

**WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD;
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!**

LABOR ACTION

JULY 5, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Yugoslav Fuehrer Goes Into Business For Himself

TITO SPLITS STALIN EMPIRE!

What Do the Stalin - Tito Charges REALLY Say?

By ERNEST ERBER

The bulk of both the Cominform attack upon Tito and Tito's reply is composed of demagogical charges aimed at securing support in the ranks of the Yugoslavian Communist Party and among Stalinists in the rest of the world. However, buried between the lines of both documents are enough clues to compose a fairly comprehensive picture of what is at stake. A knowledge of Stalinism and its internal structure should cause any competent observer to dismiss all the charges of "Trotskyism," "Bukharinism," ideological deviations on the role of the party, lack of internal party democracy, "Turkish rule," tactical errors in nationalization, etc., and seek the basic causes of Stalin's concern over Tito's role and the latter's intransigent defiance of the Kremlin.

Stalin's main concern is over Tito's independence of Moscow dictation, regardless of whether this exerts itself in questions of major or of minor importance to Russia. It is part of the very essence of Stalinism that it cannot tolerate 99 per cent loyalty. A totalitarian structure demands TOTAL acceptance. Anything less than this is dangerous and must be overcome. If it cannot be corrected through pressure, it must be fought and destroyed.

The identification of "rule or ruin" as the basic operational principle of Stalinism may be an over-simplification, but basically it describes the only final alternatives before Stalinism in its relations with any other force, including those that are 99 per cent Stalinist.

CANNOT BE AN EQUAL

This factor works with special importance in the Kremlin's relations with its satellite states. Russia can only tolerate a nation as a "sphere of influence" while in the process of reducing it to a complete puppet. It cannot achieve a status quo in its relations with another state on the basis of a division of power, such as capitalist imperialists have done historically.

The capitalist imperialists have succeeded in maintaining certain nations as their "sphere of influence," like the United States in Latin America, for long periods of history because the domination of capitalist imperialism is basically an ECONOMIC one. Russian imperialism can only dominate through its military and political power, the latter ex-

ercised through its control of the international Stalinist apparatus which is essentially a secret police network. Every evidence of independence on the part of the satellite state, consequently, is tantamount to rebellion.

Were Tito to succeed in establishing even a measure of independence, every puppet leadership in the Russian empire would seek to do the same. To permit Tito to "become an equal," as he insists, would mean the beginning of the disintegration of the entire web of Stalinist control. A comprehension of this fact explains what has puzzled so many commentators, namely, why Stalin acted so precipitously and so brutally against Tito. Stalin, like every authoritarian, knows that a system that rests upon authority dares not temporize with those who defy it. Disaffection in the ranks must be wiped out, quickly and decisively, lest it spread and become unmanageable. Stalin's relation to the Yugoslavian assertion of rights to independence is the same as that of a military commander to mutiny in the ranks. To temporize with it, to negotiate with it, to compromise

with it, can only destroy the system as such.

For Stalin to permit Tito any degree of autonomy is to permit Tito to influence the other Communist parties in his own right and in possible opposition to Russia. Stalinism cannot survive under these circumstances. It must remain monolithic or not exist. Stalinist parties cannot be confronted with a choice between a Stalin policy and a Tito policy. Such a situation requires party democracy, discussion and a democratic vote—all of them tantamount to a death sentence to Stalinism.

As a nation on the border between the Russian empire and the West and as a nation that is not occupied by Russian troops, Yugoslavia's assertion of independent rights is especially dangerous, since it raises the specter of Belgrade seeking to play a diplomatic role of its own between Russia and the Anglo-American bloc. The Kremlin can tolerate a nation seeking to play such a role if that nation is not yet fully under Stalinist control but in the process of being controlled.

(Continued on page 4)

Allows No Full Partnerships



Satellite Dictator's Break Deals Serious Blow to Kremlin Despots

The Cominform's attack upon Tito and his bitter reply has suddenly revealed the granite-like solidity of Stalin's empire to be susceptible to internal explosions fraught with the gravest consequences for the authority of the Kremlin, not only among its satellite nations, but in Russia itself.

The Cominform's resolution accused

Hot on the heels of Tito's counterblast against the Cominform denunciation of his regime's "hateful" attitude toward Kremlin domination comes the first word indicating what may be the Yugoslav dictator's perspective in a positive sense. These are the first reports of the new program being presented by Tito's Central Committee for the coming Fifth Communist Council meeting on July 21. It seems to add up to this:

Tito is going into business for himself. No longer content to act as branch manager for Stalin's bureaucratic empire in eastern Europe the Yugoslav sub-fuehrer has announced the launching of his own company.

Point 4 of the Yugoslav CP's new program calls for "the tightest cooperation" with Bulgaria and Albania and efforts toward "uniting the Albanian and Bulgarian peoples with the Yugoslav peoples on a prin-

ciple of national equality"—that is, the formation of a Balkan bloc of CP-dominated countries which will seek to deal with Russia as an "equal."

At the same time the program calls for "tight cooperation with the Soviet Union," refers to Russia as the head of the "democratic anti-imperialist forces of the world," and gives no verbal sign of any turn toward a pro-Western orientation such as was widely expected to follow the split with the Moscow bureaucracy.

Indeed, it might be more accurate to conclude that Tito is in reality asking for promotion from the status of branch manager to that of junior partner with Stalin. It is difficult to believe that he can seriously hope to

Communist Parties and the latter were kept in an ironbound apparatus manipulated from Moscow.

In the last analysis, this could only mean the control of the Communist Parties outside of Russia proper by means of the GPU, the Russian secret service. The charges and countercharges between Moscow and Belgrade about secret police espionage reveal that both Stalin and Tito considered the role of the GPU as crucial in maintaining Kremlin control over Yugoslavian affairs.

POWERFUL EFFECTS

The rebellion of the Tito leadership is the first instance of serious opposition within the Stalinist movement since the expulsion of the Trotskyist and rightist oppositions in the late 1920s, when monolithism was declared an official doctrine and all Stalinist parties accepted the authority of Moscow without question. Though not on the same ideological plane, if ideological differences can be said to play a role, the Tito opposition can prove to be far more dangerous to Stalin than that of Trotsky.

