

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

# LABOR ACTION

NOVEMBER 8, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## VOTE UPSET SHOWS PEOPLE REJECT TAFT-HARTLEY AND 80<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS!

### CP Taint, Isolation From Labor Movement Produce Wallace Flop

The meager showing of the Wallace-Taylor ticket is one of the secondary but extremely important consequences of the huge popular vote for Truman. While the decline in Wallace sentiment has been clearly evident for some time, the small size of the vote indicates clear-cut repudiation. Truman and Wallace sentiment have followed opposite trends; as the former increased, the latter declined.

The Progressive Party flop is not a totally unexpected upset. It is the culmination of a clearly defined trend. But this does not alter one basic

#### What Next?



fact. The ability of the Progressive Party to get on the ballot in forty-five states against technical obstacles and concerted opposition and its ability to organize state parties on a large scale, indicate the inherent possibilities in a new political party.

Even more important is the gage of Wallace sentiment early in 1948. At that time Wallace led a growing popular movement. Large sections of Negroes, middle class and working men saw in the Wallace party a great hope for a new political departure. This early Wallace sentiment is the true barometer of the political potential that a labor party could begin with.

For the decline of the PP is due to its isolation from the labor movement and its alienation from the masses, and—what is perhaps decisive—the

identification of Wallace with Stalinist totalitarianism and its foreign policy. Stalinism proved to be the Achilles' heel of the PP. The huge Truman vote represents, on labor's part, a repudiation of Stalinism and its American representatives. As the realization of the extent of Stalinist domination over Wallace and the PP became clear, labor, the Negro masses and the middle class moved sharply away.

#### ONE LOCAL VICTORY

The only victory the Progressive Party can claim is the re-election of Vito Marcantonio in New York City's 18th District. But this victory is Marcantonio's and has no relationship whatsoever to the national party of Wallace. This is Marcantonio's sixth re-election. His machine is a local one, based on local patronage and local deals with Tammany.

Positive proof of the purely local character of this election is provided by an analysis of the vote. Marcantonio received 35,000 votes but was unable to carry Wallace with him. As a matter of fact, Wallace ran a poor third, receiving only 7,000 votes. Truman carried Marcantonio's district with 18,000.

Leo Isacson's defeat in the Bronx has serious repercussions for the Wallace party because he was the first electoral victor under a Wallace banner in the special election last summer. His decline since then is a barometer of Wallace's decline. Lee Pressman's swamped-out candidacy in Brooklyn is equally important. He polled only 29,000 against Multer's 103,000. Pressman was one of the white hopes of the ALP and its inner Stalinist core. He received special aid from the strong Brooklyn Stalinist machine.

The half-million New York State votes which the ALP received do not compensate for these severe losses. The ALP was able to poll 496,000 votes without Wallace in the previous election.

The debacle in California is a better test of Wallace's actual strength, since in that state there is a large Communist Party which is well entrenched in the unions but without a previous political machine. Hope ran high indeed for Wallace in California. In July the PP estimated its vote there at a half million, sometimes even a million. Wallace actually polled less than 90,000.

(Continued on page 2)

In one of the most startling political upsets in recent electoral history, the American people made a choice between what they considered lesser and greater evils, and repudiated the 80th Congress and all its reactionary works.

In what must be considered an assertion of the popular will against the confident predictions of the pollsters, dopesters and the big business press, Harry S. Truman was returned to office, carrying with him a totally unexpected Democratic majority in the House and a Democratic majority in the Senate.

Truman was not by any standard a labor or people's candidate. Yet his victory is testimony to the terrific political potential of labor and the "little people" who voted their stand on the Taft-Hartley Law and the other issues which affect them deeply.

We go to press too early to analyze the vote over the country. Here, writing a few minutes after the official radio announcement of Truman's re-election, we wish only to discuss what is, in our opinion, of central importance to the labor movement. We refer to the election results as they affect the formation of a new and independent political party.

#### EFFECT ON NEW POLITICAL FORMATION

The election, for all that it revealed the vitality of the people in safeguarding their convictions on labor legislation, civil rights and so forth, may prove a serious blow to the developing movement for an independent labor party. There is no way of avoiding that unsavory consideration.

Actually, however, a true reading of even the pre-

liminary returns contributes exceptional evidence on the opportunities for an independent party which speaks for labor and the people.

It is fairly certain that the labor leaders, who with few exceptions came out for Truman, will interpret the election as a justification of their "practical" politics—"practical" politics meaning a vote for the "man who can win."

The election has proved that the labor movement can "practically" contribute significantly to the victory of its candidate even where it has to go up against terrific propaganda odds and actual restrictive legislation on the limits of campaign participation.

In the greater sense of advancing labor's interests, the election did not by any means vindicate the politics of "practicality." On the contrary, it showed how impractical it is to throw the weight of labor behind a man who is not labor's.

Truman won—and he won by what can be said to be a popular uprising against the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Law, against the enemies of price control, against the Dixiecrat racists.

The labor leaders' man won (barring a few such extreme political bankrupts as John L. Lewis and Dan Tobin), but...

That man is an injunctionist.  
That man is a strikebreaker.

In that light must the end of "practical" politics be read.

#### DEMOCRATS NOT PARTY OF PEOPLE

However badly the polls (whose verdict we mistakenly followed up to a point) were off, there is no doubt that Truman was less than a popular candidate to begin with. In fact, important sections of the labor leadership tried to block his nomination, in so little esteem did they hold him. His campaign was sagging badly until the labor leaders came out and sold him to labor and the people.

Reuther went so far as to challenge arraignment under the Taft-Hartley Law by public endorsement of Truman—a courageous act in what we hold, despite the results of the election, to have been a not so commendable cause. PAC put its resources behind Truman.

#### Four More Years



### CHINESE REGIME ON WAY TO COLLAPSE

## Defeat Brings Chiang to Low Ebb of Power

By JACK BRAD

A disaster of tremendous importance overwhelmed China with the fall of Mukden. All Manchuria, with its million square miles and forty million population, is now in Stalinist hands. The rout of Kuomintang armies is complete in the North. Whole army corps surrendered, tens of thousands joined the Stalinist armies and the number of dead, wounded and lost runs into the hundreds of thousands.

In the last three weeks cumulative defeats have reduced the Kuomintang

in all North China to a feeble holding force. The entire balance of military power, and with it political power, has shifted. This holds for all of China.

The loss of the Shantung peninsula with its great ports, cities and rich agriculture, the threatened loss of Taiyan, and now the flight from Manchuria exposes all of North China to the Stalinist armies. The city of Peiping, ancient Great Wall capital of the Manchu empire, is in an intolerable position and must fall in a short time. The great naval base at Tientsin is sorely threatened. Only the U. S. naval flotilla keeps it in Kuomintang hands. All of Hopen province is caught in a squeeze between victorious Stalinist armies from the North, South and East.

#### SHIFT OF POWER TO CHINESE CP

The fall of Manchuria dramatizes the shift in power to the Chinese Communist Party. The Kuomintang is proved completely incapable of defending its own territories and its own rule; the fortunes of the Kuomintang are at a nadir. No government in human history ever descended to such depths without undergoing considerable upset. Already the cry is heard in the halls of the Legislative Yuan (Parliament) for Chiang's resignation or at least a leave of absence. In its present form the Chiang regime is doomed.

This man could say the day after Mukden's fall: "We have had reverses in the Northeast but the Communists are not yet in a position to directly menace North China... the overall situation does not give cause for worry." No comment is necessary. Here is reactionary obtuseness in full parade.

The Chiang regime has ruled by the successive extermination of all opposition. The secret of its power under great adverse stresses is that it has capitulated all possible alternative political formations. It remains to be seen whether it has succeeded to the point where, in the absence of an alternative, the feudal-bureaucratic

ruling clique will keep power by default. But even if it does, it can only accelerate the collapse and increase the cost of its own destruction to all China. And in the process it too will undergo great alteration.

Already are heard cries of defeatism. Numerous groups are actively in favor of compromise with the Communist Party; others favor peace without terms and at any price; and still others favor retreat below the Yangtze, surrender of the Great Northern Plain, the Yellow River Basin—the heart of China—to establish a Southern bastion, there to wait for the outbreak of World War III and American military intervention.

The forces of disintegration, of localism, of war-lordism—all the deeply rooted centrifugal forces of feudal China have been given a head. The landlord cliques, the black-marketiers and speculators—the most corrupt elements of the ruling class—will now intensify their ghoulish ransacking of China's prostrate body. For the defeats will worsen the economic situation, increase the inflationary pace, decrease the food supply and the raw material supply essential to industry.

