sayers, "The Great Conspiracy." The fake testament and the book of frauds are intended to divert attention from the real testament of Trotsky. Everything that he ever wrote is open to the working class of the entire world for whom it was intended. When the murderer's pick-ax entered the brain of Trotsky, his life-blood splattered over his last work. It was the manuscript on Stalin. This work is about to appear in France. The Stalinists have every reason to fear the influence of this work upon workers and public opinion. The biography is one part of the real testament of L. D. Trotsky. The last words of Trotsky, on his deathbed, spoken in my presence show how unbreakable was the revolutionary spirit of this man. It is the complete answer to the new calumny. "Tell the friends that I am sure of the victory of the Fourth International. Go forward!"

That message was immediately transmitted by wireless and press to all corners of the world. It is the

meaning of that message reinforced by all the living ideas of Trotskyism that leaves the Stalinists no peace. The very lies in their monstrous growth, one negating the other and yet being feverishly manufactured anew, are a tribute to the strength of the real ideas of Trotsky. Stalin would like to shut the door of Trotskyism to the workers by having them think it leads to hopelessness and bankruptcy. That door is Stalinism. Precisely through the heritage of the unconquerable Marxist teaching, inspired by the revolutionary fervor of L. D. Trotsky, will the world working class regain its confidence and its unified strength. In vain do the Stalinist gravediggers of the revolution use their temporary power to bury the gigantic thought contained in the October revolution. All the lies of the frightful totalitarian regime that now rules Russia will crumble along with the regime itself—this is inevitable. Trotskyism remains the sole continuator of the great revolutionary traditions of Marx, Engels and Lenin. That is the essence of the real testament of Leon Trotsky.

Note: Suit for libel has been instituted against the French weekly France-Dimanche.

As we noted last week, we are compelled by space requirements to make new arrangements for the important discussions on current political issues now being carried in Labor Action. Our discussion on Palestine, which has already been going on for four months, is scheduled to continue for a short time further. With this issue we open a discussion on the Marshall Plan. In order not to overweight our four-page weekly beyond its capacity, the discussion on the Czech events which has already started will be continued mainly in the columns of The New Internationalist, whose April number features four interpretative and informational articles on the question. LABOR ACTION will publish discussion articles on Czechoslovakia received prior to this announcement; any received henceforth may or may not be published, depending on space requirements for the Marshall Plan and Palestine question. The discussion of the Czech events will also be continued in the Workers Party Bulletin, which is for public sale (order direct from the Workers Party). The allocation of articles between the Bulletin and the New Internationalist depends as usual on quality, length, and the representation of significant viewpoints. We also repeat that, as in the case of the Palestine discussion, contributions on these subjects (including the Marshall Plan) to LABOR ACTION are limited to 1000 words. Shorter articles are preferred. In addition to all of the above, the letters-from-readers column of LA is always open for discussion of any issue at any time, subject to the comments made last week.

was a conspiracy against civilization itself, an insidious pestilence which merited no quarter. Churchill's rancor-ridden mind was prepared to believe anything about the old Bolshevik leadership—and he did. In 1917 he believed Kerensky's frame-up of Lenin and Trotsky as agents of the Kaiser and in 1937 he believed Stalin's frame-up of the old Bolsheviks as agents of Hitler.

The role of Stalinism in world politics, however, began to jar Churchill's version of national resurgence in Russia. Stalinism was most certainly the latter, but it was more. The Comintern emerged as a widespread Russian Fifth Column, intent upon penetrating everywhere and preparing the ground for a Stalinist coup d'etat. In despair, Churchill got off his well known remark to the effect that Russia was "a puzzle wrapped in an enigma." In the light of his bewilderment about Stalinism, his view that the purges were "perhaps not needless" and that Vyshinsky "played so masterful a part" must be taken as the judgment of a man who has revealed his shrewdness on the familiar ground of Empire politics in war and peace, but has equally revealed an abysmal ignorance of the great historical questions of our day.

DEVELOPMENT OF RELATIONS BETWEEN RUSSIA & GERMANY

We can assume that Churchill faithfully repeated the story told to him by Benes to the effect that the Czech intelligence discovered that the Soviet embassy in Prague was being used as a contact post between military personages in Germany and Russia. It is also not excluded that Benes' secret service actually ferreted out such a German-Russian military liaison via Prague. This mere fact, if it were established, does not necessarily give an iota of credence to the Stalinist version of the execution of the Russian general staff.