Tito, unlike Trotsky, is beyond the police power of the Russian state and bases himself upon his own state apparatus. Tito has already shown signs of carrying the fight into the other Stalinist parties and even the impoverished resources of a state like Yugoslavia give him ample means of conducting a political struggle, waged by all the traditional methods of the Stalinist movement, both in the countries behind the Iron Curtain and among the Stalinists of the West.

The external similarity of Tito's Yugoslavia with the Russian social order permit him to pose as a "socialist state," a "little Soviet Union," in appealing for support among the pro-Stalinist elements of the West. His stand cannot but exert a profound influence upon the bureaucracies of the other satellite countries, which will sympathetically identify their problems with those Tito faced in Yugoslavia. The existence of a "second workers' fatherland" that is anti-Moscow has such profound possibilities for the future development of the Stalinist movement as to defy even speculation at this early date. It would strike at the very heart of the ideological hold of Stalinism upon workers and intellectuals everywhere.

CRUCIAL MOVES

It is not excluded that Tito's defiance of Stalin is either already linked to elements with the Russian bureaucracy or can become an issue around which such elements can mobilize support. Tito's defection will be understood clearly as a major catastrophe for Stalin among the rival tendencies of the Russian bureau-

(Continued on page 4)

Won't Say "Uncle"



play a completely independent role as between the Western bloc and the Russian bloc, as a "bridge" or "balance of power" between East and West.

The new Yugoslav program, even more than the reply to the Cominform, may be interpreted to mean that Tito's longer-range perspective is: to blackmail Russia into accepting him WITHIN THE RUSSIAN WAR BLOC with a status similar to that which, for example, Churchill hopes to attain for a "Western Union" within the American-dominated war bloc.

While speculation along these lines, based as it must be on fragmentary indications, is highly risky (to say the least), there have been previous indications of such moods among some elements within Stalin's satellites. The idea of such a Balkan federation was first put forward not by Tito but indeed by Dimitrov, sub-fuehrer of Bulgaria. This proposal, which was made last year presumably after conversations with the Yugoslavs, brought a rebuke from Moscow and the idea was dropped. What was then a feeler for Dimitrov becomes now a program for Tito, put forward in the teeth of Russian

(Continued on page 4)

Irgun - Haganah Battle Sheds Light On Threat of Civil War in Israel

By AL FINDLEY

The spectacular struggle between the Irgun and the Haganah, last week pointed up the danger of a right-wing provoked civil war in Israel. The events confirm LABOR ACTION's analysis that the Irgun was resolved at all costs to maintain its military freedom and to use its military power to establish its authoritarian rule. LABOR ACTION warned of this early last December, even when the socialist Zionists were minimizing the post-partition strength of the right wing bands.

Unfortunately for the Irgun, the time of the first test of strength came as an accident. The Irgun had not planned for it. A ship of their American Committee for a Free Palestine, loaded with small arms and some recruits, arrived after the UN truce had gone into effect. The ship was named the "Altelana"—pennam of Vladimir Jabotinsky, theoretician and deceased leader of the extremely re-

actionary Revisionists. Of course the Irgunists magnified the cargo and the number of men the ship carried, in the traditional manner of its "big lie" propaganda technique.

The government demanded that the ship remain outside of the territorial waters and be placed under the jurisdiction of the army. The Irgun refused. They have long been accustomed to harsh demands followed by the capitulation of Ben-Gurion and his Social-Democratic Labor Party. This had taken place when the yellow union of the Revisionists forced Ben-Gurion to sign a permanent no-strike agreement (repudiated later by the rank and file) and again recently when he capitulated in accepting the agreement "coordinating" the Irgun and the army. But this time working class interests were not the main question. On that Social-Democrats find it easy to retreat. Involved here were commitments to world powers and there is nothing that a Social-

Democrat honors more than his commitments to strong powers.

The Haganah went into action, and after a short battle seized the beaches and prevented the landing of the munitions. The beaches were then turned over to Irgun units of the Jewish army. This was interpreted as a sign of the usual vacillation and the Irgun thereupon proceeded to attempt to unload the ship at Tel-Aviv. A battle resulted and the ship was put afire by shore batteries. Forty people were killed in the battle. Among the killed was Abraham Stavsky, convicted assassin of the labor leader, Arlarzoff. Approximately 400 were arrested as a result of this incident.

VICTORY FOR BEN-GURION

The Irgun and Stern groups announced their withdrawal from the Jewish army and their return to the underground, calling for the overthrow of the government, which they characterize as a "Marxist dictatorship" of the Labor Party and Ben-Gurion. The ministers of the Misrahi and its labor affiliate resigned from the government—not because of any religious questions involved, but to uphold an ally of theirs in the fight against the real labor movement of Palestine.

However, the main groups of the Jewish bourgeoisie felt that the time was not ripe for a civil war NOW. The entire Jewish press with the exception of the Revisionists condemned the actions of the Irgun. With the uneasy truce liable to break down at any moment, they thought the time inappropriate. This feeling, it is reported, is shared by a good many of the rank and file of the Irgun and Stern groups who are returning to their posts. These are the nationalist elements who were attracted to the Irgun on a purely nationalist basis and ignored, rather than adopted, the semi-fascist and anti-working class policies of the leadership. The Misrahi ministers have returned to their feshpots on the promise of an amnesty for those arrested. The Stern group has ordered its men back into the army and a statement of Irgun Radio said that Beifin (Irgun leaders) would do the same in a few days.

Ben-Gurion will probably use this victory to proceed to erase the independence of the Irgun and Stern group within the official army. In the June 25 issue of LABOR ACTION we said that the degree of military freedom of the Irgun within the army would be decided by "the political struggle." The accident of the timing

(Continued on page 2)

Shachtman Analyzes Situation in Europe

Over 350 Hear WP Chairman Stress Path to Socialist Regroupment

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, spoke to an enthusiastic audience of over 350 people Friday night, June 25. Just back from a four-month stay in Europe, Comrade Shachtman gave an eyewitness account of the political situation in France and England. Speaking on the subject "Europe in the Shadow of the Third World War," special emphasis was given to a detailed analysis of the political currents which are now affecting the French working class. The audience, despite the heat, listened with rapt attention.

Comrade Shachtman discussed the fact that the economy of France is in a state of complete disintegration, with three economies living side by side: the private industries, the nationalized industries (nationalized because they were bankrupt and the government is trying unsuccessfully to revive them), and the ever-present black market. The speaker stated that the devastation caused by the war and the continued impoverishment of the working class cannot be adequately described in print.