Relationship between Russia and the United States is also transformed. America is in jeopardy of being driven out of Asia. American policy, in President Truman's second administration, begins with a very narrow base indeed. Even to stabilize a South China regime will require an enormous outlay running into billions of dollars, which would seriously alter the orientation of United States foreign policy. It is questionable whether the Marshall Plan and the Western Union lend-lease are possible simultaneously with a huge military and economic program for China. For such a program would require direct, massive intervention. Such an intervention would face great opposition among the Chinese masses and from many sections of the Kuomintang as well. The Communist Party would make great popular gains in a struggle against such intervention.

It may very well be that America's day is done in China, that it is too late and the price is too great. The historic ambition of America's China policy, for exclusive dominion over a unified China is doomed for a long period to come, if not forever. Asia as a possible expansion ground for

American capitalist expansion is no longer possible.

The CP will now be able to establish a stable and substantial state in North China from which to expand its military activities. The disintegration of the Kuomintang will move many elements toward the CP. Talks looking toward a new CP-sponsored coalition have been underway since May 1. Groups of political exiles centered in Hong Kong, led by Marshal Li, many former generals and leading politicians of the Kuomintang, and the Democratic League are committed to entering such a coalition, which would have great attraction in the cities among students, intellectuals, middle class and lower functionaries.

Such a national coalition may be launched shortly, now that a suitable capital is available in Mukden. It would claim to be the true government of all China. Its agrarian reform program would have even greater appeal than that same program now under exclusive CP aegis. The isolation of the Kuomintang would be increased. Many groups of bourgeoisie, especially in the Northern cities,

(Continued on page 4)

### Palestine Stalinists Net Political Gain In Unification of Arab and Jewish CPs

By ED FINDLEY

Palestinian Stalinism has gained a unique political advantage by merging its Arab League for National Liberation with the Communist Party of Israel. The merger, first announced by the Arab League of National Liberation on October 8, was finally consummated last week in Haifa at a plenary session of the enlarged Central Committee of the CP.

As a result, the Stalinists now possess the only political formation encompassing both Arab and Jewish members. This fact will enable the newly combined CP of Israel to enter Jewish and Arab candidates in the November elections for the Constituent Assembly.

#### MAPAM VIEW DECISIVE

The absence of any other organized political tendencies among the Arabs in Israel is thus likely to give the CP a near monopoly in the Arab population centers. At the present time, the only other Arab candidates who may be expected to enter the election lists are village heads, community elders, independents or individual Arabs sponsored by various Israeli parties.

The Stalinist position among the Arabs is further strengthened by their domination and control of the only functioning Arab trade union center—the Arab Congress of Trade Unions; and by the past sponsorship of the Arab League of National Liberation by the Israeli Minister of Labor, Behtov, a leader of the Mapam.

It seems likely, however, that the Mapam's (United Workers Party) enthusiasm for and sponsorship of the Arab Stalinists may abate somewhat in face of their joining the Communist Party of Israel, with whose leadership the Zionist-socialists have old and painful accounts to settle.

It is this correspondent's impression that the reluctance or inability of the Mapam leadership—despite its pathological pro-Stalinism—to ignore the past and to form a united front, or, at least, an electoral bloc with the Israel CP, was a decisive factor in the Stalinist decision to merge their Palestinian parties.

#### ESSENTIAL TURN

The memory of the pogromist role of the Palestine Communist Party is too fresh in the minds of the Israel workers and collective farmers. Even the pro-Russian Mapam leadership

could not afford to ignore this. Were they to form an electoral bloc with the CP, they would lose a great deal of popular support among the Israeli masses.

As soon as it became clear to the Stalinist leadership that their dirty record made it impossible even for the willing Mapam leaders to help them pave their way into the Constituent Assembly, they had to turn elsewhere. Hence, the merger of the Arab League for National Liberation with the Communist Party of Israel.

The existing party vacuum among the Arabs offers this Arab-Jewish Stalinist party a heaven-sent opportunity to steal sizable representation in the Constituent Assembly.

This well-laid and ambitious plan of the Stalinists can be thwarted only if the Israel labor movement and its parties abandon—as they must sooner or later—the reactionary and self-defeating exclusive membership policy.

Only if the doors to the Histadruth and the Mapai are thrown open to Arab workers, will these politically homeless masses have an address other than that of the Stalinists to which to turn.

#### Upset!



That the Democratic Party is not and will not be a substitute for a party that by class interest and support is a party of the people.

It is not labor's party, and cannot be labor's party. And this will not be changed if the labor leaders are again given free entry to the White House as in the halcyon Roosevelt-Hillman days. It cannot be changed by incidental victories like the conquest of the inconsequential Michigan Democratic Party by the auto union forces.

(Continued on page 3 in editorial column)

### Election Pollsters Take Licking

Vote Discredits Infiltration of Government by "Sampling"

Whatever else may be the results of the election, one thing is certain: the oracles of American politics, the professional pollsters, have been resoundingly defeated. From the staid New York Times, through Dr. Gallup and Elmo Roper, down to the lowly New York News, one and all have proved way off the beam by the voters.

The pollsters went overboard in predicting the landslide election of Governor Dewey. These so-called "analyses" were unquestionably influenced by a desire to insure the election of the Republican ticket by

themselves molding public opinion. Their aim is to re-inforce the strength of the side they favor, weaken and demoralize those they oppose, establish an opinion of indifference among wide sections of the voters who might feel the issues are already decided, and in the final analysis, replace the method of general election with that of so-called "impartial" sampling.

By trick wording of questions, and improper weighting of the results, Gallup, Roper and Co. have time and again given a false picture of what American public opinion really is. As an example, Dr. Gallup's poll for

Look magazine "proved" that American workers favored the Taft-Hartley Act. Even the most superficial observer of the labor movement knows from his own experience that such a result is directly contrary to the fact.

In order to obtain this result Gallup included such questions as "Are you opposed to racketeering in the trade unions?"—this, on the somewhat unsupported assumption that the Taft-Hartley Act combats such racketeering. Workers who replied that they were opposed to racketeering

(Continued on page 3)



NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Lewis Leads UMW Into Political Blind Alley

By GERALD McDERMOTT

What are the plans of the United Mine Workers of America for the next four years? How does the UMW plan to protect and extend its gains? At the present time, miners are receiving more benefits from their union than they ever have before. At the same time, the miners' union has faced more hostility and opposition from the ruling capitalist class and its government than it ever has before.

Two weeks ago, we recorded that the political policy of the union was hopelessly committed to supporting Republicans and Democrats. The ridiculousness of this policy is shown by the legislative report of the union which time and again lists a majority of both parties in Congress voting against labor on vital issues. The speeches of Lewis and of John T. Jones, UMW director of political activity, correctly point out that the welfare fund may well be attacked by Congress as soon as elections are over. That makes voting for the parties that wrote it, passed it and used it all the more dangerous.

John L. Lewis, in a dim way, is aware of the dangers facing the miners and all of labor. He pointed to the trend toward fascism getting underway in the country. In his closing speech he warned that "No man can say what the conditions in our country will be when we meet again in constitutional conclave."

OUTDATED WEAPONS

Not only are these dangerous times for labor in general, but for coal miners especially. Coal mining is a sick industry. Already, coal production is beginning to slump. Lewis sees it coming, but his weapons are the weapons of the past.

Noting the decline in the markets for coal and the shortened work week now in effect in some areas, Lewis stated: "If there are only three days' work left in the industry, we'll all have three days' work. If we are going to starve, we'll all starve together." Lewis is proposing a stabilization program to the operators where work will be evenly divided. Otherwise the operators invariably shut down or reduce the work of the most militant locals during slack periods, thus striking at the heart of the union.

Such a stabilization program is

only part of the answer, however. Solidarity has stood the miners in good stead, but starving together is not much of an outlook for the future. What would be better would be a demand for a guaranteed annual wage, to be followed by the call for nationalization of the mines under the control of the workers. Such a program would require the formation of a political party of labor, but the alternative is depression. And every miner must realize what a depression will mean to the welfare fund. The fund is based on the number of tons mined. If tonnage falls as it did in the last depression, the welfare fund and all that it means will be riddled.

Lewis is placing his main reliance in defending the union in the future on a fat union-treasury. He remembers, no doubt, that it was the last



\$75,000 in the UMW treasury in 1933 that made possible the organizing drive that brought the ruined UMW back from the grave. One of the reasons he gave for the increase in dues was that the money may be needed to rebuild any locals or districts of the union that are wiped out in future assaults on the union. There's nothing wrong with a fighting reserve fund for the union. The trouble with the UMW policy is that the UMW is going to vote for the people who are going to attack the UMW.