(Cont'd next week)

By JACK WEBER

Stalin has made gross blunders more than once. But there is one thing he has always banked on, and quite properly. No bourgeois government, of whatever shade, be it extreme right, center or left, would ever aid revolutionists against him. Quite the contrary, they have gone out of their way to give aid and comfort to Stalin against his revolutionary opponents. We are reminded of this historic fact by the "revelation" in the Memoirs of Churchill that Benes, then premier of Czechoslovakia, played a modest role in the frame-ups that sent to their deaths the Red Army generals, Tukhachevsky, Gamarnik, et al.



Benes revealed in conversation with Churchill that the Czech police had "uncovered" plotting between the Nazis and the Red Army generals against the GPU, so that the accusations against the army generals could appear to have support through a friendly foreign government. The Memoirs have appeared elsewhere without this footnote, which in any case adds quite ambiguously that whether the GPU supplied the information or not is of no particular consequence. Benes performed a service for Stalin. Churchill might have added that no doubt in his role as "humanitarian democrat," the creed he professed in his American lectures, Benes was ready and willing to perform an even greater service for the Kremlin. The stupidity of the GPU was all that prevented this service from being consummated.

HOW THEY TRIED TO FRAME GRYLEWICZ

The Moscow trials up to that of Piatakov in early 1937, it will be recalled, had failed to carry conviction in world opinion. The Kremlin director planned to set the stage better for the next big trial, that of Bukharin, Rakovsky and numerous Russian diplomats (the Trial of the Twenty-one), so that the infamous charge of spying for foreign powers, this time Germany and Japan, would make some impression abroad. (It was unnecessary to convince the Russians who, in any case, never believed the trials.) The GPU was

therefore given orders to spare no expense to bring off trials of Trotskyites as spies and foreign agents in other countries.

The Franco-Soviet "alliance" had naturally resulted in a similar pact with the French satellite Czechoslovakia. These pacts brought about a spirit of real accommodation to Stalin on the part of the "partners." The French police had, during the course of the negotiations for a military pact, hounded Trotsky out of France. They went further when the former GPU official Ignace Reiss broke with the Stalinists and was assassinated in September 1937. The ring of murderers, beginning with Spiegleglass, was completely known. The actual killer, Gertrude Shidlova, was in the hands of the French police. Their connivance permitted her to escape across the frontier in a Russian embassy car. The murders of the secretary of the Fourth International, Rudolf Klement, and of Leon Sedov in Paris went completely unsolved due to the calculated inaction of the French authorities. Who was Benes not to prove as compliant as his French superiors?

Reiss had been slain. But his diary remained and was published. It revealed how the infamous Yezhov, fit successor to Yagoda as head of the GPU, had directed that the German revolutionist Grylewicz be denounced to the Czech police as an agent of the Gestapo. Grylewicz, instrumental in getting out the Russian Opposition Bulletin in Berlin before Hitler came to power, had managed to flee to Czechoslovakia just one step ahead of the Gestapo. The GPU now put pressure on the Czechs to bring him to trial as an agent of this same Gestapo that sought to take his life. He was arrested in Prague in July 1937. A suit-case containing letters and documents was confiscated by the police. Reiss reveals how Slutsky, head of the GPU in France, positively fumed with indignation at the slowness of the Czech administration in bringing Grylewicz to trial. The diary also reveals the chief conspirator, Stalin, phoning to Yezhov constantly and impatiently to learn the status of the Grylewicz affair. But alas! The GPU added one more to its careless mistakes in its frame-ups. The suit-case, having left the hands of Grylewicz, was planted with "incriminating" documents appended to his letters. Unfortunately some of these documents bore dates long after Grylewicz had access to his material. How then had he received them? Benes and his police were stumped. Grylewicz was questioned about the Moscow trials, but that hardly helped matters. He was finally expelled from the country in December 1937, after having been held in jail for months without charges and without trial.