In a thorough analysis of the Stalinist party of France, Shachtman pointed out that the overwhelming majority of CP members in France are passive and disillusioned with the party, and remain in it simply because they see no real alternative. No

one in France, Shachtman declared, wants to go back to 1939. The working class has a deep yearning for a thorough reorganization of society, for complete nationalization and for their own control of their destiny. They want to "continue the revolution."

The British Labor Party, he stated, has continued its nationalization program beyond the expectations of the Marxist movement. The possibility of the nationalization of the steel industry and chemicals cannot be excluded. The working class, which wants a more rapid and complete extension of the nationalization program, is beginning to exert some pressure on the labor officialdom. Today, even some minor trade-union officials are demanding workers' control of production and a thorough expropriation of the bourgeoisie. Although the left wing of the Labor Party is still small and infiltrated by Stalinists, the necessities of the English economy may impel the labor bureaucracy to push its program forward. The question of how far it will be able to go without encountering very serious resistance by the capitalist class is of great interest and importance for the Marxist movement. While remaining sharply critical of the government for all its inadequacies and cowardice, Shachtman points out that it is impossible

to take a position of head-on opposition to the Labor Party and that the small core of Marxists in England must function within it and act as the only organized force in England today, to push it to the left.

Concluding on a forward-looking note, Comrade Shachtman stressed his conviction that the small and scattered groups of Marxists will regroup and begin to function in the mass working-class movement and serve as the necessary leavening force to create the alternative to the barbarism of Stalinism and capitalism.

Justin Graham, member of the Socialist Youth League national bureau, welcomed members and sympathizers of the SYL who were gathered in New York over the weekend for a national student conference. Stating that the only future which capitalism offers the youth of America is graduation from school right into the army through the peacetime draft, Comrade Graham explained that the SYL has its own valedictory speech to make and that it will function and grow among the youth of America because it struggles for a world of peace and plenty, a world of socialist organization and universal brotherhood.

The August issue of *The New Internationalist* will carry extensive sections from Comrade Shachtman's report.

NEW YORK MEETING NEXT FRIDAY

MAX SHACHTMAN

Will Speak on:

Tito-Stalin Break

LABOR TEMPLE

FRIDAY, JULY 9

242 East 14th St. (near 2nd Ave.)

Admission: 35 Cents

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Reuther Group Wins in Michigan CIO

By WILLIAM MILLER

GRAND RAPIDS, June 23 — The Michigan State Convention of the CIO has just concluded with an overwhelming victory for the Reuther group. An infinitesimal opposition composed almost exclusively of Stalinists had just enough strength to attempt to put on a show.

This convention, called as the Michigan CIO is preparing itself for the coming November elections, completely failed to answer the problems of the workers. The main resolution of the convention, calling for working within the Democratic Party, was passed with only a minimum of discussion. The convention was a very dull affair with none of its traditional life and color.

Inasmuch as the Stalinist forces were so small, the attempts of the Scholle leadership to whip up enthusiasm against the Stalinists were greeted with immense apathy by the delegates. The demonstration following the nomination of Gus Scholle for president of the Council was a very artificial one in which only a small percentage of delegates participated.

This convention of the Michigan CIO Council has always been regarded as a testing ground for the UAW convention. It was at its 1944 convention that there was begun the fight against the no-strike pledge which reached such fruition in the UAW convention several months later. It was at its last convention that the Reuther victory in the UAW was first indicated. Consequently, this convention is of particular interest because it shows the beginning of a division in the Reuther forces which heretofore have been united in their opposition to Stalinism.

The Scholle-Hopkins leadership of the state council has always been regarded as the conservative section of the Reuther group in Michigan. Its main base lies in the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU), and has in addition to this surrounded itself with typical anti-Stalinist bureaucrats. These elements of the Reuther group have always been the consistent defenders of "CIO policy," and have always hewed to the Murray political line.

As contrasted to this group, there has always been a "left" group in the Reuther caucus which has been best personified by Emil Mazey. This group contributed the bulk of the opposition to the No-Strike Pledge during the war and has been the advocate of a labor party in the UAW.

The developing division in the UAW could be seen in the struggle for vice-presidential posts. A superficial observer might see a fight between rival bureaucrats for a job; yet the real struggle stems from the fact that one section of the Reuther group is determined to cut out the progressive section from leadership positions.

The original struggle developed when the leadership proposed that the slate consist entirely of the incumbents with absolutely no changes. This was opposed by many rank-and-file delegates since two of the incumbent vice-presidents are regional directors of the UAW. After a struggle in the inner councils, these two, McCusker and Cote, stepped down. The replacement for Cote was a routine one, but a new struggle developed over the replacement for McCusker.

Although the Scholle forces had entrusted the chairmanship of the resolutions committee to Ken Morris of Briggs Local 212, they seemed absolutely determined to keep him from representing the East Side UAW on the board. Instead, Ann Patuska of Local 29, an active ACTU member, was given the nomination on the slate. This caused a good deal of indignation among East Side delegates including the Briggs 212 group, Dodge Local 3 and Ford Local 400. The delegates had expected a caucus of East Side locals to name the nominee; instead the ACTU member was handpicked by the top leadership. And it was this organizational fight that typified the growing division in

the Reuther group between the "CIO policy" group and the labor-party forces.

PROGRESSIVES EMERGING

The labor-party forces at this convention were extremely disorganized. The feeling of hopelessness and helplessness as a result of the CIO-political-action policy left the labor-party supporters demoralized. Many of them supported the PAC proposal, saying "What else can we do?" Yet many were so weak in their support that the slightest argument would shake them into silence. Since there was no active leadership for the labor-party proposal, these delegates remained silent and their sole expression of discontent became manifest during the organizational fight for vice-presidential posts.

The convention was chaired in a bureaucratic manner by Gus Scholle,

in contrast to Walter Reuther's chairmanship of the last UAW convention. Scholle's stubborn refusal to seat a small Stalinist delegation won many supporters on this particular issue for the Stalinists.

Another significant rebellion was indicated by the refusal of the delegates to accept biennial conventions. When the proposal was made by the Scholle leadership at a caucus in Detroit, there was not one single person who spoke against the proposal. Yet at the convention, where the Reuther forces were so overwhelmingly powerful, this proposal was voted down by an overwhelming vote.