One of the cheerful notes of the convention is the newly announced health program to be financed through the welfare fund. This program will provide funds for medical care for all miners and their families for "everything from cancer to having a baby." Where necessary, the union will build hospitals. Thus an end is in sight to the hated and still prevalent company-doctor system.

CHEERFUL NOTE

On the question of contract demands, the convention gave a blanket endorsement to the National Policy Committee to formulate demands for higher wages, shorter hours and improved conditions. The convention made it plain that the UMW will continue to fight for wage increases. We think the contract should be improved, of course, but it would be better to announce the demands—subject to revision because of higher prices or other factors—so that the rank and file would be informed from the start as to the objectives of the battles ahead.

As to safety conditions in the mines, there has been no improvement. Federal mine inspectors still do not have power to enforce their findings. The convention again called for a law to make this possible. It is shocking to realize that a federal inspector cannot make an operator correct a condition that threatens to kill men, and the outlook for a law to correct this is not bright with the kinds of Congresses we are getting.

The convention took no action on setting up a seniority system, although that demand could still be included in contract demands, and certainly should. The important question of welfare aid for aged miners who retired—or were fired or black-listed—too early to benefit from the welfare set-up, was referred to the officers.

STATE OF UNION

As the miners' union faces the future, there remains one important question. What is the state of the union? We do not mean its treasury, which is full, or its size, which is on the increase. We are speaking of the internal health of the union, of its democracy. Here the record has not been good and the convention did not improve on the record.

It has been widely publicized already that Lewis's salary was raised

to \$50,000, that of Vice-President Thomas Kennedy and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens to \$40,000 and that of International Board members to \$12,000, plus additional compensation "for services rendered." We know that the miners feel that this is one way of showing the public that they are behind Lewis. We feel, however, that strike solidarity is a better way of demonstrating this. When union leaders get into the salary ranges of corporation executives, they tend more than ever to put holding their jobs above undivided service to the union. We are not saying that this is true of all, or of any, of the officers of the UMW. But there is the temptation.

The convention further voted to eliminate the scale and policy convention that is held between constitutional conventions. Constitutional conventions come only every four years. The elimination of the scale and policy convention reduces the voice of the rank and file even more in the affairs of the union.

AN UGLY SLIP

There was one ugly note in the convention that must be called to the attention of UMW members. That was a phrase in Lewis' opening speech. He said: "I was hoping that... Harry Truman... would put me in jail, which is the thing any WHITE MAN would have done, rather than rob you." Not only was this vile Jim Crow phrase reported in the press, it is reported in the UMW Journal. We would like to know, Brother Lewis, if you believe that "white men" are any better than black men or yellow men or any other kind of men. If this "figure of speech" was a "slip of the tongue," as some will say, then we say that it was a foul slip.

Incidents like this only serve to strengthen the vicious Jim Crow which is already altogether to prevalent among too many members of the UMW, to the mortal danger of the union. We believe that Lewis should repudiate that statement to the entire membership and labor movement, and that he should apologize for it. We would like to see dozens of local unions protest to Lewis over this.

We cannot fail to mention another speech in the convention. Vice-President Kennedy told the convention,

in an attack on people who try to separate Lewis from the rank and file, that "It would be as reasonable to expect to separate His Holiness, the Pope, from the Catholic Church in the world."

We do not want to get into a religious quarrel here. What we have in mind is that, according to Catholic doctrine, the Pope is infallible, and that his word is the word of God. Without detracting one whit from the contributions Lewis has made to the miners' welfare, we protest that neither he nor anyone else in the labor movement is infallible or should be pictured as such.

Among things the convention did not do was establish a sorely needed educational program, to train new leaders and, among other things, work for greater solidarity through the elimination of racial prejudice. This is a must for the union.

We do not mean that the UMW is on the rocks or is headed that way. Nothing shows that better than another statement by Lewis, that we would like to hear made by a few other labor leaders.

"So you got this welfare fund. Do you know why? Because you took it. Nobody gave it to you. The Truman administration didn't give it to you any more than the Roosevelt administration gave you the union."

This philosophy is the best guarantee of the future of the miners' union and the labor movement.

Wallace

(Continued from page 1)

The decline, and now the defeat, of Wallace-Stalinist politics is due to popular rejection of Stalinism and its international imperialist policies. It also indicates strikingly that no new political movement can arise and grow outside of and alien to the powerful American labor movement.

So long as the Progressive Party was not so clearly identified with Stalinism and not so sharply divorced from the labor movement it flourished. The basic premises for a labor party remain unaffected by the Wallace results. They are actually strengthened insofar as the evidence shows that labor can make or break political destinies.

YOUTH and Student CORNER

By JULIUS FALK and JACK MAXWELL

We print below a copy of a pencilled letter received from John McCartney, national organizer of the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL), with a reply from Comrade Falk, national secretary of the Socialist Youth League:

Editor, LABOR ACTION

Dear Sirs:

I have just noticed Julius Falk's description of the National Youth Council for Independent Political Action in October 18 LABOR ACTION.

It continues the Trotskyite tradition of distortion and falsehood—one of the reasons democratic socialists will have nothing to do with Trotskyites.

The national secretary of the YPSL and myself never said "these people are materialists" and "these people want to use the Labor Party to bring socialism," as Falk alleges. Anyone at the meeting would testify to that. While I am going to theological seminary soon, the YPSL national secretary is non-religious and somewhat of a materialist.

I am confident that no farmer-labor party or youth section of such a party wants Trotskyites in it. Your record of disruption and defeat in the Socialist Party is well known. Also the totalitarian nature of your theory and your party is testified to by the people who have left your party, many to become leaders in the YPSL and SP.

John McCARTNEY  
National Organizer, YPSL

(We would like to suggest that it is customary officially to address people in the socialist movement as Comrade.—Ed.)

I would not presume to weigh COMRADE McCartney's letter in the scales of the religious principles he purports to uphold. But it seems to me that he committed a sin when he wrote this note to us. He lied. And not unwittingly either. A man can make a mistake without lying, but anyone who denies—so categorically—what he said, and what was discussed, is just plain lying.

If McCartney did not attack the SYL because we want "to use the Labor Party to bring socialism," why didn't he deny this when I took him to task for the "alleged" remark at the meeting of the National Youth Council for Independent Political Action, several months ago in Columbus, Ohio? I quoted him then, just after he motivated a motion to exclude Trotskyists from membership, and there wasn't then a peep out of him. At that meeting, McCartney's point on this question was that the Trotskyists would not enter such a party in good faith, but only in order "to use the Labor Party to bring socialism." That is the exact quote and the context in which it was made. I remember the exact quote because of the utter stupidity of a so-called socialist using it as an argument against the SYL; I also remember it because I noted it on a piece of paper and used it when I spoke directly after McCartney at this meeting.

The fact that the other YPSL functionary at the meeting is "SOMEWHAT OF A MATERIALIST"—a new philosophical category!—doesn't in the least indicate that I am lying

about McCartney having attacked the SYL as "these people (who) are materialists." The fact is that there was an audible snicker in the room when McCartney pulled that gem, and he was upset at the response, so much so that he muttered apologetically that he realizes that other people in the room are materialists, too.

McCartney becomes completely absurd when he writes that "anyone in the room would testify" that our report of the proceedings at this meeting was untrue. There were, of course, people in the room who heard and remember exactly what was said. McCartney credits me with much too much imagination. I couldn't for the life of me invent such stories. I'm only capable of quoting someone who seriously made these arguments.

There is small point to debating the rest of the letter here. We have challenged the YPSL to debate the political and theoretical issues involved. The YPSL has not yet accepted. As for McCartney's Stalinist-like slander about "Trotskyite... disruption... distortion... falsehood..." I prefer to answer it with a letter just received from a YPSL comrade from Ithaca, N. Y.

Ithaca, N. Y., Oct. 25, 1948

Dear Friends:

I have read, with some regret, the recent characterization of the SYL and the WP as "totalitarian" by the YPSL. I am a long-time YPSL and a member of the Socialist Party who is quite active and I should like you to know that I feel that type of characterization to be not only ignorant, but detrimental to what, by any standards of political logic, should be close cooperation between our groups. Evidently McCartney, the YPSL organizer, has not been reading LA at all in the past few years and has not spoken to many WPers either. If he had he would be impressed by the scrupulousness in which WPers have acted and thought recently on the issue of democratic technique. The election stand of the WP, for example, in which it advocates a vote for one of the three socialist candidates as a vote for socialism, is, in my opinion, a healthier and more open-minded position than one of carrying old grudges and dead issues on ad infinitum.

