

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

LABOR ACTION

MARCH 14, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

Noted Scientists Ask U of C Colleagues to Join Kutcher Protest

CHICAGO, Mar. 7—Five world-famous scientists and scholars, including Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize-winner and director of the U. S. War Research Atomic Bomb Project, today called upon their colleagues at the University of Chicago to join them in defending the legless veteran James Kutcher in order to combat "a frightening atmosphere that cuts the nerve of independent thinking." Kutcher is seeking reinstatement in his clerk's job in the Newark Veterans Administration from which he was discharged last October solely because of membership in the Socialist Workers Party.

The five signers of the appeal are Prof. Anton J. Carlson, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; Prof. Richard P. McKeon, former chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies; Prof. Malcolm P. Sharp of the University of Chicago Law School and noted authority on Civil Rights; Prof. Harold C. Urey,

Nobel Prize winner in chemistry and director of War Research Atomic Bomb Project (1940-45); and Prof. Louis Wirth, president of the Sociological Society and also president of the American Council on Race Relations.

Their letter warns their colleagues that "whether you know it or not, you are involved in one way or another in developments on the civil rights front." It declares that "the whole fabric of American justice is being tampered with in a severe way."

"Administrative agencies have been and are dealing with government employees in procedures which violate the basic decencies of notice and hearing which are part of our tradition of due process of law. People are being fired from jobs and are being forced to suffer various indignities, not the least of which is impugning of character. All this at the hands of administrative officials and other non-judicial bodies pro-

(Continued on page 2)

Whither Molotov?



Vishinsky for Molotov— What's Behind Change?

Foster and Dennis Pipe Up in Cominform's Chorus of Pledges to Support Russia

The American branch managers of the Kremlin—locally known as the "leadership of the Communist Party of the U. S."—last week got into the act started by Thorez of France and Togliatti of Italy. William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, CP national chairman and secretary respectively, issued a statement along the same lines as the rest of their Stalinist leaders in the various countries.

The punch line of the Foster-Dennis statement was: "If, despite the efforts of the peace force of America and the world, Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war, we would oppose it as an unjust, aggressive imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity. . . . We Communists [would] cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace."

This statement is, of course, carefully worded to sound as if it referred only to a war resulting from U. S. aggression. (The Stalinist line of humbug is that Russia on the other hand is constitutionally incapable of any act remotely resembling aggression.) Actually, as everybody knows, Foster and Dennis are saying: "In any war between the U. S. and Russia, the Stalinist movement will function as a pro-Russian fifth column—so beware!"

But all literate people were fully aware of this before the recent declaration was issued. The late flurry of Stalinist declarations on this point do not add a whit to this. What is significant is that the Stalinist party leaders on a world-wide scale have chosen this time to underline and draw attention to their aims, in a concerted propaganda attack obviously agreed upon and organized; as LABOR ACTION pointed out last week, it is an item in the Russian reply to the North Atlantic Pact.

The statement itself, as worded by Foster and Dennis, is of course NOT treason—Truman's fulmination to the contrary. In reply to the president's epithet of "traitors," the CP replied that Lincoln, Jefferson and Carl Schurz had in their day publicly opposed a war being carried on by the government. The spectacle of these Russian agents wrapping themselves in Lincoln's mantle may be disgusting, but it is important for the American people to understand that opposition to war, even after it has broken out, is a democratic right which cannot be taken away by the government except as part of the development of a police state.

Fifth columnism in the service of another imperialist is a different matter—which is why Foster-Dennis did not admit this in their statement. The

tactic of the reactionaries and the tenor of Truman is to throw into the same bag any socialist or even pacifist opposition to war and the CP's particular brand of pro-Russianism—which is not anti-war at all but merely opposition to any enemy of the Kremlin.

BUT THE CP ITSELF DOES NOT BELIEVE IN THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHT TO OPPOSE WAR, ANY MORE THAN THE REACTIONARIES. They proved this during the Second World War, during the period when, after the German attack on Russia, they became raving super-patriots. As soon as THEY were supporting the war, as Russian patriots in a country allied with their masters, the anti-war position of the REAL socialists became . . . treason.

Proof? One need only look at one of the gutter pamphlets they published in 1945, entitled "The Trotskyite Fifth Column in the Labor Movement," by George Morris. The usual Stalinist slanders against the Marxist socialist movement ("Trotskyists")

are here found in full force, but now the charge is that these socialists are "fifth columnists" and "pro-Hitler," etc., on the ground that . . . they are opposed to the war. In this pamphlet the case against the real socialists is summed up in six points. Says Stalinist Morris:

"Even a casual acquaintance with their work and literature . . . shows that they:

- (1) Oppose the war . . .
- (2) Oppose national unity . . .
- (3) Ridicule a post-war outlook of national unity and full employment . . .
- (4) Oppose labor's wartime no-strike pledge . . .
- (5) . . . seek to undermine the authority of . . . the most outspoken win-the-war and win-the-peace leaders.
- (6) Concentrate fire chiefly upon President Roosevelt . . .

This proves they are traitors, said the Stalinists—and now with hypocritical indignation they hear the same from Truman.

By JACK BRAD

The sudden Moscow announcement of Molotov's replacement by Vishinsky as Russian foreign minister has caused consternation and speculation everywhere. In all probability this uncertainty is as great behind the Iron Curtain as on this side of it. For the absolutist despotism that is the Politbureau of the Kremlin works in darkness, without explanation or forewarning. It gives no explanations nor feels any need to do so; its shifts are sudden, often tragically affecting the lives of millions but completely beyond scrutiny, not to speak of control. The chief question is to fathom from the straws in the wind the meaning of these latest moves.

That a change is in process is evident. Russia's imperialist program in Europe has not progressed for over a year, since the Czech coup. While expansion in Asia has continued with seven-league boots, perhaps this creates more problems than it solves for the Kremlin and in no way compensates for the stalemate and actual failures of its European program. For it appears that at least some sections of the ruling bureaucracy thought it possible to extend Russian hegemony at least to the Rhine without war and in a short period. The Ruhr is the prime objective of Russia's European policy.

Not only has Molotov failed in this but American imperialism has succeeded in stabilizing West Europe's politics and economy and has even organized it into a gigantic, far-flung integrated military alliance which puts the vast might of the American productive machine on the continent

LABOR ACTION recognizes the difficulty of attempting to assess, so soon after the event and on the basis of little more than the bare Moscow announcement, the significance of the replacement of Molotov and Mikoyan in the Russian government. The accompanying article by Jack Brad, is presented—both by the writer and by the Editors—as an interesting hypothesis on the political meaning of the change. LABOR ACTION will return to this subject as soon as further data is considered to clarify the question.—Ed.

as a decisive military factor. And almost of equal importance has been the Tito development. The measurement of success of any Russian policy will be to a large degree its ability to weaken, undermine and destroy this most dangerous heresy.

The present program has thus reached an impasse. It has failed against Tito, it has raised the specter of other Titos in Bulgaria and Poland; the Ruhr and West Germany are for the coming period in Western hands. The UN, also, has failed to advance Russia's interests.

That is to say, the wartime-established arenas for relationship and regulation of inter-imperialist differences no longer serve any Russian purpose, and Russia's commitment to

(Continued on page 4)

Paris Court Hears Witnesses Indict Stalin Crimes in Kravchenko Suit

By PIERRE COLIN

PARIS, Mar. 5—The suit of Victor Kravchenko, former Soviet official and author of the book "I Chose Freedom," against "Lettres Françaises," Stalinist literary weekly, finally nears termination after a month of uproarious and violent court sessions. This legal proceeding had been initiated by Kravchenko as a result of an article written by Sim Thomas for "Lettres Françaises" which charged that Kravchenko had not written his book and that it had been written for him by American OSS agents.

The trial quickly surpassed the limits of a libel suit and was transformed into a violent and impassioned debate on the character of the Russian regime.

Vilify Accusers

From the very outset, the Kravchenko-Lettres Françaises trial has become news item number one for most newspapers in non-Stalinist Europe; many newspapers in France publish complete verbatim coverages of each session of the trial proceedings. The debates and problems raised by the trial have become a favorite subject for editorial rhetoric. People avidly follow the debates which are a subject of daily conversations and discussions.

The final juridical outcome of the trial, at this point, seems to be a

more or less foregone conclusion. Despite the pains taken by the Stalinists to organize their defense, despite the direct aid furnished by the GPU and the open intervention of the Russian government into the trial proceedings, the extreme difficulty of concealing the true nature of Russian totalitarianism, the obvious falsehood of the Sim Thomas article has led them to defend themselves in a manner which is hardly designed to convince those who are not conditioned by the Stalinist mentality.

It has been relatively easy for Kravchenko's lawyers to prove that the article written by Sim Thomas, the purportedly "well known American newspaperman," is a fabrication. The Stalinist defense was not able to present Sim Thomas to the court for the simple reason that he is a fictitious creation cloaking the identity of a GPU agent in France who actually wrote the contested article.

The Stalinist smear method of defense against Kravchenko and the harrowing revelations made by Russian refugees, is one that is only too familiar. They are the "pures" fighting for peace and liberty and anyone opposed to them is a variety of fascist hyena who naturally is also an anti-Soviet agent, Nazi collaborator, etc.