The complete bankruptcy of the Murray leadership as represented by Scholle can be seen in the resolution on political action. This resolution called for working within the Democratic Party, assessing the results in

November, and, if they are negative, the Michigan CIO Council should recommend to the National CIO Convention the organization of a new political party independent of the old parties.

The remainder of the resolutions were routine resolutions on the Community Chest, elimination of seven-day operation, etc. There was no real debate on the convention floor on any issue.

But the importance of the convention—if its past characterizations as a testing ground holds for the future—lies in the fact that a progressive group is emerging from the Reuther caucus basing its program on a labor party. This group is still groping for existence, is largely unaware that it exists. Yet the short struggle over the vice-presidential posts has proved that a new phase of struggle is developing in the UAW.

NAACP Will Stick With Truman

By KATE LEONARD

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the leading organization concerned with the securing and protecting of civil rights for Negroes in the United States, held its annual convention in Kansas City, Mo., last week, meeting from June 22 through June 27. Simultaneously it published its report covering the work of the last four years.

The theme of this 39th conference of the NAACP was "political action to secure civil rights." The Association leadership, while reaffirming its traditional position that the NAACP is "multi-partisan"—that is, that it would continue to refrain from the blanket endorsement of a party or a candidate while working for the incorporation of a civil rights program into the policies of all parties on local and on national issues—in effect gave approval to the Democratic Party, and to the man who in all probability will be its standard bearer in the coming national election, President Harry S. Truman.

The agenda and the discussion were very weighted. Perhaps the high point of this tactic was the speech of Dr. Channing H. Tobias, awardee of the Spingarn medal. Dr. Tobias, president of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and a member of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, called the report of this committee "the most revolutionary thing done at the White House since the Emancipation Proclamation," and praised the President as follows, "Since this is a political year, the public tends to confuse motives, but in this instance Negroes and their friends know what the President has done for them and are grateful to him."

MORE OF SAME

This latter statement may have been the high—or the low—point in the gearing of this convention to the Truman cause, but it was preceded and followed by more in the same vein. The convention saw the unusual spectacle of a politician denouncing his own party. Dowdell H. Davis, managing editor of the Kansas City Call, who admits to being a "lifelong Republican," said that there was nothing to inspire confidence in the platform of his party on the civil rights issue.

Austin T. Waldin, the attorney in the NAACP-sponsored Ingram defense case, stated that the Negro "belongs" in the Democratic Party of the South for "practical reasons." It is not clear just what Mr. Waldin meant by this remark, which is given out of context in the news releases, but perhaps he agrees with Henry Lee Moon that the Negro vote in several Southern states "is sufficiently influential to keep the South in the Democratic Party." An appraisal made at the same time that the like-

lihood of a Southern "rebellion" going to that length is deprecated pretty widely. The convention was addressed by Oscar R. Ewing, federal security administration, a Truman man with a vengeance. Southern delegates from Texas, Baltimore, etc., testified that their local members had a strong preference for Truman.

Wallace forces at the convention caused some little trouble. They described their position as "strong but not antagonistic." Walter White began the first day by chiding them for "muddying the political waters of the organization," saying that the Wallace movement would lead to the return of a more conservative Congress than the 80th Congress. Wallace supporters demanded that the pro-Truman speech of Dr. Tobias be stricken from the record. White replied with a statement which said in part, "No member or officer of the Association should use or exploit his connection with the NAACP as a means of obtaining office or preference." It can be assumed validly that one reason the leadership did not go further in abandoning its formal "non-partisan" stand was the "spanking" value this might have in handling the Wallace minority. More than "spanking" seems not to have been required.

On the second day the delegates debated the question of democracy within the organization. Walter White, again taking up the cudgels, accused "some political organizations" (presumably the well-known backers of the Wallace candidacy) of seizing upon technical questions of organization as a means of spreading confusion in the association. No doubt a valid statement to the extent that it was directed to the Stalinists and their fellow travelers, but hardly one which answers the charge of lack of democracy in the functioning of the organization.

It is correct to scan and weigh programs, but what program bears scrutiny? The campaign promises of the last four-year period has not been a barren one in the field of civil rights. It is not difficult to draw up a balance sheet, with the pros and the cons, and this in part the NAACP report does. The NAACP emerged from the war years the strongest of the organizations in the field. To point out that it attained its ascendancy at least in part by default may now be irrelevant. It is a stable organization with a tradition and it has been able to make something of an adjustment to a changed situation.

ORGANIZATION DIFFICULTIES

To quote a man whose understanding of such matters is translucent (that much can be said for George S. Schuyler): "Nor has too much progress been made in democratizing the association. Selection of delegates to the annual conference is not yet on an equitable basis nor is the selection of board members. In this the NAACP lags behind most other organizations of a mass character."

In this connection, as well as in attempting an appraisal of the NAACP as an adequate instrument for an organized militant struggle for democratic rights for Negroes, membership figures as reported to the convention have their significance. The "over 800" delegates coming from 40 states of the Union and Hawaii represented a membership of about 580,000. A pretty accurate tape

measure for judging the success of last year's campaign for 1,000,000 members: short of the goal by at least 40 per cent.

There is a financial crisis and the convention voted to increase membership fees to \$2.00 a year. The reason for this could be simply said—the cost of living for organizations too has gone up. But Walter White's strange motivation should not be passed in silence. He quoted the late lamented Kelly Miller, "For too many years the Negro has paid for what he wanted and begged for what he needs." Viewed only as a collection speech, this is a bad one. Considering its source, it smacks of middle-class snobbery. Mr. White needs to be reminded that while Kelly Miller had a caustic tongue, it was not always aimed in the right direction.

POLITICAL ESSENTIALS ABSENT

Apparently without too much difficulty, the leadership of the NAACP is well on its way to pulling this organized movement into the Truman camp, to the support of one of the two parties of capitalism. The ease with which it is happening only underscores the tragic situation in which labor today finds itself. The tragedy—not only for the NAACP, but for the whole struggle of Negroes "to secure these rights"—is identical with the impasse of organized labor. The minimum essential, a political arm, a labor party, is absent. The NAACP is right that Wallace is no alternative.

It deserves full credit for the work accomplished in the last four years. Notably, the legal struggle to have the white primary outlawed and the campaign against the restrictive covenant. Its opposition to separate and unequal facilities in education and in transportation; its excellent analysis of the medical picture as it affects the Negro, published in pamphlet form under the title "Medical Care and the Plight of the Negro," are well known. The Ingram defense case, begun by J. B. Dorsey, mechanic, president of the Americus, Ga., branch of the NAACP, is current his-

tory. It would be easy to give due praise, and stopping there, go on to something else.