It seems to me that members of your party and mine ought to make more of an effort to understand the opinions of each other. I think they would find, as I have, a basic similarity of opinion and attitude although, perhaps, not of approach. Certainly the analysis of the current situation, as well as areas of danger and the general solution indicated are very similar for both parties. McCartney, whom I consider an able organizer and a fine socialist, should, I think, approach the SYL perhaps critically, but certainly not with antagonism to the memories of differences which in the past may have been acute, but with the changing scene, have only historical worth.

Sincerely yours,  
Morton D. SCHWARTZ

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

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Why the SLP Wasn't There

Editor: Stan Grey's article covering the so-called Dobbs-Thomas debate is guilty of one misrepresentation of fact. Grey says: "The only thing lacking in the debate was the presence of the Socialist Labor Party. This the SLP refused on the ground that, being the only genuinely revolutionary party, they would have only half as much time as the two 'reform' parties put together. Obviously a put-up job." That it was a put-up job is correct, but not in the sense Grey would have his readers believe.

The Dobbs-Thomas debate was maneuvered by the adroit Socialist

Party in evading the challenge of the SLP to debate with it. The SP had made quite some capital out of the fact that Henry Wallace had evaded and avoided debating Norman Thomas. Since the SLP has formally and informally a number of times challenged Mr. Thomas to debate, and succeeded in having Thomas skirt that possibility, in as many tries, the SLP took up the SP's remarks printed in Life and signed by Harry Fleischman, its national secretary. Thereupon took place a series of some five or six letters between the two parties, in which any neutral observer could not fail to note the evasiveness and insincerity of the SP at last to meet with the SLP in debate.

One of the conditions set down by the SP was that they would welcome

debating with the SLP and the SWP. This dodge is a familiar enough one, for they knew that the SLP would not participate in a "talk fest," as it was characterized by Arnold Petersen of the SLP. The SP thought that a discussion under the heading of "Which Party in America Stands for Democratic Socialism?" should include the three parties with the word "socialist" in their title. As Mr. Petersen pointed out, the term "democratic socialism" is a redundancy, as socialism is per se democratic and that prefacing the word democratic served to confuse the issue in the minds of people to mean that there was some other kind of socialism other than democratic. In the exchange of letters, of course, the SP insisted upon the inclusion of the SWP as they knew this was their only saving tactic.

Aside from Grey's summarily dismissing the SLP's actions as a put-up job, it does not seem to be in the socialist tradition to utter half-truths or lies out of the whole fabric. The SP on a previous occasion had denounced the SLP for "scabbing on fellow workers," and "that they do this as a matter of policy." This lie, which appeared in the Denver Post, signed by Harry Fleischman, was unanswered by him in spite of Petersen's objections, and no withdrawal of it was printed in either the Call or the Denver paper. It so happened that an SLP member did lose his job for refusing to cross a picket line where he worked, although he was a non-union office worker and could have worked without an onus upon him for doing so.

Grey, whose article is merely one of personal opinion, lost his disinterestedness when a chance to impugn the SLP presented itself. As a matter of fact, the place reserved for the SLP member was sheer humbuggery and hypocrisy, for both the SWP and the SP knew beforehand that the SLP would not take part. These odious schemes resorted to by groups which call themselves socialist, at the expense of other socialist groups, is on the level of capitalist politics. It is rather surprising to see LA contributing to this sort of practice. Grey is entitled to his personal opinions on any party he chooses to write about. But he definitely perhaps, through ignorance of facts, allowed himself one chance to take a pot shot at a party with which he differs. Does this help the class problem?

Norman JOHNSTONE

Reader Johnstone is confusing two things: one the particular debate reviewed by Stan Grey; the other, the debate the SLP would like to have with the SP. So far as we know, the debate discussed in LABOR ACTION was initiated by the SWP. It could not therefore have been devised as a plot by the SP, though we are not in a position to say what went on in the minds of the SP officials when they agreed to debate. We understand that the SLP has been after the SP for years, challenging it to debate. For our part, we cannot see how the SP can justify its refusal to debate the SLP. However, the SLP's refusal to participate in a debate with the SWP cannot be justified either except by the incredibly sectarian standards of

the SLP. If anything, the SLP's wish to debate the SP (which, we are told goes back to the 30s) is something of a contradiction of its normal, abusively sectarian attitude to other socialist groups—an attitude which determines even the most routine and minute of relations (like the hesitation to exchange periodicals).

With respect to the other matters, we would like for reader Johnstone to raise them in the pages of The Call, the SP paper. We would like to see, if the Call consented to print such a letter, how it would square these inexcusable slanders with its pretense of sanctimonious virtue. The idiocy of the SLP's position on the trade unions is one thing; to accuse its membership of scabbing is, however, the kind of invention that could only be produced by people who lack a decent consideration for facts. We do not contest that the SP leaders are experienced practitioners of the "art" of unprincipled vilification.—Ed.

By Leon Trotsky:

Living Thoughts of Karl Marx .....\$1.50  
Stalin (a biography).... 5.00

Cash with orders—We pay postage  
Send for our complete list!

LABOR ACTION  
BOOK SERVICE

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 (62 issues) at \$1.00

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ (please print)  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ APT. \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ ZONE \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bill me  Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

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.

12-45

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

RENEW NOW  
EXTEND YOUR SUB

With the Workers Party

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, class lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the WORKERS PARTY. For information of WORKERS PARTY activities in cities not listed below, write to WORKERS PARTY, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

- ALBANY: White to Box 221.
- BAITIMORE: International Fellowship House, 21 West Preston St., 2nd floor. Public forums every second Friday of each month. Discussion group on remaining Friday evenings.
- BUFFALO: 639 Main St., 2nd floor. Office hours, 11 a.m.-2 p.m., Monday through Friday. Open meetings Thursday evenings. Discussion groups Thursday evenings.
- CHICAGO: 800 West North Ave. Tel.: Michigan 9003. Office hours: Wednesday after 4:00 p.m. Meetings: Every Wednesday at 8:30 p.m.
- CLEVELAND: WP Branch meets Sundays, 8:00 p.m., in the Croatian Home Association (6314 St. Clair Ave. Write to Bernard Douglas, Box 1130, Cleveland 3, Ohio.
- DETROIT: 6241 Gratiot, Room 10. Telephone: PLaza 5559. Open on Tuesdays and Fridays, 1 to 5 p.m.
- LOS ANGELES: 3214 So. Grand, Los Angeles 7. Tel.: Richmond 7-3280 (if no answer, phone AX 2-3067). Office hours, 2 to 5 p.m. daily.
- NEWARK: 248 Market St., Newark 2. Open house Friday evenings.
- NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. Open every day from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday until 10:30 p.m. Tel.: Watkins 4-4222.
- HARLEM BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at Workers Party Headquarters, 2143 Seventh Ave. (near 126th St.), Room 6.
- CENTRAL BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor.
- CHELSEA BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15 p.m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor.
- BKLYN - BROWNSVILLE BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at the De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin Ave.).
- SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE MANHATTAN UNIT: Open forums, Friday nights, 8:15, at WP City Center, 114 West 14th St.
- BROOKLYN UNIT: Open forums, Sunday nights, 8:15, at De Luxe Palace, 538 Howard Ave. (near Pitkin Ave.). For more information, write to Socialist Youth League, 4 Court Square, 4th floor, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
- PHILADELPHIA: 1139 West Grand Ave., 3rd floor. Meetings Wednesday at 8:00 p.m. Open House, Sundays 7:30-10.
- PITTSBURGH: Write to P. O. Box 752, Pittsburgh 30.
- READING: Write to P. O. Box 1671, Reading, Pa.
- ST. LOUIS: Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.
- SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA: Write to Labor Action, 466 Tenth St., Room 212, Oakland 7, Calif.
- SAN PEDRO: Write to Labor Action, P. O. Box 1246.
- SEATTLE: Write to P. O. Box 28, University Post Office, Seattle 5.
- ST. LOUIS: Write to Douglas Bridge, P. O. Box 3414, Maplewood Branch, Maplewood, Mo.
- YOUNGSTOWN: Write to J. P. Walters, Box 606.