This was not the only attempt to condition public opinion to make it receptive for the coming show trial. Preparations were on a world-wide scale, naturally including the United States. Trotsky having found a haven in Mexico, the GPU was ordered to set the stage for a spy scare among the Japanese in California. The Russian press contained hints on this score as early as July 1937. The Rubens-Robinson pair were to be the show-pieces in this sector of the frame-up. Here again Stalin failed miserably to achieve his purpose. All that the Rubens case brought about was to uncover the Stalinist passport racket in New York City. The Rubens were traced beyond any shadow of doubt to the GPU. The attempt to link them up as "Trotskyite spies" sent to Moscow by Trotsky was too transparent. But here again the one government that might have been interested enough to press the case to a conclusion and make public its findings, the United States government, remained absolutely silent. If it did not lend itself to a shoddy frame-up, it also did nothing to expose Stalin. Closely connected with the Rubens case was the disappearance of Juliet Stuart Poyntz who had broken with Stalinism and who knew too much about the Rubens. This case was never pressed despite the revelations made by Carlo Tresca concerning her abductors. Similarly the murder of Carlo Tresca remains "unsolved" to this day.

The remarkable spirit of accommodation of the bourgeois governments when Stalin's hounding and framing of revolutionists is concerned, is not lacking even in Churchill's memoirs. It is not only that he leaves ambiguous the "service" rendered by Benes. Churchill knows the great service that Stalin has performed for the bourgeoisie in wiping out the greatest Marxist leaders. He would undoubtedly agree with the spirit if not with the exact phrasing of the words of one whom he called "that great man," Mussolini.

Mussolini wrote ironically, but truthfully, in his paper Popolo d'Italia, after the murder of Bukharin and the others in the Trial of the Twenty-one in March 1938: "Stalin does not resort to castor oil to punish Communist leaders who are so stupid as still to believe in Communism. . . . He makes a clean sweep by means of systems which were born in the steppes of Genghis Khan. . . . Stalin renders a service to Fascism." Mussolini was merely more outspoken than the rest of the bourgeois world in thus expressing his thanks to the Kremlin. The rulers on both sides of the Iron Curtain are one in their hatred for proletarian revolutionists.

A DISCUSSION ON CZECH EVENTS

By E. R. MCKINNEY

(Continued from Last Week)

Comrade Howe's article is a little difficult to deal with. He begins with the observation that "The hearts of all socialists were . . . sick with sorrow and apprehension last week." He suffered a "sense of oppression" and a "feeling of discouragement." Comrade Howe finds the world preparing for war like a patient who has had such large doses of pain and horror that they seem normal to him. Howe finds the world rushing headlong to its doom. However I am not much impressed or moved by Comrade Howe's "sorrow," his "oppression" or his "feeling of discouragement." I don't believe that sorrow, oppression and discouragement are very helpful qualities in the struggle against Stalinism or capitalism. Furthermore, sorrowing socialists are not a very sturdy breed. Socialists feeling "discouragement" will not be of much service in the struggle against Stalinism or capitalism. Socialists, that is revolutionary socialists, REAL communists must be made of sterner stuff. It is in times of proletarian setback that revolutionary socialists do not become "sick with sorrow and apprehension. . . ." It is in times such as we are passing through today, when "the socialist movement is in an even weaker condition," than it was ten years ago, that revolutionists must not join the petty-bourgeoisie in a frantic flight to the wailing wall. The first paragraph of Comrade Howe's article could properly appear in a column by Norman Thomas or in a Nation editorial by Freda Kirchwey.

Comrade Howe is correct when he writes: "Only fools and scoundrels can keep talking about European politics as if all is well, as if the working class is reaching the peak of its road. The truth is otherwise." Howe goes off the other end and there isn't much difference between those who attempt to talk up a revolution and those who gulp up the victory of Stalinism everywhere. For instance Comrade Howe is for "honest pessimism." This is the only "basis for useful discussion." What is "honest pessimism" and what would be dishonest pessimism? I take it that Comrade Howe is addressing himself to Marxists and militant thinkers in his article and not to old ladies, or to disillusioned youth who have been nourished on the theory of the drive "to be a complete man." If his piece is addressed to Marxists, he will have to tell us what Marxian pessimism is. He will also have to tell us in what way his "honest pessimism" is superior to or more effective than the "official optimism" of the Fourth International.

HEART OF THE POSITION

Howe's discussion of the differences between Nazism and Stalinism is standard Party position and was settled in its main outlines in 1941 when the Party rejected the position that Russia was a fascist state. On the question of Stalinist barbarism, the

Trotskyist movement said back in 1935 that nowhere were revolutionists so brutally treated as in the "Soviet Union." At its 1941 convention the Workers Party also rejected the position that Stalinism and bourgeois democracy "are equally reactionary."