It would be easy and wrong, for an annual convention is a time for thought and appraisal. Support to Truman is not the way to hasten the joining of the issue. That requires independent pressure and in the absence of the first prerequisite for effective independent pressure, a political arm of labor, it would perhaps be presumptuous to answer the question: can the NAACP be transformed into a militant mass movement of protest against Jim Crow and discrimination? The question is posed by the country in which we live. Such a movement will come out of this organization, or will come beside it.

July 15 Is Set For Shachtman Speech on WEVD

NEW YORK—Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, will speak over Station WEVD on Thursday evening, July 15. The time is 10 to 10:30 p.m. His subject will be "What Next in Europe?"

Shachtman has just returned from Europe after a stay of several months. During this time he made contact with leading socialists in the French, Spanish, Italian and German movements. He became thoroughly acquainted with the French political scene, including the new tendencies collected in the Democratic Revolutionary Rally.

His talk should prove of interest to all socialists and militant workers. Friends of the Workers Party are urged to get together for a radio night to listen to Comrade Shachtman and to discuss his speech.

Labor Notes From The West Coast

By WILLIAM BARTON

OAKLAND, June 26—With the big beef on the waterfront as backdrop, the labor movement in the San Francisco Bay Area, continues to jump from one hot situation to another. About a week ago, the second strike in two years was threatened for the Key Transit System, operating all transit lines in the East Bay and across the Bay Bridge to San Francisco. The issue was, primarily, wage increases. The Key workers, members of the AFL Carmen's Union, postponed their strike, set for June 1, and ultimately accepted an agreement close to the national pattern—an immediate 8 cents an hour increase, and another 2 cents in five months.

Shortly afterwards the CIO Warehousemen, members of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen Local 6, struck most of the large distributors in northern California. They, too, settled for a 10 cent an hour increase, after an eight day walkout provoked by the adamant stand of the employers. Despite the fact that the local is one of the Stalinist strongholds in the national labor picture, the strike received the official or unofficial support of not only both wings of the split California CIO, but also much of the AFL, including the sometimes hostile San Francisco Building Trades Council.

An interesting sequel was the refusal of one large outfit, Safeway Stores, to continue bargaining with the local and the preparation to recognize the AFL Teamsters, who seem hell-bent on raiding the CIO wherever there is the slightest opening. In this case the union went to the courts. Superior Court Judge Herbert Kaufman has issued a restraining order demanding that the company adhere to the master contract between Local 6 and the Distributors Association of northern California, and to appear in court on June 28 to "show cause" why it should not be permanently restrained from attempting to ignore the contract.

The wisdom of this use of court as-

sistance by a labor organization is made doubly questionable by the recent experience of its international organization on the waterfront. Whereas the East Coast maritime unions have had a full-fledged 80 day Taft-Hartley Act injunction tossed at them, the West Coast unions have only received a temporary restraining order until July 4. The Bridges leadership of the longshoremen's union, which at first adopted the attitude of "let's wait and see what happens after the injunctions wear off" now appears to be spreading the idea that the present court order is only a beginning and nothing better can be expected later. In a recent union bulletin, Bridges said "Our battle is not going to be won in the courts—chances are that we will lose." Although he continues along the lines of "when we are free to strike, we will strike," the same bulletin has little bits of admonition to "keep cool for 80 days," "don't get all heated up"—the clear hint being "take it easy." Some sort of job action response to government by injunction is now very popular on the entire Pacific Coast; employers are already denouncing "slow downs."

The victories of 1934 and '36 can not be sacrificed by default. Bridges and company know that if they are responsible for such a loss they are through. This is one of those few moments in contemporary history when the interests of Stalinist leaders and the labor movement temporarily coincide. But the confusion caused by the Stalinist twists and turns, the sharp divisions in the labor movement produced by their rule or ruin tactics, the fact that they are mostly driven by the needs of Moscow and not of the labor movement, makes the ability of any union they control to combat the boss offensive that much more difficult. It remains to be seen whether the CIO longshoremen and the other waterfront unions under their domination can overcome that obstacle as well as the waterfront employers and their government.

Irgun — Haganah Battle —

(Continued from page 1)

of the "Altalena incident" has decided this issue quicker than we expected. Ben-Gurion is at the same time moving to legalize ALL non-official military organizations, including the Palmach, semi-autonomous striking force of the Haganah. This is strongly opposed by the United Workers Party, whose members comprise the overwhelming majority of the of the Palmach. Their protests will, of course, be of no avail. When a Social-Democrat strikes a blow at the right, he usually strikes two at the left.

THREAT OF CIVIL WAR

Liquidating the freedom of the Irgun and Sternists within the Jewish army in the state of Israel will not, however, lay the ghost of threatened civil war. The key to this question lies in Jerusalem and "elsewhere," where the Irgun and Stern groups claim the right to continue as independent military forces. The events since the signing of the original agreement of unity point to the fact that both groups will attempt to keep their power intact by deserting other fronts and concentrating in Jerusalem. It is clear that with their power concentrated in nearby Jerusalem, "elsewhere" will include the territory of Israel. And, above all, it is absurd to allow the most important and decisive front in the entire Palestinian war to become the plaything of semi-fascist bands who want to use it as a stepping-stone on the road to authoritarian rule. The next time they move it will be a premeditated and planned move that will be more difficult to stop.

One of the by-products of this ill-timed attempt at the first stages of

a civil war is that it once more exposed the Irgun as a front organization of the Revisionists. In addition to the facts that leading Revisionists were involved in the fighting and that Irgun received support from the Revisionist press, the invasion by the Revisionist youth group of the Histadruth building in Tel-Aviv and the consulate in New York clinches the point. Kenneth Bilby of the Herald Tribune reports that the Revisionists will "join" the newly formed Irgun "Freedom Movement."

LABOR ACTION was the FIRST to point out that Count Bernadotte and England would attempt to prolong the truce indefinitely in order to whittle away at the Jewish state. By now every source reports that the UN is trying to get an indefinite truce. They are especially anxious to prolong the truce until after the presidential election in the U.S. and then put through a new "solution" at the fall session of the UN in Paris, one more favorable to their allies—especially Abdullah.