Such has been their stereotyped response to any and all questions raised in the trial. Whenever any of the Russian witnesses testifying in favor of Kravchenko related before the court their personal experiences with the Russian slave camps, the GPU persecutions, the famines, the purges, etc., the Stalinist defense automatically responded, not by attempting to refute the information presented by the witnesses, but by denouncing them as Nazi collaborators, degenerates, traitors et al. The attempt at personal vilification was carried a step further when the Russian govern-

ment issued a diplomatic note to the French government, declaring that Kravchenko's Russian witnesses were war criminals wanted by the Russians. This demand was simply a move to intimidate the court, for it was quite easy to disprove this calumnious attempt. (Some of the people in question were members of the Russian Communist Party and all of them had suffered at the hands of the Nazis.)

In the case of Kravchenko, through the means of imported witnesses from Russia, the Stalinists have tried to prove that he was always a drunkard, an incompetent engineer, a wastrel, a thief and an embezzler.

As a further means of defending themselves before the telling testimony by Russian witnesses who have fled to Germany, a series of prominent "character" witnesses who are well known for their "progressiveness and integrity" were heard. The distinguished assemblage included the "Red" Dean of Canterbury, Koni Ziliacius, English MP, Albert Kahn, notorious apologist for the GPU in the U. S., Pierre Cot, Jean Cassou, etc. Most of them were obliged to put on a song and dance stating that the editors of "Lettres Françaises" are fine upstanding people and that Kravchenko deserted his fatherland during the war and was therefore a miserable traitor and, as everyone knows, all traitors are liars. The fellow travelers were forced to pay off for the publicity and support given them by the CP, even at the risk of allowing themselves to appear ridiculous.

Marne Testimony

The most moving and sensational testimony of the trial thus far was that given by Gertrude-Buber Neumann, wife of Heinz Neumann, who together with Thaelmann was the top

(Continued on page 3)

Washington Case Raises Civil Liberties Issue: Should Stalinists Be Permitted to Teach?

By R. FAHAN

The most interesting civil liberties case since the frameup of Trotskyists in Minneapolis during the war has arisen in the University of Washington. The issues involved are several: academic freedom, the nature of the present academic climate, the right of Stalinists to teach, the role of anti-Stalinists in the universities. Before discussing these, however, I should like to present a few facts.

What actually happened at the University of Washington? Three professors—Herbert Phillips, Ralph Grundlach and Joseph Butterworth—were fired by the university's Board of Regents for being members of the Communist Party. Phillips and Butterworth having admitted their membership. Before the Board of Regents acted, the matter was discussed by two other bodies: the Faculty Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and the Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of Washington. (These facts are taken from an excel-

lent article by Ralph Lampman, a member of the university's economics department, in the March Progressive.)

The Faculty Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom voted to dismiss ONLY Grundlach, for reasons quite irrelevant to the present case. It did NOT vote to dismiss Phillips and Butterworth. The Faculty Committee acted AFTER a year and a half long investigation by the local version of the Dies-Thomas Committee, which had hailed professors to its chambers to pry into their political beliefs. Phillips, Grundlach and Butterworth had refused to answer questions on constitutional grounds. Three other teachers—E. Harold Eby, Garland Ethel and Melville Jacobs—admitted to having been members of the CP, said they had since dropped out, but refused, when urged by the committee, to divulge the names of other members of the CP.

Please keep clear in your mind the fact that the charges were filed by the university AFTER the legislative

committee's hearing against the above six teachers. You will see why that is important as we go along . . . especially when we get to Professor Sidney Hook, ex-Marxist and doubtful democrat.

Charges Fall Into Two Categories

The charges against the six were of two general kinds: One, that they were members of the CP and that membership in the Communist Party is incompatible with intellectual and academic freedom, since they now subscribe, as Raymond Allen, president of the university, said, to "the doctrines and dogmas of a political party which admits of no criticism of its fundamental principles and program." The second group of charges: that the accused had committed specific acts representing academic dishonesty, incompetence and neglect of duty, such as failure to observe proper standards of objectivity in classroom work and failure to respond satisfactorily to questions put by the

legislative snoopers.

Now notice that as soon as Butterworth and Phillips admitted to CP membership, the college administration dropped the second group of charges and concentrated on the first one: CP membership pure and simple.

This is the way the 11-member Faculty Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom voted. Five felt that under the existing tenure code the professors could not be fired, because they were being tried on an *ex post facto* basis, that is, they were being tried for "crimes" which had not previously been specified as such. They believed, however, that the tenure provisions should be reversed to allow CP members to be fired. Three other members were against firing CP members. Three other members were for it.

How to interpret this split of opinion? A majority of the Faculty Committee was, in the immediate situation, against firing Butterworth and

(Continued on page 4)

Cardinal Spellman Recruits Scabs in Gravedigger Strike

By WYATT LEE

No blows or harsh words were exchanged on the picket line as the 100 strikebreakers filed by, led by a rotund, plump-faced man and guarded by a cordon of police. The pickets retired in bitter confusion and left the field to the photographers and newsmen who were on hand to report a novel labor story.

For the scabs were not professional goons hired by a Chowderhead Cohen, but soft-headed religious students recruited from a seminary to break a strike of 240 grave-diggers. And their leader, who termed their action "a corporal work of mercy," was Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York and the acknowledged head of the Roman Catholic Church in America.

The pickets across the street, huddled together into a knot of angry, resentful but silent men, were for the most part communicants of the Roman Catholic Church and members of the diocese headed by the strike-breaking Cardinal. They could handle a pick and shovel with practiced ease but the theological niceties that enabled their spiritual leader to brand as "immoral" their strike for a 40-hour week was a sophistry beyond their immediate comprehension.

WON'T MEET WITH UNION

The gravediggers' strike, in effect for several weeks, arose from the demand of their union, the United Cemetery Workers Union (UCU), for a five-day week at the same wage previously earned for a six-day week, and with overtime paid for Saturday work. According to union spokesmen, representatives of the Calvary Cemetery, located in Long Island City and operated by the trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral, have been unavailable for negotiations and the strike was undertaken as a last resort.

When church authorities finally did respond, it was in the form of a public announcement by Cardinal Spellman that no negotiations with the strikers would take place because the union was affiliated to the Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers and was therefore "Communist-dominated." The strike was "morally unjust," the Cardinal said, and he proposed to break it with the aid of students from St. Joseph's Seminary at Dunwoody, N. Y.

Kephart Bill Killed in Pa.

The Pennsylvania State Senate on February 28 temporarily killed the Kephart bill, which would have extended the 1947 anti-strike utility law to transportation. The bill was re-committed to the Labor and Industry Committee "for further study." The bill was discussed in last week's LABOR ACTION article on the aftermath of the Philadelphia transit strike.

If the strikers were a bit confused to learn that asking for a 40-hour week is "immoral," imagine their consternation to learn from their archbishop that they are "Communist-dominated." Not only is the overwhelming majority of Local 293 members of the Catholic Church, but its officials are members of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, a group which considers the fight against Communism one of its main tasks!

However, to appease the Cardinal, the union met on the second day of strike-breaking, took an anti-Communist oath and voted to disaffiliate from its parent organization. In addition, they declared that "Communism is not the real issue" and condemned "the union-busting tactics of any employer, including the Catholic Church when it acts as an employer."

Spellman, still shepherding his scabs on daily visits to the cemetery, retorted "They're getting repentant rather late (odd words from a priest who believes in administering the last rites of confession)," and denied that the action of the union opened the way for negotiations.

SEEK INJUNCTION
Shifting from the Communist issue, the Cardinal retreated to the higher plane of religious ethics. "The issue in this morally unjust strike is that it leaves all these people unburied," he said. "If they think that's decency, I don't."

The mundane question of wages and hours for the grave-diggers was ignored by the Cardinal in his solicitude for the dead, and at this writing it is still being ignored. Instead, church officials have gone to the courts to seek an injunction to force the strikers back. After all, the scabby seminarians who were jestingly warned by

(Continued on page 2)

An ACTU Leader Comments:

Roger K. Larkin, executive secretary of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU) had this to say:

"From the beginning of the Calvary strike on January 13, 1949, up to the present moment, the duly-elected negotiating committee of Local 293, United Cemetery Workers, CIO, has endeavored to meet management for the purpose of bringing the strike to a peaceful end.

"These efforts have been rebuffed at every turn. Therefore, the blame for the continuance of the cemetery strike cannot in justice be placed upon the shoulders of the men.

"Nor has there been the slightest evidence to support the claim that the strike was Communist-inspired. Local 292 in its organizational stage was chartered by the CIO Executive Board as an industrial union. Later the CIO board, of its own volition, placed the Cemetery Workers local in the Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers and the CIO entirely—their only alternative at the time.

"We know the leaders and the members of Local 293. They are neither Communists, fellow-travelers nor sympathizers. As a matter of fact, it would be difficult to find a union in the Greater New York area with a greater proportion of Catholics.

"We are hopeful that a more reasonable atmosphere will soon prevail and that the continuing efforts to bring union and management to a conference will soon be successful."

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Fitzgerald UE Local Rebuffs CP

LYNN, Mass.—A bitter speech at the recent meeting of UE Local 201, Lynn, brought out that the educational committee is being abolished in the new local constitution now being drafted. The speech was made by Frederick M. Kelly, business agent of the local. Kelly admitted that the committee was being abolished because the Stalinists control it.

There is no doubt that the Stalinists will lose the fight. This will mean that they will lose the tiny toe-hold they have in Local 201.

Kelly's charges were made in his speech on the completion of the new constitution. When speaking of the abolition of the educational committee he made some indirect references to "Communists and communism." Kelly was immediately baited by some Stalinists in the hall. He lost his temper and began to cite instances when the Stalinists used the committee for their purposes, how the committee's work was discussed at Communist Party branch meetings, etc.

SIGN OF THE TIMES

It was quite obvious that Kelly wanted to scrap the committee very

quietly, but his hand was called and he went into detail.