Along with Judd and others Howe takes the position that the Stalinists will not seize power without the support of the working class. This of course, if true, makes Stalinist totalitarianism qualitatively different from Nazi totalitarianism. This makes of Stalinist rule, at least at the beginning, a sort of benevolent totalitarianism. From this point Comrade Howe gets to the heart of his position with the question: "Why did the Czech workers help the totalitarian bandits seize the government?" He replies: I think the answer is that the support by the Czech workers of the Stalinists is based on a unique mixture of reactionary and revolutionary motivations. . . . The workers support the Stalinists because they want socialism—that is certainly true; but they also support them because their conception of what socialism is has been debased and corrupted as a result of the catastrophic declines and the barbaric experiences of recent history. In other words the 'revolutionary' kernel of their reasons for supporting Stalinism is encased in a reactionary shell."

This is very bad but Howe hasn't finished with this theme. The whole period since the 1920s has been one of "terrifying experiences." These experiences have tended to destroy first "the initiative of the workers and, second, their conception of what the aim of their struggle was. . . . the working class and with it all humanity has become an object of manipulation by totalitarian parties." It isn't so easy to get hold of all of this but we must try.

It is clear that Howe has surrendered or has been completely oppressed by the totalitarian wave of the future. He bows before inexorable fate. True he calls for socialism and holds that "it is still possible for men to act," but the perspective is "dark, very dark." Aside from the manipulation of "all humanity" by totalitarians; the atom bombs are poised to wipe out all humanity. I say again, revolutionists must be made of sterner stuff. No matter how dark the future, it is the business of all humanity who call themselves Marxian revolutionaries to face the facts resolutely and without fear and trembling; without "sorrow" and "pessimism," and wailing. Is a Marxist revolutionist merely one who "accepts" Marxism? Or better, one who accepts Marxism in the bright days of spring but seeks other consolations during the dark days of the winter? I say again that it is exactly now that the Marxist is the invaluable and the indispensable man. But he must be a dry-eyed man, one who stands firm and a beacon light to a working class lured and misled by Stalinism.

It is clear from the above that I do not accept the analysis and the conclusions of Judd and Howe. I

think that both of them have misunderstood and misinterpreted what transpired in Czechoslovakia. These positions expressed in LABOR ACTION are another example of the danger of inadequate and superficial analysis. It is made worse when the analyses are made in the grip of fear and trembling.

The contention is made that there is "something new" in the situation. The something new is the support of the Stalinists by the workers in the seizure of power. I have already pointed out some of the flaws in this argument above. I want now to discuss the event in a more positive way. The workers are not at the high level nor the low level argued by Howe. They do not "want socialism" nor are they against capitalism in any way except the most elementary. This means that they are primarily concerned with more immediate necessities such as goods and services. This is certainly true of the workers of devastated, war ravaged and poverty stricken Europe. If this is not true and one makes the claim that the Czech workers want socialism and are against capitalism on any higher level of political thinking, then it will be very difficult to maintain the Howe thesis that the Czech workers do not know the difference between Stalinism and socialism. In another way the position of Judd is a refutation of the Howe thesis. Where Judd says that the Stalinist program appears progressive and revolutionary to the workers he is in support of Howe; they don't know the difference. But Judd has them smart enough and politically developed enough to know that one should reject bourgeois democracy, as a bankrupt social order, in favor of a revolutionary program and socialism. The dilemma in Czechoslovakia it seems was that while the workers were highly political on one day, they were stupid and backward on the day following.

ALREADY HAD COMMAND

Now what is the probable answer to what transpired in Czechoslovakia? I believe it is the following. First, far more weight must be given to what Judd calls "techniques" than he or Howe does. The Stalinists already had command in the country before the so-called seizure of power. Stalinist seizure of power is in no essential different from a Hitler seizure of power. There is no need to inject some really mystical ideological element into the situation as Judd does. There is certainly no need for Howe's metaphysics or his lachrymose retreat. There was the Stalinist party, the Stalinist led action committees, militia and the Stalinist led unions. The coup had been well-prepared in advance and the workers had been bribed by benefits or intimidated and terrorized. Even those workers who dissented could have no effect; they could easily be silenced. The Czech workers had no assistance, no guidance and no protection of any sort. Comrade Howe should try to think this through. He is here in the

U. S., and yet mere reading of what the Stalinists were doing several thousand miles away, filled him with sorrow and trembling. What would he have done if he had been in Prague where the Czech workers were?