NEW PEACE PLAN

In the meantime, Egypt has violated the truce by firing on a UN plane and preventing a Jewish convoy from reaching Jewish settlements in the Negev. Count Bernadotte has given the Jews the right to do as they please. This violation of the truce follows close on the heels of King Abdullah's visit to Cairo and is undoubtedly the result of the failure of Abdullah to cede the Negev to Farouk of Egypt. Abdullah, however, continues to make violent statements that he will never accept any Jewish state. This despite recurring reports in the Jewish press that Eng-

land is on the verge of recognizing the Jewish state in order to clear the flanks of trouble and concentrate on Berlin, Europe and Russia. King Abdullah, however, is not giving up in attempting to convince the other Arab feudal lords to give him most of Palestine. He is now proceeding to visit his family enemy, Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia.

Count Bernadotte, it is reported, has presented a draft of a peace plan that includes: (1) reduction of the area of the Jewish state; (2) complete internal independence of the Jewish state; (3) foreign affairs and defense to be under control of a central government. There is no question that these proposals are only a beginning in the demands that will be made on the Jewish state in an attempt to transform Rhodes into a new Munich.

American workers can be a decisive factor in preventing a new Munich by demanding the lifting of the embargo immediately and the preparation of arms shipments to leave as soon as the current truce ends. At the same time the American working class should insist that the government redeem its promise and use its transports to help 100,000 Jewish DP's migrate to Palestine NOW, instead of allowing them to rot in the stifling atmosphere of converted concentration camps.

Subscribers — Attention!

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

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

12-27

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

RENEW NOW
EXTEND YOUR SUB

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

We Stand Corrected

Editor:

The June 14 issue of LABOR ACTION has a front page factual mistake which, while not very serious, may be picked up by some critical reader. The remark is made that the peacetime draft before the last war was passed by one vote. That is not the case. It was passed by a decisive vote in both houses, though the opposition was greater than at present. The "one vote" decision came on the provision to keep the selectees in after their originally stipulated one year was up. I believe it was passed by that one vote in the House in the fall of 1941.

William BARTON,
Oakland, Calif.

The Nature and Use Of ERP Assistance

Editor:

The question of ERP and whether, if, or, and/or the proper perspective is being taken by socialists in wanting it, not wanting it, wanting it and yet not really wanting it, has almost reduced the subject to a state of comical aspect. Theoreticians, polemicists, logicians and what have you have all answered one another, and agree on one thing: that they can't agree on anything. Leaving aside all minor considerations, considerations which on the face of them appear more like doctrinaire arguments among persons with a viewpoint rather than an attempt at solving the problem, it would seem that the only course

available, at the moment, as much as we may not agree on all of its ramifications, is to support ERP, that big bogey man that masquerades under the euphemism of "democracy" or what have you.

We take it for granted at the outset that whatever aid is sent or will be sent over is merely done in order to purchase the goodwill of the peoples of Europe for ourselves as against Russia. Democracy in its pure sense does not enter in here and dealing as we are with two varieties of World Expansionists, it is foolish to think that directly the masses of the aided countries are aided through any altruism on either side. Bought and suborned elections in America are put in the background when focused at the European end of the telescope. Whatever aid the peoples of Europe might receive will be in spite of

United States effort, rather than because of it.

An analogy might be made here of capitalistic custom, particularly in the United States. When a Hutton, a Rockefeller, a Guggenheim, passes on they leave to posterity a sizeable amount which is put into a fund, or foundation for the perpetuation of their name. But also with this there are a few beneficiaries among the proletariat who are the recipients of their largesse. What happens to ERP will approximate the above instance. It is not the best alternative, but the only one which will enable the peoples of Europe to ward off Stalinism. Being in a third camp, there is little business to be done with either of the contestants. Every move is a transitory one, an expedient rather than a solution. Until the masses all over the earth reconcile themselves to the fact

that there is a way out, we must be content with devices, means, and palliatives in dealing with them. We don't like this method, we wish we could straightforwardly deal them their cards and let them play out their hands. But we aren't dealing. Whatever cards we can get our hands on we must, due to the situation, smuggle them, or divert them to aid our own ends. The field of possibilities, and probabilities appears exhausted from reading LA. We now get semi-humorous allegorical comments, and critic lambasts critic. As mentioned above, the combatants seem more intent on flooring one another than contributing to a discussion of the issue at hand.

Norman JOHNSTONE—N. J.

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)

Political Roots of the New Party

Who Created Wallace's Party?

By JACK BRAD

What is the origin of the Wallace-Stalinist Party? Was it born of great working class struggles and consequent transformations in the social philosophy of the masses?

The new party is different from all its predecessors, not only in program, but in origin and consequences. While great discontent exists among all classes, and in the working class in particular because it bears the brunt of American capitalism's drive for profits and world rule, masses of people did not create, nor are they actively involved in the new party.

There is no relationship between this great popular wave and the Wallace-Stalinist Party. Problems of wages and price control, of the famous General Motors Program for opening the books and taking all wages increases out of profits...

NOT A LABOR PARTY IN ANY SENSE

The basic problem raised by labor in the post war period is that its previous gains, hard won on the picket line, are stolen back by the political power of the capitalist class through its two parties in Washington.

Since the entire labor movement, except for that small section under Stalinist control, is not in the new party, there is no relationship between it and labor's economic organizations. There is no coordination of leadership, program, rank and file, aims, or methods and needs.

It is not with the enthusiasm of a new social departure and with the energy of a great social class taking its historic place in political life that workers will vote for Wallace—those who do.

The sharpest differentiation exists between those who wish to express political protest by voting for the Wallace-Stalinist Party and the actual members. Democracy is completely absent since the condition for membership is the acceptance of Wallace and the party and its program without arenas for challenge or discussion.

Preliminary to the national Wallace convention there have taken place a series of state organizing conventions. With monotonous regularity the delegates represent the same well-known Stalinist-dominated or front organizations.

WHY IT WAS CREATED

Finally the party is unique among all previous third parties in its absolute emphasis on foreign policy. In fact, for over six months, Wallace, before the party was launched, kept repeating that if the Truman administration changed its foreign policy toward softening its Russian line, there would be no third party.

Where then did his new party come from? It is clear that it is not a creation of the American working class or of the popular masses. Many may vote for it but they did not build it, join it, become full-fledged proponents within it or attempt to lead it.