The incident assumes importance only when it is remembered that Local 201 is the home local of Albert Fitzgerald, national president of the UE. Fitzgerald follows the "party line" so closely that he is often considered a Communist Party member, which he isn't.

The action in his home local shows that Fitzgerald is not letting the Stalinists make any progress there. Fitzgerald knows that he must have solid roots or else he will be a complete captive of the Stalinists. Not that Fitzgerald has shown any opposition to the Stalinists, with the exception of one single weak phrase uttered in a speech at the CIO convention, but he sees the way the winds are blowing—and they are not in the direction of the Stalinists.

"The fate of" James Carey, Fitzgerald's predecessor as national president, is well known to Fitzgerald. Carey followed the Stalinist line for some years. When he decided to fight the Stalinists he found that they had moved in on him everywhere. Carey had no real solid base and he was thrown out as president.

GUARDS HOME BASE

It was at that time that Fitzgerald was elected. The Stalinists had a great deal of strength at the convention but they needed some more, and they also had to keep the union from splitting. So they approached the General Electric locals to choose a man. The GE locals controlled a large section of the membership but they had always complained that they were not fully represented on the top leadership level.

The GE locals were inclined to choose Al Coulthard, then business agent of 201. Coulthard, a principled but conservative trade unionist, declined the offer and suggested Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald was president of Local 201 that year. He had been elected on a fluke of fate. Local 201 takes in the West Lynn Works and the River Works, GE plants in Lynn. The president is chosen alternately from each plant each election. In other words, the president's post is not an important one. Fitzgerald had been active in social affairs and when it came time to choose a local president, he was selected. At the national UE convention, Coulthard's prestige among GE delegates won the national presidency for Fitzgerald.

Fitzgerald has kept close to Local 201 since that time and very few actions are carried on without his sanction.

Kelly's action obviously had Fitzgerald's consent. Kelly tried to get rid of the educational committee quietly so that the newspapers would not play it up and embarrass Fitzgerald, as charges against members

These Pamphlets Are Now Available

- By LEON TROTSKY
The Lesson of Spain, the Last Warning! 20c
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay 25c
The Russian Revolution 10c
Whither France (chapter I) 10c
The Communist Manifesto Today 10c
What is an Insurrection? 15c

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.
Name
Address
City
Zone State

1947 BOUND VOLUMES OF LABOR ACTION \$3.00

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

First Step
Unemployment among railroad workers passed the 100,000 mark last week, reports from railway sources showed yesterday. This is around 10 per cent of the total working force. —AP, February 13, 1949.

PEON, TOO, BELONGS TO THE LANDLORD

From a summary report on peonage in Latin American countries submitted to the commission of inquiry into forced labor, reported in last week's issue, by Albert K. Herling, quoting from a description supplied by the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America:

"Under the traditional Bolivian hacienda system, upon the eastern shores of Lake Titicaca, the huasipunguero is paid no cash wage whatever. He is given from one to three acres of land and grazing rights for his sheep, and in return he works on an average of four days a week for his master. The peonage custom is generally in force whereby the patron may requisition, without payment, a measure of the peon's grain, chickens, a goat or sheep for use on his own table. He may also call out a boy or a girl from the peon's family for service in the 'big house' or for work in his city residence,—again without payment of cash wages. The peon families are rotated, taking turn and turn about in providing this impressed service. The patron also takes all the manure from his peon's stock as fertilizer for his own fields. The peon cannot leave his patron's employ without his permission. He is usually in debt to his employer and is also held to his environment by traditional bonds and a fatalistic inertia. The landlord considers that everything which lives off his land or is raised upon it is his."

Cardinal Leads Scab Crew--

(Continued from page 1)
Spellman not to work too hard, must be suffering from blistered hands and aching backs.

Repercussions from Cardinal Spellman's union-busting tactics may have widespread effects in those sections of the trade union movement where the ACTU is a force. ACTU members may find themselves in the unenviable position of the Stalinists, with the actions of their leaders making a lie of their protestations within the union movement.

The Stalinists, as every one knows, pretend to support union and civil liberties here while in Russia the unions are puppets and slave labor is a commonplace. ACTU members now find themselves urging collective bargaining while their church leader refuses to negotiate with church employees.

Actually, Spellman represents the dominant side of organized Catholicism. The obscure priest who works with workers and encourages them to use unions to advance their interests is an insignificant factor in the overall scheme of the Catholic Church whose world interests have nothing in common with the aspirations of the working masses.

The rise of Spellman to the pin-

nacle of the American section of the Roman Catholic Church is a truer criterion of the policies and workings of the organization than the activities, however laudable, of a priest in a working class neighborhood who sees that his flock must be fed and helps them, through union channels, to obtain better conditions and wages.

When Spellman received his red hat at Vatican a few years ago his history was reviewed in great detail by the American press. One could only gain the impression that a typical American businessman, a shrewd promoter, a good administrator and an excellent fund-raiser, had been rewarded with one of the highest honors of the Catholic Church.

In a sense, the appointment represented an accolade to the United States and recognition of its dominance in world affairs. Where once

the higher ranks of the Catholic hierarchy were filled with men skilled in world diplomacy and the intrigues of states, now a "real American," a go-getter Yankee from New England, was lifted up among the mighty.

For such a man to descend to the brutal level of strike-breaking is completely understandable. His property sense, his instinctive disregard of a worker's right to strike, stems from the same philosophy of a Tom Girdler who could cold-bloodedly order the shooting of striking steel workers in defense of management's right to run its own factories.

What the Catholic worker should understand is that the Spellmans of this world run the Catholic Church, not Father Murphy around the corner who came out on the picket line in the packing house strike and turned his parish house into a community kitchen for the pickets.

One Third of Negro City Dwellers Earned Less Than \$35 a Week

A survey conducted by the Federal Housing Administration shows that in 1946, when annual wages were at a high point, more than 35 per cent of Negro city families had less than \$35 a week income. In making this survey, the FHA had only one thing in mind. It wanted to convince private builders that some Negroes made enough money to be "good risks."

In this survey report, the FHA showed the low incomes and the upper level incomes, and in this way give us a good set of figures to judge the living standard of Negroes living in cities.

The survey shows that about half of the Negro city families in 1946 had incomes in the \$1800 a year class. This was the year that about half of the white city families had incomes of around \$3100. The survey also shows that less than 16 per cent of the Negro city families had incomes of \$3,000 or more a year. This means that 35 per cent of the Negro city families had less than \$1800 a year incomes.

The FHA would like to see private

builders build more apartments and homes for Negroes. They know that the scandalous housing problem is even more serious for Negroes than it is for others. They know that this will increase the pressure for federal housing unless private builders start right in with thousands of projects.

But the private builders are not interested. They collect huge rents from their present slum properties. If they build, their slums will be worthless; so why should they build? In addition, the builders are wise enough to know that the 1946 figures were used because there was virtually no unemployment then.

Now there is unemployment and, as in the past, the Negroes were the first to lose their jobs, especially in the industries where there is no unionization. So if in 1946 35 per cent of the Negro city families earned less than \$35 a week, we can rest assured that a much larger percentage is now in that classification, reminding us all that this is just the beginning of "normal" times for Negroes and whites alike.

Kutcher --

(Continued from page 1)
ceeds from the doctrines of 'guilt by association' and 'subversion,' arbitrarily defined.

BEYOND SECT OR PARTY

The letter links the case of Dr. Edward Condon with that of James Kutcher, "a legless veteran of World War II who has decided to stand up and make a fight," as outstanding instances of this type of arbitrary treatment.

"James Kutcher was fired from his job in the Veterans Administration because of membership in the Socialist Workers Party, a fact he openly acknowledges. Kutcher challenges the administration's right to deprive him of his job without a public hearing for himself and his party, and demands the right to defend himself against the administrative 'star chamber' proceedings which have condemned him without trial."

The signers of the letter state that the Kutcher case "goes beyond sect or party" and "involves every type of man and group concerned with civil liberties and freedom of conscience." An accompanying statement to be signed by faculty members protests the denial of genuine freedom of association and freedom of thought in Kutcher's case and urges that Kutcher be given the public hearings he has asked. It also supports the efforts of the National Kutcher Civil Rights Committee to win justice for the victimized veteran.

You Write As We Please—Or Else

The Vatican today announced that it had reorganized its press service that had been inaugurated in 1937 and that functioned on a much reduced state during and since the war. Together with the announcement the Papal Secretariat of State issued a booklet containing the rules that newspaper men must follow in covering Vatican news. The first article of the rules said that cards would be issued provided newspaper editors-in-chief would "guarantee that both their representatives and publication will maintain an entirely correct attitude in regard to the Holy See and the Catholic Church." . . . N. Y. Times, February 6, 1949.

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.