NOW OUT! The NEW INTERNATIONAL October 1948 THE ECONOMIC DRIVE BEHIND TITO by Hal Draper THE CONGRESS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL by Max Shachtman What the Wallace Campaign Proves Notes of the Month Socialist Policy in East Europe by a Group of Eastern European Marxists TWENTY-FIVE CENTS



# Editorials

## What Vote Upset Shows - -

(Continued from page 1)

### VOTED DESPITE TRUMAN

Some of these leaders, as we have noted, have made commitments about independent political action; Reuther and Green, for example. It is true that in Reuther's case the commitment was hedged by the reference to revitalizing the Democratic Party as a possible alternative. Nevertheless, the enthusiastic response to the Reuther statement was not based on this pledge, but on its very opposite—namely, the expectation of a new political party.

**It is reasonably likely that these men will now dump their commitments. And here, we think, lies the job for the ranks: to make it absolutely clear that insofar as they voted for Truman they did not do so in order to continue to shuffle along the old political paths.**

Labor, and in general that vast section of the people who sense that their future is best served by alliance with labor, did not vote so much for Truman as despite Truman.

**It was a vote against Taft-Hartley for one thing. Proof? In Massachusetts there were three propositions on the ballot which would have instituted a kind of state Taft-Hartley regime. All three were defeated.**

Proof? While Hartley himself did not run, the candidate he endorsed received a trouncing in a traditionally Republican district.

**Proof? Illinois Senator Brooks, champion of anti-labor measures, was swamped by liberal Paul Douglas.**

Proof? An outstandingly foul enemy of labor and sponsor of the foul DP bill, Representative Revercomb, running for the Senate, was defeated by the vote of West Virginia's coal miners.

**Proof? Notoriously anti-labor Senator Ball was defeated by Hubert Humphries, darling of Americans for Democratic Action.**

Proof? PAC claims that it mobilized the vote to defeat 80 Congressmen and seven Senators who voted for Taft-Hartley.

It was a vote against race discrimination. Truman said little about the civil rights program in the early stages of the campaign. Only when it became clear that there was no way of patching up the Dixiecrat breach did Truman reassert the civil rights program. We maintain that this helped him in the big industrial cities, helped him with the millions of Negroes. We maintain that even in the South there was considerable popular sympathy for the program—obviously among the Negroes.

**They did not vote for Truman so much as they voted for an end to the viciousness of discrimination.**

Proof? Harlem voted overwhelmingly for Truman.

**Proof? East Harlem, with an overwhelmingly minority population that suffers deeply from discrimination, voted for Truman though it re-elected ALP-Stalinist Vito Marcantonio to Congress.**

Proof? Chicago's South Side, with its heavy concentration of Negro inhabitants, voted for Truman.

**Proof? Even in the South, there was a low popular vote for Strom Thurmond, Dixiecrat candidate—less than a million.**

We submit again that these are proofs not so much of the vitality of the Democratic Party as of the potential for a labor party. In the absence of a labor party, labor turned to Truman.

### TASK FOR TODAY

It may be argued that the low Wallace vote is a denial of our point. Not at all. Elsewhere we discuss the Wallace vote. Here it need only be said that the Wallace movement was poisoned by Stalinism and the people knew it. Here we need only remind our readers of the terrific response to the Wallace movement before the Stalinist taint became undeniably obvious. Here we need only remind our readers that Wallace proved a new party can get on the ballot in almost all states.

**We cannot at this moment hope to assess the significance of every aspect of the elections. There is the important question of the Socialist vote. The official returns are not yet in, but the Socialist Party headquarters reports that in New York Norman Thomas' vote is five times above his 1944 figure. There are no returns on Socialist Labor Party or Socialist Workers Party voting as yet. Thomas' vote is not a large one—some 26,000—but it is enormously significant, particularly given the general trend. It can be assumed that many who would have voted socialist were scared into a vote for Truman by the "lesser evil" bogey.**

What must concern us now is the future. That future is still dark with inflation, war, militarization and invasion of democratic liberties.

**Labor's interest in these matters cannot be entrusted to Truman. Labor's interest stands in jeopardy from Truman on these matters.**

It can only be entrusted to a party which is built upon labor's strength, and daily champions labor's interests. Thus we say that the election is a signpost pointing to the reality of labor's strength, its readiness to assert itself politically.

**And that remains our essential task in 1949. If we do not begin now, immediately, to demand that steps be taken toward the creation of a new political party, we will find ourselves confronted in 1952 with the promises that were made us in 1948: "This is not the year; wait until 1953."**

We must start now. We can depend on no one but the militants in the labor movement to promote this necessity. Payment on the promises of a new party must be exacted now—to prepare the road to victory with conferences and actions that will untie our political arm, map our victorious fight against the legislation spawned by the labor-baiters, halt the inflationary spiral, and block the designs of the war planners.

# WORLD POLITICS

## How Stalinism Leads to Defeat

Under a combination of armed force and violence employed by the French government and a widespread confusion and dismay within their own ranks, France's striking coal miners are going back to work after four weeks of exhausting and fruitless strike effort. The strike definitely appears to be broken, and it is clear already that the militant miners have suffered a heavy defeat.

When John L. Lewis denounced the action of the French government in his letter to William Green and ironically demanded that Green intended to do about the fact that this government was brutally shooting down miners striking for their just and legitimate demands, Lewis was expressing an elementary labor solidarity which is all to his credit. Green's first reaction was friendly and sympathetic, but he quickly yielded to the advice of others (that eminent authority on Stalinism, Jay Lovestone, for example?) and squelched his own tiny show of proletarian solidarity by proclaiming that the strike was purely "Communist inspired." Stalinist led and organized was the strike beyond any doubt, but that had nothing to do with the fact that hundreds of thousands of poorly fed, housed and badly paid miners had presented their legitimate demands to the French Government and had received police, troops and bullets for an answer.

### REACTION ON FRENCH WORKERS

The strike is lost and a serious reaction will set in among the workers of France. Unfortunately, this reaction will not only be directed against the Stalinist saboteurs who led this strike action to inevitable rout and defeat; it will be reflected in a growing apathy and mood of defeatism among workers in France as a whole. By their conduct and methods, the French Stalinists have not only again demonstrated that the sole concern and interest of Stalinism is its own political program (regardless of what price the legitimate union movement must pay for this self-concern of the Stalinists), but also that in those areas of Europe and the world where rival capitalism is still a force and a real power, Stalinism can only lead to defeat and rout.

The Stalinists made no effort to organize the strike systematically, on a wide union basis, any more than they showed a desire to negotiate with the Government, which runs the mines in France, and reach a satisfactory settlement. They are exclusively concerned with the question: how shall this strike be kept going so that French economy as a whole suffers a maximum economic loss? Their actions were all in the realm of open sabotage (flooding of the mines and withdrawal of safety crews); setting one section of the workers against those miners who belonged to anti-Stalinist

unions; throwing the labor movement into confusion and chaos by setting off their system of roving and shifting strikes; and conducting a largely political, anti-Marshall Plan propaganda all during the course of the struggle. In effect, the Stalinist leadership bred mistrust, confusion and disruption of the miners ranks.

### SP COVERED WITH DISGRACE

If the Stalinists behaved as politically conscious people have now learned to expect from them, the other important labor and political organizations of France likewise covered themselves with disgrace and contempt. The French Socialist Party not only sits in the government which is systematically breaking the strike, but the gentleman in charge of this particular operation is none other than the now-notorious Jules Moch, French Minister of Interior and a leading "comrade" of the Blum Socialist Party. That decrepit old figure too, emerged briefly from his hole to answer Lewis' letter with the typical remark that it was all the work of the Stalinists. Lewis may know little or nothing about the inner political situation of France, but he has enough union instinct to know that miners do not strike over nothing and under purely political instigation. The French SP has dug itself deeper into the grave by its action. The same holds true for the anti-Stalinist CGT movement (Workers' Force) which sent back its members behind the guns, tanks and bayonets of the troops. All in all, a tragic and depressing picture is represented in France by this strike, with the workers victimized by Stalinism on the one hand, and the reformist political movement on the other. From the Government it got what it expected—strike breaking, police and violence.

It is too soon to assess the extent of the damage done, but surely it must be considerable. The miners have gained absolutely nothing after one month of strike; their unions have been weakened. Throughout the nation as a whole, the forces of culture de Gaulle—who maintained a strict silence during the affair—have undoubtedly been strengthened by the reaction of fear and confusion which has been created among the middle class.

The Government has already announced its intention to prosecute and Stalinist miners' leaders, and also its intention of revising laws about strikes so as to severely limit future strike actions. Under the pretext of defending the nation from Stalinism, a period of repressive labor legislation and action is about to begin. Such is the fruit of a continuation of Stalinist leadership in the French labor movement. How right was Trotsky in referring to Stalinism as "the syphilis of the labor movement which must be burned out with a red-hot iron!"

Henry JUDD.



