

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 21, 1952

FIVE CENTS

The Basic Problem of the Polish Anti-Stalinist Resistance . . . page 6

Steel Union Pressuring Truman . . . page 8

AFL-CIO Denounce U.S. on Tunisia . . . page 5

YES — NATIONALIZE THE STEEL INDUSTRY!

What the Steel Barons Fear Is What the People Need for a Real Solution in Steel

If Truman Really Meant It . . .

As we go to press, it is reported that the direct negotiations between the steel union and the steel owners have broken off and that the government is now ready to negotiate directly with the union. For the steel seizure itself solved nothing, and could solve nothing as long as the dictators of the steel industry (and therefore dictators of the basic economic life of the country) stood pat. A fire could be put under the owners if the government not only put the flag over their plants but also seized their profits for the period; this Truman will not do. Now the government threatens at any rate to come to a wage agreement with the workers, presumably at least to give them the WSB package.

The latter is no doubt possible in some form, above all because this is an election year and Truman has shown that he, at any rate, understands that without the labor vote the Democratic Party's position in 1952 is a hopeless one. Even in this best of possible eventualities, however, the steel crisis will only be tided over for a while. For the issue that has been raised by the steel owners is not over their ability to pay—in fact, to pay without even serious inconvenience to themselves.

They have raised the question of power.

Not state power in the classic sense; the U. S. is a long distance behind the rest of the world politically. But in their own fashion the steel owners see the question of power looming even when the government steps in merely on the elementary question of wages and prices. The question of power that they raise is that of maintaining the complete, unchecked and uncheckable economic power of the pri-

ate profiteers over the lives of their workers and the economic life of the whole country.

Even a government deal with the union on wages will solve nothing basically for them or for the country. For then the plants go back to the same "outrageously greedy" autocrats of steel—and they have a hundred weapons in their arsenal to drive forward to their own aims, from suits for damages against the government to stalling and sniping at the union.

Truman's "seizure speech" denounced these overlords of the American economy in some of the most vigorous words heard from a president against private capitalists. If one half of what he said about them is true—and the fact is that even his speech told not one half of the full story of callous grasping profiteering in the industry—then the interests of the people demand that these men be dethroned from their despotic tyranny over the commanding height of industry and economic life.

The steel men are yelling in almost hysterical fashion that the seizure means "nationalization." This is partly a propaganda trick on their part, since they know that Truman is no nearer advocating nationalization than Ben Fairless. But it is not MERELY a trick, and it is only formally directed against TRUMAN. The steel men see in nationalization the only step which can really and permanently stop them from getting their way and imposing their will, in the longer or shorter run.

Therefore: Yes—nationalize the steel industry! That which the steel bosses fear most is what the people need most, as a genuine solution of the steel crisis!

By MARY BELL

What was heading toward a battle on the picket lines in the steel dispute has become transformed, through the government seizure, into a battle of words, government boards, legality, courts—and more words, with the issue still very much in doubt.

The steel industry, with its paid and unpaid publicists, has been conducting a propaganda campaign of unparalleled volume and stridency, through every medium that aims at eye and ear (including congressmen, of course).

The "seizure" has been labeled almost everything. That redoubtable business magazine, *U. S. News & World Report* heads its feature for the week "Will Strikes Bring Socialism? Ease of Seizing Industries Points the Way." Hearsting Victor Riesel, labor columnist of the *N. Y. Daily Mirror*, accuses Truman of creating class war by his action.

The steel companies' latest full-page ad on the seizure excerpts thirteen of their favorite newspapers in which these typical phrases occur: ". . . labor dictatorship . . . Constitutional system is doomed to destruction . . . virtual confiscation of the steel industry . . . socialistic planners . . . constitutional and political crisis . . . as fundamental as the Roose-

velt court-packing plan of 1937 . . . dictator, as far as the nation's steel industry is concerned . . . put the government into the steel business without authority of Congress . . . one of the most high-handed acts committed by an American president . . . powers of government on the side of a great labor union . . . there's no telling what might be the next step in confiscation of private property and infringement of personal liberties . . . Nazi-Fascist character of Truman's act . . ." and so on.