RENEW NOW

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK — IN — THE SOCIALIST LEADER Britain's Foremost Weekly Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars Shorter Periods Pro Rata Order from: SOCIALIST LEADER 318 Regents Park Road Finchley, London, N. 3, England

WORKERS PARTY BULLETIN Three more issues of the Workers Party Bulletin are now out, containing documents and discussion articles in preparation for the coming national convention of the party. These are: No. 8: Amendments to International Resolution, by L. Shields; Mass Work, by W. Barton; Discussion by Jim Sifakis; Organize the Unemployed, by Robert Frost; Imperialist Struggle for World Domination, by E. R. McKinney. No. 9: On the Resolution for Independent Western Union — Questions by SYL and Reply by Political Committee; Socialist Propaganda Group and the Negroes, by Larry O'Connor; Draft Resolution on the Negro Question, by the PC. No. 10: Let's Make a Fetish of Unity, by Al Findley; The Situation in the U. S. and Our Next Tasks, by R. Magnus, Scott Byer, M. Rand; Notes for Pre-Convention Discussion, by E. R. McKinney; A Proposal for a Change in Our Press, by Hal Draper; Trade Union Resolution, by the PC; Resolution on the Trade Union Question, by E. R. McKinney. As announced in LABOR ACTION before, the first five of these convention discussion bulletins are also available. Bulletins are fifteen cents each, or you can subscribe to all (beginning with No. 1) at \$1.50 for ten issues. Order directly from Workers Party, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

YOUTH and Student CORNER

By JULIUS FALK, National Secretary SYL

Autopsy Report

Do you remember what happened when anyone called the former American Youth for Democracy (AYD) a Communist Party front organization? All the abuse in the Stalinist slander lexicon was heaped on whoever dared suggest this. The most righteous indignation coming from the members of the Communist Party inside—and on top of—AYD.

If in 1945 you merely suspected that this organization's support of military conscription was motivated by Russian foreign policy, you were obviously a "red-baiter" and a "reactionary." If a year later you hinted that AYD was now against conscription because Russia's foreign policy had changed, you were sure of being branded a "war-monger."

Last month, in this column, we described the dissolution of this self-styled "broad youth organization." At that time we did not have a copy of the referendum posing the question of dissolution before its membership (though this was decided long before any member voted on it). Now we have a copy. In the February 18 issue of the Daily Worker the referendum's text is given in full. Here are some excerpts:

"To endorse the objective of helping to found a Marxist youth organization: to dissolve national organizations of AYD. . . ."

"They are cooperating loyally with youth and student clubs of the Communist Party and with a number of individual college and community Marxist societies. They are prepared to contribute effectively in the coming few months towards the building of a new national organization that will lead young people in the spirit and devotion to the working class, and democratic heritage of our country and goal of socialism."

Now that the AYD is no more, nationally, and is very little more than the CP members on campus locally, the mask is abruptly and unconsciously torn off. The Stalinists evidently figured that with their "broad youth organization" flat on its back, they might as well get as much direct help as possible for the Communist Party from the few feebly thrashing local limbs of AYD. Thus, all pretense had to be done away with and local clubs are to help "found a Marxist youth organization," and cooperate locally with "youth and student clubs of the Communist Party." If you look up the resolution on the youth question passed by the Communist Party at its last national convention, you will find that its new perspective is to "found a Marxist youth organization!"

In some ways it is difficult to understand why the Stalinists should openly reveal their control of a front organization, even if that revelation comes through a post-mortem, for the story of Stalinist control of the AYD will surely reach the ears of those who have been sucked into other fronts. We will do our bit on this score. It seems doubly foolish from the CP point of view considering the fact that AYD was one of the most controversial of its offsprings, with charges and denials of CP control running through the American press since AYD's inception in 1943. Perhaps the only explanation is a cynical and bureaucratic indifference towards its past denials of sponsoring the AYD and dictating its policy now that it is defunct and of no use; and an equally cynical conviction that no matter what they do, they will be able to

keep on convincing "innocents" that to call a Stalinist stodge organization by its real name is "red-baiting," "reactionary" and "war-mongering."

Letter from Berkeley

Dear Comrades,

A highly important precedent has been set by the recent trial and dismissal of three faculty members of the University of Washington. The Regents did not question in any way the academic competency or objectivity of these three professors, but made it very clear that they were only charged with being members of the Communist Party. These three men were first given a fair and objective trial by the Faculty Tenure Committee, where they testified to being members of the Communist Party. After a thorough examination of their records the Committee gave these men a clean academic slate, and recommended dismissal of the charges, but the Regents cynically ignored this recommendation and dismissed the professors instead.

A movement for reinstatement has grown up in two or three of the West Coast Universities, reaching a high point at the University of California where Professor Phillips spoke to a crowd of 3,000 students at an off-campus meeting at the school's West Gate. The Student Committee for Academic Freedom, composed of various student groups, sponsored the speech and collected about 2,000 signatures protesting the action as "a severe violation of democratic principles," and urging "the immediate reinstatement . . . with full tenure . . . of Profs. Butterworth, Grundlach and Phillips."

As most American students respond very favorably toward campaigns for academic freedom, it was unfortunate, but not accidental, that the student committee, which was run and controlled by the Communists and Young Progressives, allowed the fight for academic freedom to become confused with the reactionary politics of the Communist Party. It is common knowledge that there is absolutely no freedom of discussion or criticism in the educational system of Stalinist Russia. The Communists support the regime which imposes this educational despotism and wish to copy it all over the world. They also justify such actions as shooting down striking students in the streets of Prague for protesting the recent coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia.

In order to prevent the complete disillusionment of the average student, it is incumbent on any group which fights for the rights of Stalinists to teach in American universities, to point to the iron barracks discipline in Russian and Eastern European universities, and to condemn it in uncompromising terms. The Stalinists are for academic freedom for themselves alone, and any confusion about this will harm the general fight for the reinstatement of these men and all other cases of the infringement of academic freedom.

Fraternally, BOB M.

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

GET YOUR COPY OF THE NEW PAMPHLET JUST PUBLISHED BY THE WORKERS PARTY— NEXT—A LABOR PARTY! by Jack Ranger A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party 25 Cents for Single Copies 20 Cents ea., bundles of 10-50 18 Cents ea., bundles over 50 Order from: Workers Party 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

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 (24 issues) at 50 cents One year (52 issues) at \$1.00 NAME (PLEASE PRINT) CITY ZONE STATE ADDRESS APT Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

Editorials

Lessons, Issues In GM Contract

Much is being made, in the UAW, of the two-cent wage cut for General Motors workers under the provisions of the escalator clause in the union's contract with that company. The Stalinists are trying to make the most of the issue in their unceasing battle with the leadership of the union. There are other elements too, allied with the Stalinists or not, who are whooping it up over the "disaster" visited on GM workers by the Reuther administration. The administration, of course, has countered with a campaign to explain graphically the actual workings of the contract, the benefits (among them the previous two-cent rise), the circumstances attending the signing of the contract, and so forth.

The agitation of the Stalinists has, as usual, little to do with the realities of the situation or the welfare of the workers. Their "militant" attack on the administration on this score is actually shot through with the basest reactionary considerations, and merely serves their own union-busting purposes. It happens that the experience of the union with the escalator (or sliding scale) clause is a subject of immense interest, and the Stalinist demagogues direct attention away from the real and many lessons that are to be learned.

There are indeed serious weaknesses in the GM contract, and labor should study them closely with the view of improving upon this contract in future engagements with the titans of industry. It is possible to be a critic of the union's administration, an enemy of the Stalinists and a defender and criticizer of the GM contract all at the same time.

It is impossible to make any sense whatsoever in discussing the GM contract and its escalator clause without first relating it to the general situation in the labor movement at the time the contract was signed. It was not a victory in that it satisfied the legitimate demands of the GM workers, not by a long shot. But it was a victory, and a tremendous one for ALL of labor, in that it halted the retreat of the labor movement. The many defeats which were piled on labor one after the other at the time the UAW cracked GM are too numerous to cite. It will be recalled that the packinghouse workers, for example, suffered a terrible beating in a strike which saw outrageous police violence being used against strikers. It will be recalled the Stalinist UE leadership stabbed the GM workers in the back by signing a poor contract. It will be recalled that Ford had announced its intention to exact a WAGE CUT. It will be recalled that there was a general employer front of solidarity emboldened by what they viewed as the weakness of the labor movement, the siphoning of the labor leadership in hesitating to unleash a real struggle—against granting any wage increases whatsoever. They, the bosses, were flushed with Taft-Hartley victory. The auto workers union, through the GM contract, broke that employer front, and won a wage increase, the escalator clause, and other concessions. Had their gains been much less, the contract at that time would still have been a notable victory, immediately thereafter the whole national picture changed. Steel, which had been adamant against a wage increase, yielded—and so on down the line.

Moreover, the escalator clause, inadequate as it was, was an important advance in labor thinking. It won an admission from an important segment of industry that the prices of commodities were a legitimate union concern since they had the closest bearing on real wages. Specifically, the contract provided for a quarterly review of the price index, and the adjustment of wage scales accordingly, with a 5-cent floor beneath which the wage escalator could not descend.

Even as is, the escalator clause was a significant achievement in principle and in practice, given the situation. However, we cited the outstanding weakness of the clause as written at the time, and it is now apparent. It should now be assessed for its educational and practical value. The escalator clause provides for wage movement upward and downward. That is why we have held that labor should fight for a RISING SCALE OF WAGES, not merely to compensate for losses suffered through price cuts but to raise the standard of living of labor.

Tying an escalator rise solely to prices assumes that the only direction of an improved real wage standard is through a problematical heavy dip in prices. (The union, just as we and most everybody else, assumed a continued swing upward in the price spiral at the time the contract was signed.) Also, it fails to relate wages to something at least as vital in the over-all picture as prices, and actually more so, namely PROFITS. The Reuther leadership had shown some understanding of this point when, in 1946, they raised the demands for WAGE RAISES WITHOUT PRICE INCREASES and OPEN THE BOOKS. Both these have to be intimately related to the problem of an escalator clause. These demands laid the responsibility for price increases at the door of the profiteers, and established a connection between wages and profits, through an invasion of the "rights" of private enterprise. ("Let's see what the books show on what you can pay in wages, and what you must charge in prices, in terms of your profits").