By JACK RANGER

### A TAX-AND-DEBT-RIDDEN WORLD

A picture of a debt-and-tax-ridden world such as has probably never before been seen in history emerges from figures compiled by a committee of U.S. government experts at the request of Congress. Capitalism, in the bare few centuries of its existence, has managed in every country to place a veritable Alp of debt and taxes upon the backs of every man, woman and child—not only those now living, but for generations to come. Most of the debt and taxation burdens are traceable directly to the hideous wars which accompany the capitalist system step by step down its bloody way to ruin.

This situation, according to the Institute of Life Insurance, from the long-run point of view has a direct bearing on the financial welfare and security of all the peoples of the world, now and for generations hence—their incomes and earning powers, their savings, their standards of living, and the whole structure of family life. (The Institute cannot conceive of a future freed from capitalism.—J. R.)

"The worldwide extent of the public debt and tax burden makes it a problem of the first magnitude for virtually all nations, large and small," declares the institute. "The major cause of this situation is the war and its astronomical cost. Neutral nations have been severely affected as well as belligerents. The problem for a time showed signs of easing as public expenditures in various nations declined from the peaks with the end of the war, but government outlays, as in this country, are displaying a renewed uptrend due to the international situation."

### \$1.00 OUT OF EVERY \$4.00

The experts' figures, which are for central governments only, and do not include state and local figures, compare the years 1936 and 1946. One measure of the burden is that in nearly a score of nations the tax burden in each one in 1946 was the equivalent of \$1.00 or more out of every \$4.00 of their national incomes in that year. In a few cases (including France) the 1946 tax burden was the equivalent of MORE THAN ONE-HALF the national income in that year.

The United States, which had been well down on the list before the Second World War, led all nations in the per capita tax burden in 1946 with \$313. Russia was second with \$297, and the United Kingdom third with \$279.

In the public debt burden (which the taxes help to carry), the United States in 1946 was second only to Britain. The British public debt was the equivalent of \$2,095 per capita, and that of the U.S. \$1,830 per capita. Canada was third with \$1,365 per capita; Australia fourth, \$845 per capita.

The Institute noted that in 1939 Germany led the world in the per capita tax burden with \$157, equivalent to approximately \$1.00 of every \$3.00 of German national income in that year. Russia was in second place with \$129 per capita. In contrast, the U.S. was in 15th place with a 1939 tax burden of \$43 per capita, equivalent to approximately \$1.00 out of every \$13 of American national income in that year.

From 1939 to 1946 the per capita American tax burden increased over sevenfold, or far more than that of any other nation, and the per capita debt burden grew more than fivefold. The Institute noted that aggregate state and local taxes in the U.S. in 1946 were the equivalent of just under \$80 per capita, or more than a fourth of the equivalent per capita federal government figures.

No one doubts that so long as capitalism exists the tax-and-debt burden will grow increasingly heavy.

Just consider this: In 1939 the total U.S. national budget was \$8,700,000,000. In 1949, Dewey and Truman are agreed, the U.S. budget for war preparations alone will reach \$20,000,000,000, and the total budget more than twice that. Even allowing for the doubling of prices, one sees that the mounting costs of maintaining capitalism are amounting to a jet-propelled rate.

Preparations for the First Atomic War will bring higher taxes from the American workers. The slight tax cut permitted the masses as a sop in preparation for the 1948 elections, and as a bribe to hold back the drive for a new national labor party, will in all likelihood be withdrawn by the 81st Congress and even heavier taxes imposed. This will be a certainty if American and Russian imperialism fail to reconcile their current differences.

## Pollsters Take Licking - -

(Continued from page 1)

lost, illustrates the effect of these fraudulent polls. The Daily News straw poll of the state gave New York to Dewey by 300,000 votes, or 49.2 per cent of the popular vote. Actually Dewey carried the state by 40,000, a bare one half of one per cent, a small margin that might well be laid to the effects of the poll itself in keeping Truman supporters from the polls with a feeling of "what's the use? Dewey's in the bag."

The New York Times went wrong in its forecast in almost every possible way. It gave Dewey a "commanding lead" in the nation, had him sweeping the electoral college by 345 minimum electoral votes, of which

he received a bare half. The Times' forecast said that the Wallace vote would be "considerable," and granting all possible interpretations, it certainly wasn't.

It is interesting to note that the ill-famed Literary Digest poll went down to its death from lacerations due to its forecast of a Landon sweep in 1936. The writer is happy to report the periodical joined the poll on its deathbed. One eminently pleasing result of the present election is that it has completely discredited the false prophets of public opinion, who, we may all hope, will join the Literary Digest in the Happy Hunting Grounds of by-gone pollsters.

Henry JUDD.

New York State, which Truman

**PITTSBURGH DEBATE! HOLD THIS DATE OPEN!**

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 8:00 P. M.**

## Which Road? Catholic or Marxian Social Philosophy

HEAR:

Catholic—**FATHER CHARLES OWEN RICE**—a leading spokesman for Catholic labor

Versus

Marxian—**MAX SHACHTMAN**—National Chairman of the Workers Party

At the **NORTH SIDE UNITARIAN CHURCH**, North Ave. and Resaca Place

Admission 50 Cents      Auspices of the Citizens Forum

**AND — ANOTHER PITTSBURGH MEETING**

Speaker: **MAX Shachtman**, National Chairman of the Workers Party

### THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN LABOR

Time: **SUNDAY AFTERNOON**      Place: **UNITARIAN HOUSE**

**NOVEMBER 14, 2:30 P. M.**      **1110 Resaca Place, cor. North Ave.**

Auspices: **Pittsburgh Branch of the Workers Party**      Admission Free

### Ranger Pamphlet On Labor Party

Jack Ranger's pamphlet on the Labor Party, selected chapters of which have been run serially in **LABOR ACTION**, is scheduled for publication immediately following the national election. A brief introduction will summarize the meaning of the election for the Labor Party movement. Its publication will coincide with the new wave of activity on labor political action promised by William Green's announcement for a third party, a scheduled conference by the UAW which will take up the same subject, and heightened interest in the question in every section of the trade-union movement. Branches of the Workers Party and readers of **LABOR ACTION** are asked to get ready for mass sales of the timeliest pamphlet possible today.

### WORKERS PARTY INFORMATION BLANK

I am interested in joining the Workers Party of the United States. Will you please send me all information as to your Program and how I can become a member.

Name .....

Address .....

### Bound Volumes of LABOR ACTION SPECIAL OFFER

Labor Action Book Service	
1943.....	\$3.50
1944.....	\$3.50
1945.....	\$3.00
1946.....	\$3.00
1947.....	\$3.00
	\$16.00

4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, New York

Name .....

Street .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

### 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.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 12, No. 45      Nov. 8, 1948

Emanuel Garroff Gelfman,  
Editor

Editorial Board: Hal Draper,  
Henry Judd, Jack Brad, Business Mgr., Thompson Conley

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a year; \$6 for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1946, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Read and Subscribe to

### LABOR ACTION

and

### THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

**LEON TROTSKY'S "THE NEW COURSE"**

Get this historic essay on Russia, together with Max Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism.

**NOW ON SALE: \$1.00**  
(paper bound)      265 pages  
Originally \$1.50

Order from:

Workers Party Publications  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.



LOSS OF MANCHURIA ROCKS U. S.-SUPPORTED CHINESE REGIME

DEFEAT BRINGS CHIANG TO LOW EBB OF POWER --

(Continued from page 1) would look with favor upon such a coalition as their bridge to peace with the CP.

It is necessary to review certain questions which events have pushed to the fore. Just what was lost in Manchuria? Here is the greatest industrial development in Asia, and the most modern. The city of Mukden had 4,750 industrial establishments employing 360,000 workers in 1940. Nearly 1,000 of these factories were large scale producers of machine tools, chemicals, rubber, fertilizer and textiles. It has a population of over two million. Mukden was the arsenal of the Japanese Kuomintang army. The modern city of Changchun had a million population.

Defeat May Be His Last Gasp



There are ten cities of over 100,000 population.

In 1939, Manchurian coal production amounted to thirty million tons. Anshan, the Pittsburgh of Asia, employed 72,000 workers to produce two million tons of pig iron and one and a half million tons of steel. New ore deposits around Penhsin became the base for a secondary steel industry and magnesium ore refining. Almost sixty per cent of all of China's iron reserves are in Manchuria.

Agriculture tends to be extensive and only forty-six per cent of the arable land is cultivated. The balance is a great frontier area suitable to growing wheat, soy beans, sorghum and hogs. Manchuria was the greatest exporter of soy beans in the world. It is one of the few agricultural areas of China that does not have a food deficit.