The Draft Resolution of the Communist Party National Committee (Daily Worker, May 30,

1948) categorically claims full credit for first planning this party.

The Communist Party, from the earliest days after the end of the war, understood that it's traditional fight for a new peoples party directed against the two-party system of the monopolies had once more been placed by events as an immediate, practical question before the American people, and, acting upon this understanding it boldly proclaimed the need for such a new peoples party.

What is clearly stated is the CP's claim to the founding of the new party and that the new party was the outcome of "its (the CP's) traditional fight for a new peoples party."

This is the explanation of the emphasis on foreign policy. The CP resolution explains that the Marshall Plan became the axis of the new party. It was this break between American and Russian imperialism which motivated the CP in breaking with the Democratic Party and in launching the new party.

DUCLOS GIVES WALLACE A PAT

This CP policy has a history. In July, 1945, Jacques Duclos, French CP leader, attacked Earl Browder and, in effect, called for his replacement and a change in CP policy.

In this same statement, Duclos also did the following:

- (1) he accused Browder of supporting American imperialism because Browder wished to maintain relationships with the Democratic Party; (2) he named Wallace as the exponent of an anti-monopoly policy in contrast to Browder; (3) he called for a new political axis of "anti-fascism and anti-monopoly." He very clearly points to Wallace as the obvious and natural spokesman for such a group.



Later on he again contrasts Wallace and Browder: "The former vice-president of the U. S., Henry Wallace, present Secretary of Commerce, said rightly that one cannot fight fascism abroad and tolerate it at home."

But this resolution of the national committee of the Communist Political Association pointed out the course to be taken in unambiguous terms. In fact the resolution clearly delineates the nature of the Wallace-Stalinist Party to come: "Therefore, it is essential to weld together and consolidate the broadest vote coalition of all anti-fascist and democratic forces..."

The political road of this third party was laid out three years ago in these CP statements and resolutions. Inspiration for this policy came from the International Communist leadership which, being well-acquainted with the needs of Russian foreign policy for the future, adopted the third-party line to implement this policy in the U. S.

The political report of this National Committee of this CP in February 1948 clearly cuts away from all notions of a class or labor party. It gives as reason for this that the official labor leadership must be rejected (since it already had come out in opposition) and calls for "united front from below."

This resolution, which is as clear a statement on the Wallace party as one can find anywhere, acknowledges that the labor leadership is not in the picture and instead that this "unique party's" uniqueness is defined by this Stalinist leadership at its helm: "The third party and the Wallace movement have not yet the British Labor Party's formal ties with the majority of the trade unions."

In fact the resolution warns of the danger of too obvious CP control of the new party: "In many cases they are compelled to organize on a relatively narrow basis... the laudable initiative of the most consistent progressives in helping to form the new parties does not, of course, give them 'squatters' rights' and a monopoly on leadership or control."

This is the true history of this Wallace-Stalinist Party. It can be traced from conception to execution in the pages of Stalinist documents. It was born and organized to give an American weapon to Stalinist imperialism in his struggle against Wall Street and not out of the needs of American labor, not out of popular mass upswells of discontent, but of Stalinist politics of manipulating the peoples' legitimate desires for their own purposes.

The proof of this analysis is, of course, in the Wallace Party itself. In a subsequent article we will examine the leadership of this party and find the evidence of complete Stalinist control.

German Currency Reform

The most striking aspect of the reduction of all Western-German assets and liabilities to one-tenth of their previous monetary value is that it is about to become the definitive symbol of Germany's partition. It has furnished the Russians with a weighty pretext for practically closing the zonal "borders" and for further, if so far none too successful attempts, to rally the German masses, specifically those of Berlin, to their side.

Currency reform in the Western zones is, of course, a logical step from the London six-power agreement under which these zones were "unified." The basis of the new Mark is, presumably, increased production and trade resulting from Marshall Plan dollars.

CONTROLS A FICTION UNDER POTSDAM

The extent of the German black market is a well-known fact and it is symptomatic, of course, of the low level of production in that country. The only reason why it did not actually, but only potentially, bring about the kind of monetary inflation which had developed in Germany in the early 1920s, was the existence of a rigid system of price controls, allocations and rationing introduced by the Nazi government and, of necessity, retained by the occupation powers.

The idiocy of the Potsdam agreement and the concomitant "Level of Industry Plans," which intended to reduce but practically stopped all vital production, made a fiction out of the control system. The latter has long been a sinecure for a vast body of parasitic bureaucrats, a morass of corruption as well, in the form of taxes, a terrific drain upon legitimate German businesses.

Furthermore, there existed—and, reduced to one-tenth of the original, still exists—a total debt of 800 billion marks in the form of war debts incurred by the Nazi government and in the form of war damages claimed by German businesses, householders, etc.

The Christian-Democratic politicians of the Western zones have already become jittery over the effects of this upon their electorate and have asked for a postponement of the elections for the projected constituent assembly until a "reasonable period" after September 1 (the date set for the elections), since they fear "extremist" tendencies may win out.

The workers, not owning anything, will not be directly affected by the currency reform. It is nonetheless probable that the revival of the German economy, if it comes about, will take place on the backs of the workers.

The bill sets up a very complicated machinery to make immigration as difficult as possible: The army must screen and investigate applicants for "purposes of security."

The Justice Department then makes its own investigation before providing visas. The Maritime Commission is put in charge of providing transportation.

Other provisions of the law are: Every prospective immigrant must prove that a job and a house await him in the United States before he is granted a visa. The cut-off date for designating a prospective immigrant as a DP is December 22, 1945. This automatically excludes Polish Jews who fled for their lives to DP camps to escape pogroms.

Another bad feature of the new DP bill which President Truman "reluctantly" signed is that a major portion of the DP quota is to be reserved for natives of Baltic countries. This has the purpose of excluding Jews and Catholics and completely ignores the actual proportion of national groups in DP camps.

After two years of discussion, on special legislation to liberalize the rigid American quota restrictions in favor of the small numbers of DPs,

dependent upon their wages and this fact will be the basis for effective wage controls.

More important, however, will be the relationship between wages and prices yet to be established. It is no daring prediction to say that this relationship will be entirely in favor of the employers, for the Economic Administration of the tri-zonal area is dominated by the Christian-Democrats in which, all the reactionary forces and personages of Western Germany congregate.