It might be said that to the extent that Reuther retreated from these demands, which marked a high point in American labor's social thinking, was it impossible to get a better escalator clause than the one written into the contract. For it seems that an escalator clause, framed in the understanding of these demands, clearly spells a RISING SCALE OF WAGES. (It is not too relevant to the immediate point we are discussing, but some note has to be made that, if the escalator

clause in the GM contract was the best that could be gotten, it was partly because that was the best the labor leadership could produce. Though the UAW leadership is ahead of the rest of the labor leadership, by and large, it is nevertheless streaked with the fundamental limitations of that leadership, and cannot escape some responsibility for the total complex. Even in introducing the dramatic slogans of the 1946 strike, the Reuther leadership showed itself incapable or unwilling to understand the full implications of their slogans. (We say this not to pick a quarrel, nor to introduce issues which are more sweeping in their implications than the one we are discussing, but only to round out the facts.)

As an illustration of what we mean, let us quote from a speech made recently by Walter Reuther:

"General Motors made more profits in 1947 than any state in the union had total income—except New York and California. . . . At the present rate of profits, GM can pay for their whole works in a little more than three years—and still have their plants."

That tells us much more of the necessary story than a piddling drop in prices. And again it seems to us to spell out an irrefutable argument for a RISING SCALE (OR ESCALATOR) contract.

Other weaknesses too can be noted in the contract, certainly as viewed in the perspective of a year's experience. The contract was signed for two years. Commenting then we said that this might rise to plague the GM workers, and so it has. It may have been necessary to sign a two-year contract at the time, and there are plausible arguments that it was the best thing to do in the situation. Nevertheless, assessing the matter educationally, and with our eyes on subsequent contracts, it can be seen that the two year agreement has not worked out well, for it prevents the GM workers from taking adequate measures to improve their wage standards today.

Many other matters could be introduced into the discussion—a guaranteed annual wage, etc.—but they take us too far afield. We come instead briefly to the question: could more have been won last year? Very likely not, given the craven attitude of the top CIO and AFL leadership which sought to counter the effects of Taft-Hartley and an employer offensive by begging for mercy. Why then discuss all this? Because, it is necessary to explore the lessons of the GM contract in order that we may avoid mistakes and emphasize gains. It may have been impossible to do better then, but it is not impossible to do better in the future—if we do not fear to employ the fighting strength of American labor.

It is impossible to leave this subject without at least a footnote on the price cut in cars announced by GM simultaneously with the announced wage cut. A correspondent from Cleveland noted in last week's LA that auto workers at least understand this to be the purest kind of fakery. The cuts are trifling and do not come close to approximating the possibility of cutting prices when viewed in the light of GM's fabulous (and they are fabulous) profits. Why did GM do this? It is obviously a "lever" publicity stunt, partly to promote sales, but even more to imply that somehow the wages of workers are responsible for high prices—wages, and we can cut prices. Whatever else is done in this situation, that particular fraud ought to be exposed down to its bare bones. Few auto workers will be taken in by it. We hope that few others will be so stupid as to fall for the humbug.

Pattern, Endlessly Repeated

From a summary of the testimony presented to the hearings on slave labor, reported in last week's LABOR ACTION, by Edwin C. Mitchell, representative of the National Farm Labor Union, AFL:

"My first intimate contact with forced labor was at the age of twelve. I went to move a family from one plantation to another where it had agreed to work. After the family's few possessions had been loaded upon the truck and we had started down the public highway, we were stopped by gunshot fire. The family fled into the woods and I was forced to return its belongings to the shack. I have personal knowledge of this pattern being endlessly repeated. . . .

"Another fruitful source of forced labor in the South, west of the Mississippi, and in the Southwest is Mexican farm labor. Our government officially sponsors such labor by entering into an agreement with Mexico for the recruitment of seasonal farm labor which is then forced to work under contract conditions which deprives it of its basic rights as free workers. It further sponsors such forced labor through the Immigration Service's practice of paroling illegal entrants to individual farmers."

1947
BOUND VOLUME
The New International
\$4.00 each

Almost three hundred pages of important Marxist analysis, stoutly bound in red cloth, title and year stamped in gold.

Limited quantity at this price—

First Come—First Served

Order from:
WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Witnesses Testify on Stalin Crimes In Sensational Kravchenko Suit - -

(Continued from page 1)

leader of the German Communist Party prior to 1933, and a former member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Neumann and his wife had sought refuge in Russia after the coming to power of Hitler.

Even prior to 1933 Neumann opposed the official Comintern policy of regarding the Hitler movement as a lesser evil and the German Social Democracy as the main enemy. In a conversation that Neumann had with Stalin, the latter expressed the opinion that with the coming to power of the Hitler regime in Germany it would thereby assure Russia of peaceful relations with a friendly Germany, whose interests conflicted with those of the imperialists of Western Europe. (This seems to agree with the analysis of Stalinist policy in Germany furnished by Ruth Fischer, former leader of the German CP, in her book, "Stalin and German Communism.") Neumann vigorously rejected Stalin's thesis and urged that the Comintern change its policy in order that a full struggle against Nazism take place before it was too late.

During the period of the Moscow Trials, Neumann was arrested by the GPU and disappeared, no word of his fate has ever been learned. The wife of Neumann was arrested as a "counter-revolutionary" in 1937 and sentenced to a seven-year sentence at forced labor. She was sent to the slave camps in the Karaganda region, which she described as a forced labor camp covering a region greater than all of Denmark.

In 1941 Gertrude Neumann was suddenly transferred from Karaganda and brought to Moscow, where she was informed that she was to be sent to an unidentified destination. Together with 25 other Austrian, German and Hungarian Communist leaders (including several of Jewish origin) she arrived at Brest-Litovsk, from whence they were escorted to the German border of Poland and turned over to the Gestapo. Gertrude Neumann was immediately placed in the infamous German concentration camp of Ravensbruck, where she remained imprisoned until the arrival of the Red Army in 1945. Upon the arrival of the Russians she managed to escape to the Anglo-Saxon occupied zone.

The Stalinist answer to testimony of Mme Neumann reached a new low in sheer filth when Joe Nordmann, Stalinist defending attorney, sneeringly replied: "How can anyone believe the statements of a GERMAN?" "L'HUMANITE" official organ of the French CP, glibly stated that Gertrude Neumann was a Gestapo agent and was transferred to Germany at her own request (as was the case with the others). She was placed in Ravensbruck by the Gestapo to spy on the anti-Nazi inmates. Tell a big lie. . . .

Propaganda Battle

It is indeed curious to observe the tremendous publicity given to Kravchenko's book and to this trial. Despite the fact that for the first time the public has been offered the revelations of a Russian functionary who was part of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The "revelations" that Kravchenko makes available to us on the iniquities of Stalinist society had been previously described and analyzed with infinitely more intelligence and force by men who have participated in leading capacities, in the formation and development of the Russian Revolution and the heroic years of its infancy.

Who has combatted with greater force than a Trotsky or a Victor Serge the rise of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the institution of the slave camps, the police regime and the elimination of democratic forms, the new forms of exploitation of the working class? The audience of their writings was limited to an international elite composed of anti-Stalinist militants whose sharpened awareness of the degeneration of the Russian state did not oblige them to forget the rottenness of decadent capitalist society.

Kravchenko has deliberately decided, in rejecting one of these regimes, to accept the other wholeheartedly. And this is why he has merited such a large measure of publicity. This is why the Kravchenko-Lettres Francaises trial became transformed into a propaganda battle which seeks its outline in the larger frame of world conflict.

Despite all this, this kind of large

publicity trial does not possess a purely negative character. Hitherto the power of the Stalinist machine in France has been powerful enough to suppress any significant publicity exposing the true character of the Russian regime in the French labor movement.

In spite of the form and auspices from which the truth on Stalinist Russia is presently being made available to the French people, it can serve to destroy, at least in part, the Stalinist myth of the Russian paradise that has been implanted in the minds of thousands of French workers. The creation of a doubt among those who persist on the Stalinist myth can be sufficient to undermine the illusory foundations of the Stalinist mentality. It is therefore the obligation of organizations of the independent left to use this wedge to the greater benefit of the ideas and principles of a renewed French revolutionary democracy.

Forum on "Asia in Revolt" Marked by Lively Discussion

NEW YORK—The third forum in the current Labor Action Forum series was held last Sunday evening on "Asia in Revolt" before an audience of 50 people. The forum departed from the usual lecture form to present a symposium on different aspects of post-war changes in the Far East, followed by a round-table discussion on several key problems posed by the chairman-moderator, Stanley Grey.

Jack Brad, the first speaker, outlined the general course of events and their background. He pointed to the decline in power of Western imperialism, the rise of independent national states and the rise of Stalinism in Asia as the chief post-war trends. The end of the "Pax Britannicus" is the main factor. Independence for India, Ceylon and Burma is the consequence of it and establishes new relationships in world power. It has created a vacuum which both Stalinism and the new national capitalist classes are trying to fill.

Abc Kimbry, speaking on new economic trends, pointed to the overriding considerations of war economy and the strait-jacketing effect of the world inter-imperialist struggle between Russia and the United States. These factors have caused a disillusionment with nationalism even at the moment of its realization. Nationalism thus reveals its bankruptcy and its inability to cope with the most fundamental "problems" such as the backward agrarian economy, semi-feudal relationships, communal differences and the creation of a modern industry free of imperialism.

Henry Judd analyzed the decline of the Marxist and revolutionary socialist movements in this colonial area. He claimed that the Trotskyist movement, once an important feature in the politics of the area, has suffered from an extremely narrow programmatic outlook and has failed to follow correctly the great events of the past few years. He pointed to the rise of an Asiatic social-democracy in such countries as India, Indonesia and Burma as one of the major phenomena and as one of the main new points to be considered in any revolutionary socialist approach to Asia.