Dire predictions of further seizures on the way are cited: oil, where 200,000 workers are getting ready to strike; coal, where John L. Lewis is preparing new demands; steel fabricators, who are pledged to follow what steel receives; rubber, where a wage dispute looms; aircraft, where disputes are pending; electrical appliances, where wage demands are also pending; aluminum, where strikes are threatened.

"SOCIALISM"?

Seizure has become such a "habit" with government, argue the steel propagandists, that it indicates a trend toward government ownership, toward nationalization, toward socialism, toward "it-can-happen-here." Call it what you will, the screamers are not always sure. They lump seizure, fascism and nationalization together; the most recurrent scareword is "socialism." That's what the seizure order in steel is supposed to lead to, and that's what they're against. Or, to put it another way, whatever they're against automatically becomes "socialism."

Now, how "socialistic" is the seizure carried out by President Truman when the steel industries failed to comply with the War Stabilization Board directive?

Upon the president's order, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, a conservative, self-made Ohio lawyer and machine politician, himself opposed to the government's taking over the steel in-

(Continued on page 7)

What's UAW Political Line in '52?

Cleveland Educational Conference Left the Big Question Unanswered

By BEN HALL

CLEVELAND, Apr. 8—The last evening session of the three-day national educational conference of the United Auto Workers (CIO) had already adjourned on Saturday, April 5; most of the 2,000 delegates had already filtered out of the big auditorium; as the attendants were putting out the lights in the back of the hall and beginning to sweep up, an uninvited guest followed by a small entourage entered through a side door and made his way to the platform where top officials of the UAW, including Walter Reuther, were still chitchatting with the speakers of the day.

It was Senator Kefauver, candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. He stood by politely, almost at attention, until someone caught Reuther's eye.

"Hello, senator," was Reuther's greeting. "I didn't know you were in town." (Cleveland newspapers had concealed the news on their first pages.) Handshakes all around; little dribbles of non-committal conversation; and Kefauver left with his aides to reappear in the lobby of the conference headquarters, Hotel Hollender. There

he pursued his quiet hellos and shook hands with bellhops and UAW vice-presidents.

Like almost everyone else Kefauver knows that big things are at stake; this is a presidential election year, calling for important political decisions. He already has won over a few local UAW leaders, and who can blame him for hoping that this lit-

tle gesture will make some impression on the UAW as a whole?

FORGOTTEN WORDS

Senator Wayne Morse, an invited speaker, had utilized the UAW educational conference earlier that afternoon to make his own dramatic announcement that he would not campaign for conservatives nominated by the Republican Party against liberal opponents, presumably Democrats; and further, that if the party nominated a slate of reactionary candidates which would take the country down the road of "depression and isolationism" he might break with it and go independent.

But the UAW seemed oblivious to the immediacy of the issues at stake. This was the most important UAW gathering between now and the November elections; yet its agenda, program, and speeches might have been made in any month of any year.

A year ago, at the UAW convention, the leadership had proposed to call upon the labor movement to convoke a national con-

gress of labor, in advance of the 1952 elections, to take stock of labor's position and map out a unified course in the crucial presidential campaign. But this was now forgotten.

Forgotten also were the stinging criticisms of Truman made by Mazy and others at that convention. There was no attempt to analyze the past, to explain how the union would put forward its political policies in the concrete circumstances of the '52 elections. As the delegates cheered Morse, for example, no one tried to explain what the candidacy of Eisenhower would mean to the labor movement. Yet, Morse will undoubtedly support the general against Taft.

REPLY TO A STICKER

Only one clear-cut slogan for political action was issued by the UAW speakers: *Get out and vote!*—a slogan capable of inspiring the same enthusiasm in the presidential elections as in a neighborhood campaign for bailiff.