Furthermore, it must be emphasized again that industry was already 75 per cent nationalized before the seizure of power. This is a good place to discuss Stalinist nationalization and the workers' response. It is the contention that the workers supported the Stalinists because of nationalization. Let us assume that this is true. It does not follow from this that they confuse Stalinism with socialism. All that one can say is that there is confusion over what nationalization is and what is its relation to socialism. But one can make this charge against others: the Socialist Workers Party, for instance and the Fourth International. It can be said correctly that the Czech workers, along with others, think on a rather primitive and instinctive level. They have heard that capitalism is the main enemy, therefore any group which is against capitalism is to be preferred to capitalist parties. Furthermore, if it is correct to expropriate the capitalist class and to support the taking of the property by the state, then it is correct to support that group which advocates such actions. This is not confusing Stalinism with socialism, or accepting Stalinism as socialism. More correctly put, it is the result of the failure of the anti-Stalinist Marxist revolutionists to reach the working class with sound Marxian propaganda and education. There has been far too much pure and simple and merely vituperative anti-Stalinism hurled at the working class, which to many workers must have appeared as so much yelping at the heels of those who have been "successful."

The Howe position is an example of this. The Czech workers supported the Stalinists. They supported the Stalinists because workers today do not know the difference between Stalinism and socialism. It is as simple as that. There is no hint that the workers perhaps do not have a complete understanding of this new anti-capitalist phenomenon which is Stalinism. What is going on is an illustration of the fact that the mass of workers understand neither Stalinism, capitalism nor socialism. This holds for the workers of the United States and of Czechoslovakia. It's about time that all of us who claim to be Marxists and working class politicians understand this; stop our whining and snapping; and descend from our pedagogical ivory towers to the proletarian grass roots.

UNDERSTANDING STALINISM

I say that workers do not understand this new Stalinist anti-capitalism. They are not alone in their ignorance. What chance have they had to understand? Could the Czech workers learn about Stalinism from the capitulationist Social-Democracy? Could they learn from the Czech lib-

erals? Could they learn from the Fourth International which is just as muddled about the nature of Stalinism as the Czech workers. We have to remember too that up to the fall of 1941 the Workers Party held the position that Russia is some kind of workers' state. Was that because we didn't know the difference between Stalinism and socialism?

If Comrade Howe's argument is correct anti-Stalinist workers in Czechoslovakia should have kept quiet when the putsch was taking place. If the workers were consciously giving support to Stalinism because they think Stalinism is socialism, opposition to the Stalinist seizure of power would result in the anti-Stalinists being liquidated as reactionary opponents of socialism; as pro-capitalist enemies of the people. Good political sense would have indicated that anti-Stalinists should wait until the eyes of the workers were opened. These slogan should have been: "After Stalin we come."

It is necessary to mention one other aspect of the "support" given the Stalinists by the Czech workers. The Stalinist movement appeared to them as a native movement, a Czech anti-capitalist upsurge. This perhaps obscured the Stalinist insides of the movement. That is why I, for one, take the position that the Stalinists in each country, outside of Russia, of course, must be looked at as invaders, as outside conquerors. Insofar as the native Stalinist bureaucrats act to establish bureaucratic collectivism, they are just as much the representatives of Moscow as is Molotov in the UN. That is, the Gottwalds are an integral part of a worldwide set-up headed by Moscow. The Gottwalds and the Fosters only support "their own" governments when those governments are in a bloc with Moscow, as during the late war. Also it must be stressed that the stability of every Stalinist regime rests ultimately on the Russian army.

The Workers Party has characterized Russia as a bureaucratic collectivist state. We believe this to be the most scientific description of this new political monstrosity. We do not say that the last word has been said nor that "enough has necessarily been said." The Stalinists are the supreme opportunists of history. They are not the most inept of opportunists. Combined with this is Stalinist terror and ruthlessness. Not mere terror and ruthlessness but efficient and effective terror. I believe that Judd underestimates this in his analysis.

As I see it the position of Comrades Howe and Judd is off the mark. Both of them seem to have the feeling that the Czech workers have let them down. Next it will be Italy. Then France. Next the United States. Then where will "socialists" take refuge from Stalinism?

The current New International carries special articles on the Czech events. Order your copy now from N1, 4 Court Sq., Long Island City 1, N. Y.