During the round-table discussion period there was considerable disagreement expressed among speakers on questions such as the attitude

and the future of these new social-democratic movements and also on the validity of Trotsky's theory of the Permanent Revolution as applied to colonial countries.

While no attempt was made to give final answers to the many questions discussed, the meeting concluded with a statement of program by Judd to which the other speakers subscribed. Judd stated that the chief question for socialists in Asia was, as in Europe, the re-establishment of a dynamic Marxist movement, and that the new social-democracies offered the only arena for such fruitful construction at this time.

The main programmatic point was given as the slogan raised in LABOR ACTION several weeks ago: For An Independent Union of Southeast Asia.

The next forum in the series will be held next Sunday, March 20. The speaker will be Harold Brown, music critic of Partisan Review, on "The Meaning of Criticism in Music."

Forced Labor in Mental Hospitals

From a recent statement presented on behalf of J. J. Tahoney, member of the Maryland Commission on Prison Labor, to the Commission of Inquiry Into Slave Labor.

"A group of independent psychiatrists are presenting to it [Maryland Commission] a report on what is euphemistically called 'Repressive Psychiatric Therapy,' a variation of 'Occupational Therapy.'

"Both of these terms mean, in blunter language, 'working your way out!' A patient is expected to prove his sanity by performing valuable work for the hospital. If he becomes really diligent and efficient in performing his assigned task, he often finds that his release is indefinitely deferred."

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

New Yorkers!

You'll Meet Your Old Friends

From All Parts of the
Country
And Make New Ones

at the

DANCE

Organized by
Local New York of the
Workers Party

Sat. Eve., March 26

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14th Street

Rent Control:

CONGRESSMEN MAIL LANDLORD ATTACK

The following article is reprinted from the February 28 issue of the CIO's Union News Service.

By FLORIA CAPLAN

Within a day or two the U. S. mails will be flooded with an estimated three million pieces of propaganda against rent control, public housing and federal aid to education—all mailed at taxpayer expense under the franking privileges of two Republican Congressmen.

This little behind-the-scenes play involves Reps. Ralph W. Gwinn of the wealthy Westchester County in New York and Noah Mason of Illinois, both bitter foes of rent control.

In addition, the cast of characters includes Frank Gannett's notorious Committee for Constitutional Government, the Natl. Apartment House Owners Association and a certain Percy L. Greaves, Jr., who operates what he calls "a research organization for rightist groups."

At the end of the last week, only casual passer-by who might have entered the Old House Office Building in Washington then the rear, would have happened on two block-long corridors completely clogged with stacks of literature waiting to be folded and mailed out under Congressional frank.

"JACKETS" TELL ALL

A glance at the "jackets" identifying the material divulged this information:

At least four—and possibly seven—speeches by Rep. Gwinn were reprinted by the Government Printing Office in lots of 450,000 each.

A subsequent check with Rep. Gwinn was made by the New York Post-Home News correspondent Oliver Pilat, who learned that the printing was being financed by the Committee for Constitutional Government and by the Apartment House Owners Association.

Although the printing order was issued by Gwinn, part of the batch is going out under Rep. Mason's frank, some of the mail sacks indicated. These were being sent to the Frank Gannett committee in bulk, from which they could be mailed without a cent of cost to the sponsors.

The campaign is being neatly timed to do a hatchet job on rent control and public housing just as these issues are approaching the floor of both houses. Asked by Pilat, why he was "helped" by real-estate-minded groups, Gwinn replied "I've worked at it harder than any other congressman, I guess" . . .

During his interview with the congressman, he asked a question for which Gwinn called on Greaves to fetch a special folder containing his views.

Greaves is described by Gwinn as a research assistant to both himself and Rep. Phillips of California. In the past Greaves has "researched" for the Republican National Committee, during which tenure he posed as a secretary to Rep. Taber (R., N. Y.), according to Pilat.

(Later he joined the staff of Rep. Fred Hartley while the T-H bill was in preparation.)
One of Greaves' recent interests has been the Displaced Persons bill, which he fought vehemently in a pamphlet called "Operation Immigration." Many of its arguments have been attacked as anti-anti-Semite. Numbered among Greaves' friends are such characters as Merwin K. Hart, noted for his anti-Semitic, pro-fascist crusades.)

REVEALING LETTER

All of which ties in neatly with a bit of information that fell out of the folder handed to Pilat. It was a letter from Dr. E. A. Rumely of the Committee for Constitutional Government to the Apartment House Owners Association. In it Rumely suggested that an additional \$1000 from the Apartment House Owners would permit the printing of Rep. Gwinn's rent control speech along with the one on public housing.

Rumely is another person who bears description. John Roy Carlson, in his book "The Plotters" says Rumely, who is secretary of the CCG, "was convicted and had served 30 days in jail in 1920-21 for his failure to report to the Alien Property Custodian funds he obtained with German interests serving the Kaiser's cause. With the funds Rumely bought the New York Evening Mail and used it as an instrument for German propaganda."

Carlson describes CCG as ". . . the powerful super-conservative New York group . . . founded by Frank Gannett, wealthy newspaper publisher."

The piece Gwinn had printed on rent control betrays another bond between the congressman and the CCG. On July 26, 1948, Gwinn had inserted in the Congressional Record an article attacking rent control written by John W. Scoville.

Scoville, formerly an economist for Chrysler Corp. and credited with a good part of the T-H Act, is now with the Gannett committee. Four hundred and fifty thousand copies of this article are now going out under congressional frank.

One sentence from the article is sufficient to indicate the attitude of Scoville—and of Gwinn—toward rent control: "This control of rents by the Federal Government is a tyrannical usurpation of power."

Gwinn, who testified before the House Banking and Currency committee last week, developed the same economic theory that Scoville uses in his article: There is no housing shortage. It just looks like a housing shortage, because the government forces rents down so low, single people take advantage of the situation and move into apartments by themselves, instead of doubling up with their in-laws. Remove controls, say both, and families faced with higher rents, will double up or move into more cramped quarters, and then the problem will have been "solved!"

That's the stuff Gwinn gave the 26 members of the committee; and that's the stuff Gwinn (who, incidentally, recently told a CIO laundry worker testifying for a 75 cent minimum wage, to take in washing if she couldn't make a living in the laundry) is clogging up the mails with—at taxpayers' expense.

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

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 W. 14th St., New York City 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: BRonxides 6-5117
Vol. 13, No. 11 March 14, 1949
Emanuel Garrett Geltman,
Editor
Editorial Board: Jack Brad, Hal Draper, Henry Judd, Business Manager: Joseph Roan
Subscription Rates: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

Blueprint for Next War

A complete blueprint for mobilization is being developed by the government, according to government spokesmen who revealed the details at the recent national conference of the Society for the Advancement of Management held in Chicago on January 20.

Edward V. Hickey, of the government's National Security Resources Board, told the conference of the amazing speed with which his Board is arranging for the quick expansion and conversion of industry that will be demanded for the next war. His Board will not even leave the small factories out of war production. The small places are being checked to see how they would be used. Regional offices are to be established, and complete mobilization plans are being drawn up for each individual industry.

Mr. Hickey was not talking about the distant future. He let his audience know that these things are being done now. So there would be no doubt, he cited as an example, the machine tool industry. In this industry, the Board made a detailed survey of its capacity and what the government would need. The Board felt that the government should not wait for war to come any closer before it placed its order. Therefore pooled orders for \$750,000,000 worth of tools have been drawn up and will be confirmed whenever a government agency says it needs a stockpile. Mr. Hickey added that similar detailed work is being done in other industries.

General Donald Armstrong also was a speaker at this conference. The General is one of the official consultants of the Resources Board. The General also happens to be president of the United States Pipe and Foundry Company.

WHAT'S IN STORE FOR LABOR

The speakers brought out that legislation is being prepared covering labor, deferments—also programs to "maintain economic stability," etc., etc. In other words, complete plans for mobilization.

It is interesting that these Boards are going ahead with their war preparations including restrictive labor acts, wage freezing and other similar codes without even the pretense of labor representatives on their committees. Militarists and big business representatives are making all the decisions.

We are against labor representatives on these Boards, but the fact that the government has excluded them is indicative of what is in store for labor in these plans. You can be sure that compulsory labor legislation, rigid wage freezing, no strike provisions, and other anti-labor measures are part of the program.

Capitalism is preparing for its third world war. A war that will make the last one look like a picnic. And in preparing for this most horrible of wars, capitalism is preparing for a reactionary regime the likes of which has never been seen in this country.

Those who are not killed in World War III will have World War IV to face shortly after. What a system.

Evaluating the Arguments of Prof. Sidney Hook

Permit Stalinists to Teach? - -

(Continued from page 1)

Phillips. But President Allen claimed that a majority of the committee favored firing CP members "in principle." Both interpretations may be right, but the fact remains that the Board of Regents rejected the SPE-CIFIC advice of the Faculty Committee. Furthermore, he noted that the majority of the Faculty Committee declared Butterworth and Phillips academically competent.

The Socio-Political Context of Case

These are the facts; now, the issues. Articles have been written by Professor John Childs and Professor Sidney Hook, the former a Liberal and the latter a Social Democrat, approving the firing of the CP people. Their argument can be summarized briefly: The CP is not a political party in the usual sense of the word; it is a conspiratorial organization loyal to a foreign power and equivalent to a spy society; it exerts the kind of unquestioning intellectual discipline—from art to zoology, says Hook—which makes it impossible for them to be honest teachers. What is not involved, they say, as President Allen of the U. of Washington has said, is the right of teachers to hold Marxist views. Only party membership counts.