BASED UPON INCREASED PRODUCTION

As indicated above, currency reform must be based upon increased production or fail of its purpose. The inclusion of Western Germany in the Marshall Plan promises some such increase, but it cannot effectively counteract the factors and forces now throttling all perspectives of a decent life for the German people.

Less known, but of far-reaching importance are the functions of the Joint Export-Import Agency (JEIA), a rather obscure Anglo-American body which controls the foreign trade of Germany and has so far prevented almost all trade with Germany where it did not take place on a dollar basis.

The functions of this agency have yet to be altered towards furthering German production. These are only a few of the contradictory factors which stymie "official" Anglo-American policy in Germany.

AIMED AT RUSSIAN POLICY

The Russian policy towards Germany is no less contradictory than the Anglo-Americans', and their attitude on currency reform is but one of many indications. Certain reasons make currency reform in their sector less urgent (though from the point of view of their general German policy it is) than in the West.

The black market in the Soviet zone is far less extensive than in the Western areas. This is probably due to the relative absence in a stabilized economy of the competitive bidding for raw materials and semi-finished goods prevalent in the private-capitalist economy of the tri-zonal area.

The black market of the Soviet zone is largely controlled by the Russians themselves and is used to extract "black" reparations, in addition, of course, to enriching themselves.

The farmers of the Eastern zone are compelled to deliver a certain quota of their crops to the cities. Whatever the effectiveness of this system in feeding the urban population, the low productivity combined with a rigid system of controls and threats leaves the farmer very little to barter or sell on the black market.

Little Claims by German citizens upon the Nazi government have been summarily wiped out and bank assets were seized by the Russians when they occupied their sector.

This relative absence of "internal" currency troubles in the Russian zone is, of course, outweighed by the general needs of the Russians which require them to capture a greater share of German production, actual or potential. With the new mark in the West making two foreign countries out of Germany, the Russians' aims are not necessarily thwarted, but they are far more difficult of achievement, and their "peaceful" pursuit is likely to be a very expensive undertaking.

Despite the defensive halo the Anglo-Americans have cast about their latest move in Germany, currency reform is a telling blow at the Russians.

(Comrade Keller will analyze the dispute over Berlin in next week's LABOR ACTION.—Ed.)

THE TRUTH

PRESIDENT, CONGRESS AGREE EACH IS WORST

By JACK RANGER

The Republican Congress calls Truman "the poorest president since George Washington." The President calls the 80th Congress, just ended, "the worst in history."

From the viewpoint of labor's rights, housing, prices, civil liberties, freedom from militarism, and aid to the world's oppressed, the working class majority in the United States has been hit hard in the past year and one-half.

WHAT CONGRESS DID

First, let's look at what Congress did: 1. It passed the Taft-Hartley bill, thereby placing formidable obstacles in the path of the unions, and making it many times more difficult for unions to function in the interests of their members.

2. On housing, Congress upped rent 15 percent, and left large loopholes for greedy landlords to drive for still higher rent boosts.

3. It turned over \$13,000,000,000 to the armed services—a larger amount than the whole average pre-war annual budget.

4. So far as foreign policy is concerned, Congress and the White House teamed up to support reaction everywhere in the world, aside from that peculiar form of reaction represented by the Russian government and its subject peoples.

5. Congress pushed through a peacetime draft bill to subject the youth of the nation to enforced service in the armed forces.

6. It passed a tax bill which saved pennies for the poor and literally billions of dollars for the rich.

7. It passed a bill outlawing portal-to-portal wage suits, thus depriving workers of billions of dollars.

8. It waded the Mundt-Nixon "anti-Communist" bill over the country for weeks, as a means of terrorizing political minorities.

WHAT CONGRESS DIDN'T DO

What Congress didn't do is as important as what it did do.

1. Congress didn't lift a finger to control prices, at a period when most economists warn we are in for a session of "hyper-inflation," and at a time when the cost of living is again reaching new all-time peaks.

2. Congress didn't lift a finger to defend civil liberties, to outlaw poll taxes, to make lynching a federal offense, to require employers to hire without discrimination, or to end Jim Crow in the armed forces.

3. Congress didn't lift a finger to put a roof over a single American family.

4. Congress shrugged its shoulders as the big monopolies continued to pick the pockets of the people. Just to demonstrate sharply its reliable service to monopoly, in the closing days Congress shined through the Bulwinkle bill exempting the nation's railroads from the anti-trust laws.

5. Congress refused to increase the legal minimum wage, at a time when a fourth of the American people are going more deeply into debt each month.

6. Congress refused to enact a government health insurance program.

7. Congress refused federal aid for education, at a time when the nation's educational system is grossly inadequate for the needs of the people.

Even in the little things, Congress catered to selfish interests. After making handsome gestures, it left the silly and unfair taxes on oleo; jammed through high tariffs on wool and other commodities; continued farm legislation in the interests of the big farmers.

TRUMAN'S RECORD

Truman was not a shade better than Congress. The Democrat in the White House exercised equal energy in kicking labor in the face.

Truman's criticism of the Republican Congress is as phony as the counterfeit \$10 bills which have recently been flooding Chicago.

The Wall Street Journal in its June 22 editorial took care of Truman on this point. After listing some of Truman's "must" legislation which Congress dumped, that paper stated:

"Now each of these passed-over measures was first suggested by the late President Roosevelt at a time when he had as complete control over Congress as any President has ever had. Mr. Roosevelt had a Democratic Congress and the bills weren't passed then."

"President Truman took over the Roosevelt program and proposed all these same things to Congress while he, too, had a Democratic majority in both Houses. Again the Congress rejected the administration's plans. Curiously, although both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman included these matters in their messages to the Democratic Congresses, THERE WAS NEVER MUCH PRESSURE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE FOR ENACTMENT UNTIL A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS CAME ALONG (my emphasis—J. R.)."

It strikes us that if two Democratic Congresses were dubious of the wisdom of the social legislation offered by a Democratic President it is hardly justifiable suddenly to berate a Republican Congress for showing the same cautions.

Neither the Democratic nor Republican wings of the boss political monopoly can criticize each other with either justice or grace. But the workers who are fleeced by the capitalist political machines can certainly do so.

That's the record of the President and the legislators who were elected to office, most of them with the support of the conservative trade union leadership.

That record provides new proof that what labor needs is not a new deal, but a new party—a national labor party—to take over Washington and form a labor government. We'll never get justice from the Wall Street-dominated old parties.

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

LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co. 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