"What will you do if both parties nominate reactionaries?" was

(Turn to last page)

Reuther Delays Ford Local Vote

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, April 12—Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600 of the United Auto Workers (CIO), which is under the administration of the international union, called this past week for a local union election by May 15.

Stellato, Vice-President Pat Rice, Financial Secretary William Grant and Recording Secretary Bill Hood argue that the UAW constitution requires an election within 60 days after the appointment of an administrator. Local 600 was placed under an administration on March 15.

It is considered quite unlikely that the Reuther leadership of the UAW-CIO will accede to the demand of the four top officers of Ford Local 600.

Spokesmen for the UAW top leaders told reporters that an election is not required within 60 days because the Ford Local 600 officers were not removed from their posts. Since the UAW constitution is interpreted between conventions by the top officers and the executive board of the international union, it is not probable that the Reuther leadership will rule against itself on this question.

The basic reason why the Reuther leadership is using this technicality to avoid an election at Ford Local 600 at the present time is because the Reuther forces have not been able to work out a slate of candidates to oppose the Stellato caucus.

The inability of the Reuther leadership to build a cadre of experienced leaders in Ford Local 600 is once again confirmed by this new development.

REUTHER HAD TROUBLE

Another ominous note was sounded by the UAW's spokesmen when he suggested that even when an election is held Stellato will not be able to run because it is planned to place him on charges

of conduct unbecoming a union member. This would disqualify him from running.

The decision of the UAW top leadership not to allow an election in Local 600 may well be within its constitutional powers, but its effect among the rank file will be to show the weakness of the Reuther forces.

The persistent reports in UAW circles that five members of the UAW's international union executive board voted on the first ballot against placing an administrator over the Ford local suggests the difficulties involved in this situation for the personal prestige and control of Walter P. Reuther in the union. Of course, in a final vote, the decision was unanimous to support Reuther on the IE.

Reports that the congressional Un-American Committee will return to Detroit in the next two weeks have aroused suspicion that they will again spotlight Ford Local 600 in an effort to weaken the Stalinists there.

Interestingly enough, the FBI this week reported in the U. S. News that Michigan's Stalinist membership was reduced from 750 to 450 during the past year.

However, the political influence of the Stalinists is something else. Only today, the Detroit News carries an expose of the activities of William Hood, Ford Local 600 secretary. What is the expose? A little over a year ago, Hood went with a delegation to Washington to protest to the State Department against their line on the Willie McGee case, the Mississippi Negro who was three times convicted and finally electrocuted on the charge of raping a white woman. The Stalinists were quite active in exploiting this case.

Of course, the Detroit News didn't mention the fact that Walter Reuther and other top CIO officials also protested the handling of the McGee case, and sent wires to the governor of Mississippi urging a stay in the electrocution.

LABOR SCOPE

L. A. NLRB WITCHHUNT RULING STIRS LABOR TO PROTEST

By GORDON HASKELL

From the time the government began to apply its "loyalty" and "security" programs to private industry, LABOR ACTION has taken a strong stand against them. We have opposed them on the general ground of the defense of the democratic rights of workers, and especially on the grounds that they constitute a danger to the labor movement itself. We have viewed with increasing alarm the tendency of unions to accept any right of the companies to discipline or fire workers solely on the grounds of their political opinions or activities.

There are those in the labor movement who have viewed our alarm on this question as stemming from "abstract" or "theoretical" conception. They have tended to discount the actual danger to the labor movement of an extension of the "loyalty" program to private industry. After all, they have reasoned, good, honest, "loyal" trade-unionists have nothing to fear from it. It is only the "subversives" who feel that their ox is being gored. In any event, they have thought, our grievance procedure will be sufficient protection against company abuse of a "loyalty" program in private industry.

We are glad to say that this has not been the universal opinion in the labor movement. Brendan Sexton's letter elsewhere in this issue, is a welcome addition to the evidence that there are those in the labor movement who clearly understand the implications of the right of employers to fire people simply because they are Stalinists or what have you.