Now there is a good deal of truth in SOME of these remarks. But the totality is a dangerous argument.

The CP is a conspiratorial organization of the kind Hook says it is; it is an agent of a foreign power. But it must also be remembered that it is being attacked on the grounds, inaccurate though they are, that it is

a "RADICAL" organization. And it must be remembered that the fired professors are being charged with belonging to a "radical" organization, and that the charges against them are the consequences of a long session of legislative committee "investigating"—with all the reactionary, anti-civil liberties implications of that fact. And it is more than curious that Hook in his article does not mention this fact; he writes as if Butterworth and Phillips were fired simply as a result of a calm, reasoned discussion of the faculty, even though exactly the contrary is the truth.

Now it takes no special brilliance to realize that there is today a general attack on civil liberties in the making; that the reactionary forces which are attacking the Stalinists are quite ready to attack, as well, anti-Stalinists. Hook himself is a little worried about this. He writes: "If removal of Communist Party members were to be used as a pretext by other reactionary elements to hurl irresponsible charges against professors whose views they disapprove, a case might be made for suspending action." That "if" is beautiful. Doesn't Hook know about the Olivet case, the case of the Oregon professor fired, not for being a member of the CP, but for believing in Lyserenko's genetics. And above all, doesn't he know that the action of the U. of Washington is the DIRECT consequence of the snooping of the state legislative committee? That should show that there are reactionary elements involved.

For us, this is the first consideration, the prime consideration: in what social and political context, in what climate of intellectual opinion, is the firing taking place? I would say that the indisputable fact is that the firings are taking place in an atmosphere of general repression of intellectual freedom—a repression that is not yet extreme, that has only begun but is nonetheless, and from that central point of view, it is necessary to oppose the firing of Butterworth and Phillips.

Can Stalinists Present "Truth"?

But let us look at a few of the general arguments on the question of Stalinist teachers. We are told they cannot present the truth, because they belong to a disciplined organization. But that raises some interesting questions. It would be false to equate the Catholic Church with the Stalinist movement, but the church is as INTELLECTUALLY, if not organizationally, disciplined as the CP. Suppose a Catholic teacher is discussing birth control? Can he—tell us, Professor Hook—tell "the truth"? Suppose a Catholic teacher is discussing the role of the Vatican in a history class? Can he tell the truth? And suppose, again, that a professor of one of the usual business schools is talking about the labor movement; can he present the truth?

The answer is obvious. There are innumerable biases in universities, biases as stubbornly clung to by people outside of the CP as inside it. There are many professors in whom we have no greater confidence to tell the "truth" than in Stalinists. The problem cannot be posed as if the university is some sort of abstract body, completely apart from capitalist society. The university is part of capitalist society, susceptible to its pressures, usually doing its bidding; and only by extremely persistent efforts is it possible for any kind of oppositionist views to retain their standing in the university. To assume that Stalinists should be expelled because they cannot tell the truth is to lay the way open for the most appalling sort of repressions.

But there is another question. Who is to tell which truth is the "real" truth? If the university were somehow exempt from the cross-currents of opinion, in the modern world and could, by some stroke of intuition, reach the truth, then perhaps it could pretend to judge. But that claim would be ludicrous. Hook and Allen speak as if they have the truth tucked away in their back pocket. We agree that the Stalinists don't have the truth, but we say that to fire people because we think THAT is to turn to the methods of the inquisitor.

In any case, if the university is to serve as a genuine intellectual preparation for life, it must confront the student with a variety of opinions, more or less reflecting those to be met in the outside world. Those who want to defeat Stalinism should realize that, especially since it attracts, often enough, the most sincere and radical elements among the students, it is necessary to use intellectual, political arguments against it, rather than police clubs. Hammer away at them in the classrooms; defeat them in debates; isolate them intellectually—good. But do not stoop to Stalinist methods to fight the Stalinists—if only because you thereby help the Stalinists.

Hook argues that in joining the CP teachers commit an intellectual ACT which disqualifies them to teach. That is sophistical argumentation. By a specific act that would disqualify a Stalinist professor, one could mean giving lower grades to anti-Stalinists than their work deserves; discriminating against anti-Stalinists in the faculty, etc. If such charges can be proved, then let the Stalinist teachers be fired. But it is significant—is it not, Professor Hook?—that these charges were DROPPED in the Butterworth and Phillips cases.

It may be argued that one can tell in advance how a Stalinist will behave. There is truth in that. (After all, we are not trying to say that it is GOOD to have Stalinist teachers; we are saying only that it is WORSE to fire them.) But it must be remembered that academic Stalinists may often be different from others. One of the six teachers in Washington, a teacher of anthropology, testified that he had disagreed with the CP on certain points of "scientific doctrine." That may seem unlikely—but it is not impossible. Fortunately for human beings, we are not all completely consistent. A Stalinist teacher cannot necessarily be assumed to be dishonest and unfair to anti-Stalinist colleagues or students. If he is, oust him—on SPECIFIC academic charges. But no expulsion by association.

A Few Questions To Prof. Hook

We wish finally to say a word about Hook's article. Hook says that he thinks the whole problem would be solved if the faculties were allowed to make decisions on such cases, rather than boards of trustees or regents. Within limits we agree with that. (Why not provision for student participation in such decisions?) In that case, however, we would ask him a few questions:

1) Since the majority of the Faculty Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom voted AGAINST expelling Butterworth and Phillips, why do you not stand with them?

2) What is your opinion about the action of the Board of Regents in placing on probation for two years the three teachers who HAD been CP members but were so no longer? After all, Prof. Hook, other people could be put on probation for reasons like that.

3) You say that you would allow faculty bodies to decide on Stalinists and that you favor firing of Stalinist teachers because they cannot teach honestly. Good. We should like to see you argue that such Stalinists (it does not matter if they are CP members) as Burgum of NYU's English department or Struik of MIT should be fired for incompetence as teachers. Would you be willing to try that? Would you be willing to urge Burgum's dismissal on the ground that he changed his opinion of André Malraux since Malraux quit the Stalinists?

That Hook is on weak grounds, and not too happy about them either, is seen in a letter he sent to the New York Times protesting the firing of a professor from Oregon State University for supporting the genetics of Lysenko. Hook tries to distinguish between firing a scientist for surrendering "his freedom to inquire into the truth by virtue of Communist Party membership" and firing him for coming to erroneous scientific conclusions. But doesn't he see that the former leads to the latter by creating certain climates of opinion?

This question is not simple. Stalinists as teachers create much damage. But in the university as elsewhere there is only one way to fight them: political exposure and intellectual defeat.

Slave Labor

The fullest report on the hearings of the Commission of Inquiry, sponsored by the Defense League, appeared—so far as we have been able to see by reading other periodicals—in last week's LA in an article written by Wyatt Lee. Copies are still available. Order from LABOR ACTION, 4 Court Sq., Long Island

London Letter

by GEORGE STONE, Editor, Socialist Leader

Labor Party Wins Sharply Contested By-Election

In the face of the most terrific onslaught launched by the Conservative Party since 1945, the Labor Party has emerged victorious from the South Hammersmith by-election. This election has been front-page news for the past week and aroused nation-wide interest. The Conservatives streamlined their organization and were confident of breaking the remarkable run of Labor by-election victories since 1945. They staged an eve-of-the-poll circus with Winston Churchill, they tried every trick, but all to no purpose. The working class refused to be stamped into supporting this party of wealth and privilege. Their answer was clear and unequivocal! The British working class in the march, it has climbed out of the abyss. It is still struggling to find the road to socialism and complete emancipation, but it is determined not to be pushed back into that abyss of black despair and reaction.

It should by now be obvious even to the most dull-witted Conservatives that Winston Churchill is a liability as a leader. His stupid speeches in 1945 made him an object of ridicule and he was greeted with scorn wherever he went. His latest effort has proved to be even more unavailing and has completely demoralized his supporters. Winston Churchill is finished! He is completely washed up! Never again will he play any significant part in the British political scene!

But although this by-election result was one of confidence in the Labor Party the fact remains that there is serious disquiet over the burden of the cost of living. This is particularly so with regard to the cost of clothing, footwear, and household furniture, etc. The Government realizes this and undoubtedly some effort will be made to ease the position of the poorly paid section of workers in the next Budget. The Labor Party and its membership should insist on bolder measures, should step up its program with more militant demands. It has the full backing of a working class anxious to move forward to social and economic liberation.

The main factor in Labor's present success is the social service scheme. This has so much support among the people that the Conservatives dare not oppose it although it is well-known that they would very much like to.

The CP Puts Up a Candidate

Two other important by-elections are pending although it is not anticipated that they will be as bitterly contested as was South Hammersmith. The first of these is in the St. Pancras constituency of London where the Labor member had a majority of nearly 8,000 at the 1945 election.

Interest in this election has been stimulated by the fact that a Communist candidate will be standing. John Mahon, recently appointed secretary of the London District Committee of the CP, is to be the Stalinists' standard bearer. I feel certain that not only will he finish well at the bottom of the poll but that he will also lose his deposit. (A candidate who fails to poll one-eighth of the total votes cast loses his deposit, which in all cases is 150 pound sterling.) Stalinism can make no impression upon the British people and the Communist intervention at St. Pancras will merely serve to emphasize this fact.

The other by-election is at Sowerby, Yorkshire, the seat formerly held by John Belcher, the Labor member who figured so prominently in the Lysenko Tribunal disclosures. There was a majority here of nearly 7,000 in 1945 and Labor is not expected to lose the seat.