Stalinism has the basis for an unmatched industrial development in the huge, integrated complex of North China, Manchuria and Siberia. It also acquires a large skilled working class and great cities; in other words—the physical pre-requisites for power.

INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL OF MANCHURIA REMAINS INTACT

Did not Russia strip Manchurian industry in 1946 and thus considerably decrease the functional powers of this industry?

All that is known about Russian looting has been obtained from the Pauley Report of 1946. This report was compiled on the basis of two and one-half days "investigation" during which the committee was unable to visit the main industrial sites. It came to the conclusion that the total of removals, destruction and deterioration amounted to \$2 billion. Since the total Japanese industrial investment amounted to \$2 1/2 billions, either Manchurian industry is wiped out or the report is exaggerated. Subsequent direct observation seems to indicate the latter conclusion.

In either case the important facts are that Japan was able to create this industrial empire in only ten years' time, 1930-1940. The coal, iron, oil, magnesium and aluminum is there. Above all, Manchuria has the only sizable group of skilled workers. Out of these materials an aggressive regime may recreate industries, perhaps not to the Japanese level because of the lack of capital, but substantially. There are innumerable physical obstacles but they are not insurmountable.

A much more serious problem is the political one. It is a little less than certain that Russia will encourage industrial reconstruction. In 1946 Russia was in a position to guarantee any regime it wished in Manchuria, thanks to Roosevelt's blessing at Yalta. Russia did not choose to entrust the Chinese CP with the industries of Manchuria. Instead she looted, sacked and destroyed. If Japanese imperialism followed a course of forced industrialization, Russian imperialism seeks to channelize and limit it.

Russian economic manipulations indicate a policy of tight control, and securing of guarantees over these plants. They issued a total of \$8 billion in notes, with which they bought up everything that could not be squeezed under their inclusive formula of war-booty. One of the establishments thus obtained was the largest wholesale and retail merchandis-

ing house; also hotels, breweries and even private residences. There are unconfirmed stories that they also obtained joint control over much of the remaining enterprises. Russian policy was not to hand over the economy to the Chinese CP for the construction of a strong Stalinist state in North China. They were distrustful, arrogant and abusive toward Mao Tze-tung's armies and administrators.

The Chinese CP has distributed the land in its areas. But this is no solution to the agrarian problem; it is only the first step toward one. Where will the peasant sell, what will he buy, how will recurrent over-production of the land be prevented? Industrialization alone can begin to supply these needs. Will the Russians assist or even permit such a development? They have acquired such a stranglehold over the remains of Manchurian economy as to be able to determine its immediate future. The resources are present, the potential is there, but it is doubtful if the Russians will permit Mao to plan a development which would of necessity contain the seeds of Titoism. The political antagonism within the Russian empire is the key to Manchuria's economic future.

Are the Russians popular in China? A tentative answer would be in the negative. In South China there are illusions and the usual mythology among intellectuals and workers. But in North China where direct contact was made, the Russians are heartily feared and detested.

The Russian armies behaved like conquerors. They looted freely they were arrogant and openly despised the native population. The Russian Commandant at Mukden permitted himself to say for publication that the Chinese were "people of low culture." When in 1946 the Russians overstayed the agreed period of occupation, anti-Russian riots tore through China.

However, these riots were directed equally at the Moscow and Yalta agreements, which were sponsored by the United States. So that anti-Russian feeling did not redound to the benefit of the U. S. Quite the contrary, the United States was held responsible for abetting the situation, for opening China's gates to a new rapacious conqueror.

What was agreed to at the Yalta and Moscow Conferences with regard to China? The biggest port and naval base in the North, Port Arthur was put under Russian military administration. The naval facilities were to be jointly operated by China and Russia. The area of Port Arthur actually includes more than the City, amounting in fact to the entire former Japanese colony known as the Kwantung Leased Territory. Russia's pre-eminent position in the major part of Dairen was recognized. The Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian railroads were to be coordinated in a joint Russo-Chinese administration. The Russians still occupy Dairen because they were granted the occupation until a peace treaty is signed with Japan. This is the brilliant product of the diplomacy of the liberal Roosevelt.

STALINIST PROGRAM OF REFORM IS KEY TO VICTORIES

Russia has not had to give material aid to the CP armies. It has been able to afford the luxury of just standing by. The CP obtained the bulk of the Japanese weapons and has continued to supply itself with huge stacks of American arms captured from the Kuomintang so that Russia has escaped blame for the civil war itself. The U. S., by contrast, has intervened openly on behalf of Chiang and it suffers all the effects of Kuomintang disasters.

NOVEMBER 13 IS SADIE HAWKINS DAY in New York. Come and Celebrate at the "SHMOOS-IS-SOCIALISM PARTY" Dancing Games Refreshments SAT. NOV. 13 from 9 p.m. at the Workers Party Hall 114 West 14th St., N. Y. C. Third Floor Subscription 50c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION by Leon Trotsky \$3.50 Order Your Copy From LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, New York

Russia is now the pre-eminent Asiatic power. Through the native Stalinist parties she can expect the conquest of Asia without war, if no new force enters the picture.

What accounts for the Stalinist victories? One thing does not account for them—Russian help in arms, finances, military direction. There is no evidence to support such claims. The Russians simply have not had to do these things.

The Stalinists win because they have a social program for the peasantry which corresponds in some degree to the needs and desires of China's millions. There are other factors, but this is the primary one. That their program is inadequate, that it does not measure up to the historic potential revealed in the 1925-26 Revolution, that its politics are reactionary and oppressive, that it cannot solve the agrarian problem without industrialization and planning, that it is an organ of Russian imperialism—all this is true. But it does divide the land, throw out the landlords, reduce taxes and rents from seventy to eight-

Productivity Under Socialism and Capitalism

Figures Don't Lie, But...

By SUSAN GREEN

Time was when the supporters of capitalism had to resort to the bogymen to scare people away from the idea of socialism and communism. Socialism would break up the family, socialize the women and any number of other hair-raising catastrophes would come about. Today the technique is different. These capitalist supporters claim that socialism exists in England and that communism is full-fledged in Russia; so they proceed to compare the standard of living for the workers in capitalist America with that in England and Russia. What can be a simpler way of "proving" that socialism and communism are abysmal failures!

Following this method U. S. News & World Report of October 29 hits its readers in the eye with an expensive pictograph on the cover, proclaiming that under capitalism the American worker makes \$10 in eight hours, that under socialism the British worker spends 19 hours making that same \$10 in terms of values, and that under communism the Russian worker toils 81 hours for the same reward.

COMPARISON OF PRODUCTIVITY

On page 20 appears an article elaborating this striking pictograph. The American workers, it says, can buy a loaf of bread, a dozen eggs and a quart of milk for an hour's work. If in England the worker can buy his food with about the same labor time, this is possible only because of government subsidy and American aid. Whereas in Russia, if these things were available to the worker, it would take him half a day's work to buy them. In the line of clothing, the article points out, the U. S. worker can earn a good quality shirt in half a day, while the British worker will labor two days for the same shirt, and the Russian worker four days. The article makes such comparisons in the standard of living in the three countries, declaring that under capitalism there is room in the budget of the worker and farmer for other things besides food and clothing, for things like cars, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines and other devices and gadgets. The case is, of course, different in England, very, very different in Russia, in which two countries we are told socialism and communism are "in practice."

The basic reason for this difference, it is pointed out, is to be found in the productivity of capitalism as against that of socialism and communism "in practice." In the U. S. an auto and a steel worker turn out four times as much as his British fellow worker; an American coal miner produces two and a half times what the British miner digs; the capacity of the American textile worker is one and a half times that of his British brother. As to Russia, exact statistics are not available, but it is estimated that the worker in this country produces ten times as much as the worker in Stalinland. "On any basis," concludes the article, "the private capitalism of the U. S. is shining in this period. Socialism and communism, by comparison, are producing a record that is not quite in the same class, whether in terms of effort required of workers or in volume of goods available to workers." So, therefore, what is there for a revolutionary socialist to do but fold his tent and quietly steal away!

By and large the comparisons made are correct. Yet, from beginning to end, the article is a lie because its implications and its conclusions are as false as the oldtime bogymen scares about socialism and communism.

First it must be pointed out that there is no socialism "in practice" in England or anywhere else. A few nationalized industries which pay

ty percent to possibly thirty to forty percent.

It imposes these reforms rather than rallying the peasantry in great revolts throughout China. The Communist Party does not call upon the peasantry to act in its own behalf. It reserves to itself the exclusive right to liberate the peasantry from landlord tyranny. But it does abolish feudalism and that is China's crying need.