TAFT-HARTLEY PLUS

A recent case in Los Angeles, in which the union involved is the Stalinist-controlled United Electrical Workers, is so openly an attack on the labor movement as a whole that even the bitter AFL and CIO enemies of the UE have issued vigorous protests. The case is set forth in an article in the Los Angeles Daily News for April 2.

What they protested was an order handed down by National Labor Relations Board trial examiner David F. Doyle in a case involving the Square D. Co. and the UE. The union had brought 19 charges against the employer for failure to bargain in good faith as required under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Most of these dealt with the usual employer tactics of stalling, changing wages and pensions without consulting the union, etc. But on two unusual charges, Doyle ruled as follows: "the company may require a non-Communist affidavit from any individual or individuals claiming to represent the union in any capacity before recognizing such individuals as representatives of the union. The company may refuse to confer, meet with or bargain with any person or persons who decline to furnish such affidavit or affidavits."

COMPANY OATHS

He ruled that it was proper for the company to ask that "the UE give it security assurances or guarantees which might be evidence of bad faith if asked of a union which possessed a reputation of unquestioned patriotism."

And finally he ruled that it was proper for the company to have written into its contract a provision allowing the firm to "discharge any employee who disseminated communistic literature in the plant or who advocated communistic action or the overthrow of the United States government by force or violence."

This ruling was attacked by Albert T. Lunceford, a CIO leader who helped stop the UE from the CIO, and by W. J. Bassett, secretary of the AFL Central Labor Council in Los Angeles.

"Under Doyle's recommendation," Lunceford pointed out, "any company could require that any union should submit affidavits for even the lowliest member of a tiny committee."

"If a single committee member, for any reason whatever, refused

to sign such an affidavit the company would be legally entitled to tell the union where to go.

"The ruling doesn't make sense. In effect Doyle is saying that the company has the right to go beyond the bounds of the law set by the United States Congress in requiring all kinds of affidavits, and is empowering the company to act as prosecutor, judge and jury in deciding whether a union should be considered patriotic or not patriotic."

"If a union asks wage increases for its members in such a time as this, the company might decide such a request was unpatriotic, therefore the union was unpatriotic for asking, and therefore honest American workmen could be subjected to the indignity of being forced to sign a company-drawn oath of allegiance."

TOO RAW

In denouncing the other section of Doyle's ruling, the AFL's Bassett said that "such a silly, loosely worded clause could be taken advantage of by any anti-union employer in such a way as to destroy or disrupt the most patriotic of unions." He pointed out that although unions might not oppose firing workers for various complaints connected with communism "such charges must stand up in court as just and sufficient reason for making the discharge." Bassett stated that such provisions in a contract would permit an employer to fire at will anyone who happened to come in contact with union literature.

"The employer would have only to say that in his opinion the union literature was communistic and he could discharge anyone he chose..."

We really don't need to add much to the statements of these two union officials.

The trial examiner's ruling will still have to be passed on by the NLRB in Washington. It is quite possible that they will reverse his findings in these matters. They are just a little too raw, even for these days of the witchhunt. But they are not fantastically out of line when union leaders are going around the country demanding that Congress grant employers the right to refuse to bargain with Stalinist-controlled unions.

We can only hope that this episode will shake up the labor movement a little and awaken it to the dangers of extending the "loyalty" program to private industry.

Tell-Tale

On March 17 the British Daily Worker carried an article by Sheila Lynd, entitled "Toys Tell a Tale," which began: "What children play with is a pretty good indication of how society rears them, for like all young animals their play is a preparation for life." It then describes the Russian toys at a British exhibition to prove that Russian children are taught to love "the arts of peace."

Not on exhibition with the toys, however, was the 1950 edition of the Russian handbook for teaching English, by Y. Linnik and M. D. Kuznetz, *Uchebnik Anglijskogo Jazyka*, for 10-year-olds in elementary schools. On page 98, its illustrative sentences read:

"The New Year is coming. The children are making many toys for the New Year tree. They are making little tanks and guns, red and yellow drums, and many little flags, red, blue, yellow and green."