One wonders, however, whether the Conservatives will start using the Tribunal evidence in their campaign against the Labor Party. Up to the moment they have scrupulously respected their pledge that they would not make party capital out of the disclosures but, if all other things fail, it is possible that they will break the pledge. In any event, I fail to see how some mention of the matter can be avoided at Sowerby. After all, John Belcher was the member for the constituency, he was the central figure in the unsavoury proceedings of the Tribunal, and questions are bound to be asked by the electorate. If, therefore, the matter becomes one for public discussion, the Conservatives will undoubtedly use it to full advantage.

Conference Discusses Nationalization Spread

This weekend two conferences are being held. One at the Isle of Wight where members of the Cabinet and the Executive of the Labor Party are meeting to formulate the general election program. It is reported that there is a division of opinion as to whether nationalization schemes should be stepped up or slowed down. I see no reason why there should be any timidity. The people are fully in favor of the trend towards public ownership and the government is already committed to the nationalization of the steel industry.

In addition, it is known that the chemical industry is one of those on the list for nationalization—discussions on this have already taken place between the Labor Party Executive and the appropriate Trade Unions. The position of Imperial Chemical Industries has figured largely in these discussions and they will most certainly be a move to take this giant combine out of private hands.

The other conference, or rather a series of conferences, is being held by the Stalinists. Undoubtedly, the Stalinists are worried by their lack of success on the political field and it is expected they will emerge from their weekend discussions with instructions for ever-increasing hostility to the Labor Government. They haven't the remotest possibility of success and they know it! But Russian foreign policy demands that they make the attempt. When will the Kremlin hierarchy learn that the British Stalinists have little or no influence here?

Ziliacius Gets His Marching Orders

The fellow travelers are alarmed! The Labor Party Executive has refused to endorse the candidature of Konni Ziliacius, Labor M.P. for Gateshead, for the next election. Ziliacius cannot complain. He has sided with the Stalinists on almost every issue. No Stalinist could have served the CP better than he has and the time is long overdue for his marching orders. Another M.P., who is likely to be disowned is fellow traveler Lester Hutchinson.

They will, of course, stand as fully-fledged Stalinists at the next election and will prove what we have said for some time: that they are party members without membership cards.

Vishinsky for Molotov - -

(Continued from page 1)

them is to be decreased accordingly. Already the Kremlin has liquidated its consulates in the U. S., has sharply reduced her foreign staffs in the U. S., UN, England and France, has withdrawn from several important UN technical agencies and has reduced her trade with the U. S. to a vanishing point.

For Russia, no further expansion of its insatiable imperialism is possible without strengthening the basis from which it operates. This means reorganization of the Communist Parties, consolidation of Eastern Europe, and deepening of the war economy throughout its empire. Its present positions have been rendered vulnerable by the Western counter-attack. It is likely that the coming period will be one of internal reorganization of the Russian empire for the larger struggles ahead. This is the changed perspective with which the master class of bureaucrats now sees the world. A withdrawal to pre-1939 levels is impossible. Russia has become a world power too big for such retirement into semi-isolation. But tightening up and reduction of commitments is clearly in order. The cold war has moved to another plane.

GERMAN PROBLEM

First attention must be given to a rapid solution to the German problem. Since the West German state seems inevitable and the Ruhr is lost for the moment for Russia, a new approach will be developed, of which the broad outlines are already clear. An East German state of some considerable strength will probably be created. The first task of this new puppet bastion will be to liquidate the Achilles' heel that is Berlin. So long as the Berlin question remains unresolved, the Iron Curtain contains a deep crack.

A larger solution to the German question, for the Russians, will require consolidation in East Europe, where fear of Germany is still strong and is still a powerful impetus behind Stalinist-inspired pan-Slavic nationalism. More important is the economic problem. For if the Ruhr is lost then a substitute must be created. German productivity, technical skill, manpower, resources and machines must be harnessed. But this is viewed with dread by Poland, Czechoslovakia and other satellite states. For it is Germany's great economic strength that leveled their economies in advance of Hitler's legions. All these states are now in the process of vast economic construction programs themselves. They see any resurrection of German economy as a threat.

The Russians, to the contrary, have need for German economic power. Thus there are reports that the Russians have ordered the return of large numbers of the three million expelled Sudeten Germans to Czechoslovakia, so that formerly rich area can help resolve the labor shortage, particularly the shortage of skilled labor, and contribute to the production of heavy industry. But this requires that the leaders of the Czech CP renge on their racist anti-German policy. There are rumors of differences in the Czech leadership over this matter. If the Germans are permitted to return, and the Sudetenland is again permitted to flourish, the Czechs want guarantees.

The Polish official CP paper recently began a new propaganda line: "that the Poles must forget their ha-

ted of all Germans." There are rumors of trade agreements between Poland and East Germany. Some circles predict that the new East German state will be admitted to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, the Russian "ERP." There are plans afoot for the construction of a new industrial complex between Czechoslovakia, Poland and East Germany. This will require not only recognition of East Germany by the satellites but their assumption of the annual deficit of 100 million marks of this area, which is now carried by Russia. From the point of view of Russia's interests, it is not alone a matter of increasing production, particularly of heavy goods and war materials, but also of pointing a permanent dagger at Eastern Europe; a dagger in Russian hands which would serve as a brake on Titoist thoughts. A Russian-controlled East Germany is to be that weapon.

VISHINSKY'S ROLE

The purges in East Europe have reduced native opposition to the vanishing point. Stalinization of parties and institutions is about complete. The new trend is toward Russification, toward tying politics, economy and culture to Russia. Thus in Rumanian schools the Russian language has been made compulsory. Throughout East Europe every type of Western influence is being expunged, and Russian movies, books, periodicals and even scientific and cultural dicta are dominant. The formula for empire that is emerging is tantamount to organic absorption and subjugation to Russia.

Vishinsky is already identified with this process. It was he who performed the operation on Hungary. Recently he spent considerable time at Carlsbad in Czechoslovakia where it was rumored that Cominform session was in process. It is not difficult to see this cynical, blood-stained prosecutor for the GPU stepping into Zhdanov's shoes as manipulator and whiplash of the Communist Parties. It is likely that the chief activities of the new Foreign Minister will be in connection with imperial consolidation in Eastern Europe rather than on the larger stage of negotiations with the West. In such a program, the Communist Parties will have an important role.

Vishinsky is not a member of the Politbureau. This hangman of the old Bolsheviks has Menshevik origins and such things are never forgotten in the Russian hierarchy. Both Vishinsky and Gromyko are second-stringers without decisive power in the great bureaucratic oligarchy. Certainly there is no comparison between a Vishinsky and a Molotov, who has been until now second only to Stalin, and whose position in the Politbureau makes him one of the real top rulers. Vishinsky will be a tool of the Politbureau but until now he has not had a voice in it. His expressions of policy will probably be more rigid, more tentative and therefore less decisive.

This idea is given added weight by Mikoyan's retirement from the post of Minister for Foreign Trade. Mikoyan, like Molotov, is an original Stalinist and remains on the Politbureau. It is the function of foreign trade that is reduced in relative importance rather than Mikoyan.

INTERNAL DIFFICULTIES

Internal problems of Russia are to receive more attention from now on. Everything is not going well inside Russia. Not only in the satellite nations is there severe economic dislo-

cation. The police system has been extended.

V. M. Dean, writing up the latest information from Russia in a foreign policy report, writes: "The internal situation in the USSR has seriously deteriorated in the past year, both with respect to material conditions (which in some instances are worse than they were during the war, due in large part to war destruction and displacement), and with respect to repression of criticism and opposition. Current repression, although not as ruthless as the purges of the 1930's is more extensive in scope, embracing not only political and economic convictions, but also all aspects of cultural life."

The turn exemplified by Molotov's and Mikoyan's transfers has much to do with these internal distresses and the rule of the bureaucracy in Russia. The next period may be an even harsher anti-Western one in all fields as part of extension of war production and consolidation of the new empire with Russia.

It has been suggested that these changes may indicate a "left" turn. Since the end of the so-called "third period" in 1933-34 there have been no "left" or "right" zig-zags in the Stalinist movement, if these terms are to be used with anything resembling their usual meaning in the working-class movement. There have only been periods of "hard" and "soft" relations with the capitalist countries (reflected in the CP policies), depending on Russian foreign policy at the moment. The ideological element has been replaced by eclectic opportunism. New terms are needed to describe the features of Stalinist politics, but "left" and "right" have lost all traditional meaning in relation to it. The present turn, in this sense, is toward a "hard" policy.

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. AKRON: Write to Box 221. BALTIMORE: 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. Open meetings Thursday evenings. SYL meets Friday evenings. CHICAGO: 800 West North Ave. Tel.: Michigan 8093. Office hours: Wednesdays 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: 9016 12th St. Meetings Fridays: 8:15 p.m. LOS ANGELES: 2314 So. Grand, Los Angeles 7. Tel.: Richmond 7-3230 (if no answer, phone AX 2-9067). Office hours, 2 to 5 p.m. daily. NEWARK: 248 Market St., Newark 2. Classes, discussions, lectures Thursdays at 9:00 p.m. NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. Open every day from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Wednesdays and Thursdays until 10:30 p.m. Tel.: WATKINS 4-4222. CENTRAL BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at the City Center, 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. CHILSEA BRANCH: Thursday, 8:15

NOW OUT! The NEW INTERNATIONAL February 1949 THE "FAIR DEAL" - Payment Deferred by Ben Hall What is Chinese Stalinism? by Jack Brad France's New Socialist Movement: Two Views on the RDR by Jacques and Henry Judd One Year of Czech Dictatorship by Rudy Svoboda TWENTY-FIVE CENTS