This is the program which causes Kuomintang conscripts to desert by tens of thousands, which disintegrates Kuomintang armies and wins battles. There is no existing alternative to it. The alternative of the Kuomintang is landlordism and political reaction also.

The CP has two other weapons. First, the Chiang regime whose corruption is unimaginable to the West. The internal decay of the Kuomintang, its alienation from the people, its persecution of all opponents and destruction of all liberties, its cruel and medieval tyranny over the people are weapons in the Stalinist arsenal.

profits to the recent private owners in the form of interest on government bonds—profits at the same rate as under private ownership—can hardly be called socialism. A few nationalized industries directed and controlled by the late private managers now given fancy positions on government boards, while worker participation in industry control is only an empty gesture, is not socialism. Production for the market, with emphasis on export trade, as is the case in England, is not socialism. Nor is a foreign policy of traditional imperialist machinations backed by military might, what socialists conceive as leading to international socialism and the brotherhood of man.

STALINISM VERSUS COMMUNISM

Coming to Russia, the bureaucratic police-state monstrosity that exists there is not communism by any stretch of the imagination. Even a simple, dictionary definition of communism, without the trimmings of scientific Magxism, indicates that Stalinism is as far from communism as the north from the south pole.

Funk & Wagnalls say communism is "A theory of government and social order according to which property and the instruments of production are held as a common trust and the profits arising from all labor devoted to the general good." Russia's nationalized industries, run like prisons by the bureaucrats, with the secret police as the final arbiter, are not "a common trust."

The wide gap between the well-being of the ruling bureaucrats on the one side and the poverty of the ordinary worker and the animal existence of the "slave worker on the other side, attests amply to the fact that "the profits arising from all labor" are not "devoted to the general good." Or perhaps the intellectual and spiritual enslavement in which Stalinism holds the populace can be considered for the good of anyone but the ruling bureaucrats. Maybe the Stalinist foreign policy of aggressive and brutal imperialism, crushing independent peoples under its iron heel, is the road to a world alliance of free and independent peoples.

When the writers in the U. S. News & World Report state "Merely to buy food for an ordinary family will take most of the working time of an average man laboring under a system of communism," they lie, because nobody knows what the working time of an average man laboring under a system of communism will net him. There is nowhere in the world a system of communism.

Misrepresentations about capitalism are made in the article as well. The American system is passed off as synonymous with capitalism, whereas American capitalism is really the only segment of world capitalism that still has virility left in it. The older capitalisms of Europe, in a weakened state before the war, have been entirely unable to pull out of the collapse wrought by the war. Why do not the writers reporting from London, Moscow and Washington report also from Paris and Rome? How about the standard of living in those unhappy capitalist countries—France and Italy? How about the productivity of labor there? And why, in reporting from London, do not these "factualists" state that in England, too, the collapse of the capitalist system was the reason for trying the kind of nationalization that they falsely call socialism?

PICTURE OF CAPITALISM

Furthermore, the picture presented of American capitalism is not an honest one, though the comparison of AVERAGES with England and Russia may be correct. The shine and sparkle of American capitalism is not seen by the millions of substandard

Second, is the U. S. policy which is identified with Chiang. It is understood that American sustenance alone maintains the Kuomintang in power. The anti-American riots of last summer were abetted but not initiated by the Stalinists. At the end of the war America was the hope of Asia but that hope has been bitterly dissipated. American intervention was popular so long as it might have introduced social change. Today America is looked upon as the bastion of reaction and imperialism. The Stalinists have gained by this.

Such a conservative observer as Nathaniel Peffer writes: "Had there never been a Russian Revolution, the difference in Asia would be one of degree only." The realities of Asiatic misery and the awakening to the possibility of change provides the seeds of revolt. This is the groundswell for Stalinist victory, which disorients the revolution to its own purposes.

U. S.-Russian antagonism establishes an imperialist framework for the expression of these desires. Within this framework the United States acts as the decisive reactionary and im-

perialist force in Asia, especially on the land question. If this antagonism did not exist, or if the U. S. were not an Asiatic power, the struggle for emancipation might break through these deep rutted channels to freedom. American policy in Asia assists Stalinism by channelizing independence and anti-feudal movements toward it. The moment a peasant rebels against his landlord he finds himself opposing America and looks for aid in the opposite camp.

AMERICAN FAILURE OF POLICY ROOTED IN CAPITALISM

Why has America failed with all its vast resources to at least limit Stalinist expansion?

"America's difficulty" is that it arrived too late; Asia's masses are no longer docile. They demand basic social revolution. America, however, represents imperialist reaction which supports all those forces which seek to maintain the people in bondage. United States supports the French against Viet-Nam, the Dutch against the Indonesian Republic, the British against the Malayan Independence movement, Syngman Rhee against the peasantry of Korea, and Chiang against all of China. American failure is the result of its reactionary policy throughout the colonial world. It is not an alternative to Stalinism or to native reaction. That is why the fight for freedom begins with the anti-imperialist struggle against America.

In 1945-1947 the United States poured billions into China to no avail. The Marshall policy in 1948 limited China aid until Chiang made concessions. But the United States never demanded social reform, only greater efficiency and less graft. Chiang could not guarantee even this. The Marshall policy of reduced subsidies is one of the reasons for the great tempo of Stalinist advances.

Can the United States recoup its losses?

The Dewey policy is being fashioned in the House Foreign Affairs Committee which seems to have accepted the program of Bullitt who proposes enlarged grants, about one billion a year, with United States supervision as in Greece. Bullitt sees the problem as a military one. He does not seem to have the faintest glimmer that the military and social questions in China are inseparable.

More extensive U. S. subsidy will, of course, somewhat stabilize the war and strengthen the Kuomintang. But such a program cannot even begin for months to come. The new Congress does not open till January. The Stalinist strategy is anticipatory; it will attempt to overrun North China this winter and force the Kuomintang armies below the Yangtze River before substantial U. S. assistance arrives. It will attempt, very likely, to set up its coalition regime before then. America is too late for

North China and very possibly for all China. America cannot sponsor social reform without weakening her own base of power. Its reaction is indigenous in its capitalism.

What next in Nationalist China? Serious changes will take place in the government but the only way in which fundamental changes can occur is by the intervention of the masses against the state. American policy may try to reduce graft and introduce efficiency but it cannot drive the landlords out of the Kuomintang or the bureaucratic cliques from the economy without destroying the only social base the Kuomintang has.

As the physical base for exploitation narrows, the rapacity of the ruling groups will increase. The axis of their rule will be greater dependence on the U. S. and concomitantly greater alienation from the masses. The inner decay is rooted in a social soil that has been rotting for centuries.

Already the economic effects of the fall of Manchuria are visible. The new currency launched with such fanfare only six weeks ago is already reduced in this short period to one fourth of its original value. Chiang's son, the economic dictator of Shanghai, has issued a public apology for his failure to bring order out of the chaos and all the emergency stabilization measures introduced have been entirely repealed. There are now no legal restrictions on prices and the inflation is greater than ever.

To reform its armies the Kuomintang will again descend upon the villages with enforced conscription, driving the peasantry to despair and hatred. To supply its armies it will increase taxes in kind. To secure itself in power it will deepen the terror and oppression. These are the natural inclinations of the ruling class of China.

Its hope now is American-Russian hostilities. It is dedicated to World War III. There does not exist a section of this class which contains the seeds of reformation. The small groups who do want reform find it easier to go over to Stalinism than to struggle against the Kuomintang. America has not found any political or social group on which to base its policy as against Chiang. That is why it continues to support his regime in spite of overwhelming disaster. Chiang will hardly permit it to find such an alternative now that U. S. aid will be more lavish than ever.

For socialists the beginning of policy is the rejection of both Kuomintang and Stalinist reaction and of both imperialisms. For U. S. socialists the first step is to demand evacuation of all American interests and pressures. It is necessary, finally, to find ways of saving and defending the remnants of revolutionary socialists.

31 Years Since the Russian Revolution 20 Years of American Trotskyism

Hear MAX SHACHTMAN National Secretary of the Workers Party American Editor of Trotsky's Works

"Bolshevism and Democracy" What are the roots of Stalinism?



Lenin and Trotsky: leaders of the revolution

SUNDAY, NOV. 7 At 8 P.M. LABOR TEMPLE 2nd Ave. and 14th Street GENERAL ADMISSION: 60 Cents S.Y.L.: 25 Cents

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Auspices: Workers Party and Socialist Youth League