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION

—La BATALLA, March 25.

FBI Stoolpigeons Still Tangled Up

By DAVE BERN

LOS ANGELES, April 5—The trial of the California Stalinist leaders continues with the introduction of a government witness, the seventh so far, William Foad of San Francisco, whom the press and prosecution hail as the one witness who "clearly understands the fundamentals of Marxism" and is "tough enough to hold his own under vigorous cross-examination."

These admirable qualities remain to be demonstrated, unless we take at face value the common denominator of Stalinist and reactionary capitalist thinking: that Stalinism is Marxism, and Marxism is something manufactured in Moscow.

If Foad can stand up under cross-examination, he will be the first witness to pass the test of consistency, accuracy, and relevance. This is true in spite of the defense's attempt, at times, to confuse the issue with Stalinist double-talk about CP principles and activities.

Meantime, an interesting example of the anti-CP (and anti-democratic) drive occurred outside the trial court. Two of the defendants, Henry Steinberg and William Schneiderman, the latter alleged acting leader of the American CP, were billed to speak in the auditorium of Roosevelt High School, and a permit was obtained by Mrs. Lillian Carlson for the sponsoring Eastside Defense Committee. The announced purpose of the meeting was to agitate against the Smith Act and to protest its use against the Stalinists here.

On March 29 the move to halt the meeting by various school and public authorities was challenged by County Counsel Harold Kennedy, who ruled that permission to use the school auditorium cannot be arbitrarily withheld—and here was the gimmick—the meeting was to foster the aim of overthrowing the government and was held under the auspices of such a conspiratorial group.

The next day the Board of Education passed, by a vote of 5-1, a resolution by Education Superintendent Stoddard to revoke the permit and to forbid use of school property for the meeting. The pretext was that said meeting posed "a clear and present danger to school property and would interfere with night school classes." (Mirror, April 1.)

Earlier, Stoddard gave his real motive away when he declared he was opposed "to permitting such meetings in our schools." Only the ignorant and prejudiced can fail to understand the implications here. Stalinists or their legal supporters cannot use school property, that is, public property, to speak against the Smith Act. Yet school property has traditionally been available, at least in theory, for any group which wished to exercise its right to free speech and assembly. Also, Stoddard knows that Gerald L. K. Smith, the fascist hater of Jews, has used Los Angeles schools to attack minorities and inflame racial prejudice.

The real reason is that the cold war demands "exceptions" to traditional freedom and legal rights, according to reactionaries and some "liberal" supporters of the national anti-CP drive. Of course, genuine radicals who are anti-Stalinist themselves are having their rights curtailed too under the guise of patriotism or "national necessity" but actually because the official anti-CP drive is used as a cover to facilitate suppression of any and all critics of capitalist imperialism and regimentation.

The lone board member to dissent, Arthur Gardner, said he "was against communism but [was] not convinced the meeting would disturb Roosevelt's 600 night school students or peril the property." A. A. Heist of the American Civil

The Story of the L.A. Scandals

With this article we conclude the story of police brutality in Los Angeles begun in our issue of April 7.—Ed.

By MALCOLM KIRK

LOS ANGELES, Apr. 13—On March 10, Tony Rios and Alfred Ulloa were exonerated of the charge of interfering with police officers by a jury that deliberated for only four hours, during which "only one of the jurors had any doubt as to their innocence." The effect of this verdict of not guilty was a judgment of guilt of brutality upon the police. Nevertheless, this action took out of the fire the case that would have been the hottest for the Police Department to answer for. It meant that the Community Service Organization (CSO) would no longer have to mobilize in the defense of its chairman, Rios, and his fellow arrestee, Ulloa.

Even though other victims of brutality do not have the backing given Rios, the fight against police brutality has snowballed and still goes on. A county grand jury investigation that started on March 18 continues and its findings have been so startling that the "super" cops of the FBI have been making their own investigation for over a week.

ONE SET OF RULES

Cases of brutality continue to come to light, and many of the victims are not members of minority groups. Some are hardened criminals, "sex offenders," "drunks," etc., and this has forced the public to take an even deeper look into the question of the methods that police have a right to use.

"Do persons who are suspected of or who have admitted anti-social acts have the right to humane treatment by law-enforcement agencies?" The answer is clear to all who think without prejudice: that there must be a single and humane set of rules of police conduct for the arrest of ANYONE.

More specifically, it is necessary to change the rules laid down by

the City Charter, Section 202, which governs the action that can be taken against police officers when they violate the law or the trust of their position. This section, authored by Police Chief Parker, completely removes the entire Police Department from any action by the people whom they are supposed to protect. If any complaints are brought against the police and if enough pressure can be brought to bear, the officer or officers in question are tried at present by a court composed of fellow police officers. This completely violates the democratic concept that the government, be it on a federal, state, or city level, must be responsible to the people. The case in Los Angeles shows that the police are not subject to such check and control.

NATURAL ALLIES

The responsible political leadership of the Eastside and the Mexican-American population have reason for the deep concern they are showing about the real sincerity of the Democratic Party for the Mexican-American. The Democratic Party cannot go "all the way" with the CSO, organized labor, and the organizations of other minority groups. Time will make it clear that it is good only for short and windy sprints.

This is no tragedy, for the power of CSO and its allies has already proved that it could elect candidates without the help of the big political machines—candidates whose only allegiance is to the people who elected them. The natural ally of the CSO should be the labor movement, and the natural basis for the CSO's political activity should be a labor party independent of the old machines.

They Like Batista

Who likes the Batista coup d'état in Cuba?

"Havana, Apr. 14—*Economica y Financiera*, authoritative commercial magazine, in the issue appearing today said editorially that while it was impossible to eulogize the recent coup... it was impossible to deny the coup was justified by the situation. "Private business today has more guarantees than under the recent constitutional government," the magazine said.—N. Y. Times dispatch.

You're Invited

To speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

In the Name of the Five New Martyrs of the Spanish People — Unity and Action Can Stop Franco's Crimes!

An Editorial from "La Batalla," organ of the POUM, Spanish socialist resistance movement

The crime has been committed. Five militants of the CNT [National Confederation of Labor], five fighters of the anti-Franco resistance—Pedro Adrover Font, José Pérez Pedrero, Jorge Pons Argües, Santiago Amil Gruanas and Giné Urrea Pina—have fallen, facing their executioners unflinchingly, on the fateful field of Barcelona.

All the efforts made to save them have been in vain. The international campaign against the Franco terror, initiated about a month ago, has not realized all the aims which it set itself. Only four of the nine who were condemned have been snatched away from the shadow of the hangman.

The five worker-militants who were sacrificed in Barcelona have gone to join that great legion of heroes and martyrs of the Spanish people which Albert Camus has called the "aristocracy of sacrifice." Their names, like the names of those who went before them in our martyrology, will not be forgotten.

The Barcelona executions confirm that the Franco regime, in the belief that the international situation is favorable to it, is resolutely determined to impose a new time of terror in Spain. In pursuing this course, at one and the same time it is taking a calculated risk and issuing a challenge. If now the labor and liberal forces of the world do not pick up the gauntlet which he throws down at their feet, Franco will calmly proceed to the extermination of the best sons of the Spanish working class.

It is therefore necessary to curb and conquer the Falangist wave of terror. In Barcelona and in Seville, there are other working-class militants who have been condemned to death, thanks to Franco's "Christian piety." The police and judicial machinery of the totalitarian tyranny is ready—more trials for about a hundred anti-Franco workers.

The international campaign which has been launched up to the present in order to stop the Barcelona executions has generally taken place through statements, political pressure and petitions. In view of the results obtained and in view of the new dangers, it is time to pass on to a further phase of activity: popular action and the mobilization of the forces of the labor movement.

In other days, when the working class was not under the tutelage of the big bureaucratized apparatuses of our time, powerful movements of the people arose to rally world opinion on behalf of Francisco Ferrer Guardia, of Sacco and Venzetti, of Thaelmann and other such victims of all the reactionary tyrannies. Today, many people soothe their consciences with verbal declarations and telegrams of protest.

Franco, who has managed to surmount very difficult situations faced by his regime and who finally thinks he sees the possibility of consolidating his power, will not retreat and will not give up except in the face of international people's action of vast proportions.

The big political and trade-union organizations of the labor movement, which these past weeks have reiterated their hostility to Francoism and their solidarity with the Spanish people, can and must do much more. In their hands are the means to win out, and they can and must use them to save all those condemned to death, to stop the new trials which are being prepared, to put an end to the terrorism of Franco and his Falange.

The present hour calls urgently for unity and action against the Franco terror. Both in Spain itself and on the international field! We say this with regard to Spain too since we are not among those who confine themselves to demanding from others what we ourselves are unable to undertake or accomplish.

The Spanish emigration, these days, faces crushing responsibilities. Its dispersal, its weakness, the petty quarrels and sterile games which divide it, are terrible obstacles in the way of arousing the labor and liberal forces of Europe and America to effective and decisive international action which can paralyze the hands of the Franco regime's hangmen.

The organ of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions recently wrote in an editorial: "We appeal to free trade-unionism and the democratic forces of the whole world to unite in a general protest movement against the political persecutions in Spain and against the perpetration of the political crimes which the Franco regime commits."

This appeal comes from an organization whose general political orientation we do not share; but it is a just and fitting appeal. And it is correct and valid not only for the international workers' movement, but, just as much, for the working-class and republican forces of Spain.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Drive Steps Up, SYL Leading, but It Is Not Yet Enough

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

We don't know whether Comrade L. G. Smith's appeal had anything to do with the contributions that came in this week, but they surpassed the weekly amounts that we have been receiving. Branches sent in \$739 in the past several days, enough to bring the drive beyond the midway mark, but still far behind the pace necessary to insure a successful conclusion to the drive.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$6765	54.1
Oregon	50	65	130
Indiana	50	50	100
Streator	25	25	100
Socialist Youth League	1,500	1259.50	84.0
Pittsburgh	150	133	88.6
Cleveland	200	150	75
Newark	300	223	74.3
Boston	50	35	70
Oakland	500	300	60
Detroit	750	441	58.6
New York	4,000	2118	52.9
St. Louis	50	26	52
Chicago	1,800	840	47.7
Buffalo	650	300	46
Philadelphia	300	103	34.3
Los Angeles	600	200	33.3
Seattle	300	100	33.3
General	1,000	284	28.4
Baltimore	25	5	20
Akron	75	0	0
Reading	75	0	0

As you can see, the SYL really deserves the biggest part of this report. In the ISL ranks, Pittsburgh is getting close to completing its quota and it has risen to the upper half of the standings. Newark too has moved up rapidly and is within striking of making 100 per cent of its quota.

Chicago, Detroit and New York have made some improvement in their positions, but not enough yet to push them up sufficiently. They are still far behind their quotas, and it is upon them that we rely for a real spurt in the final weeks of the drive.

Right now we are calling on Philadelphia, Los Angeles and Seattle to make some showing in the next weeks in order to complete their quotas. We have not heard too much from these areas in recent weeks. As you can see, all three are still below 35 per cent of their quotas.

There is a big job ahead of us in the final three weeks of the drive; we are depending on every single branch and area to complete all quotas so that we can hit 100 per cent in this drive as we have done in every previous campaign!

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1952 Fund Drive.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates.)

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?
Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

Youth Student and Corner

Wayne's CSR

To the Editor:
As a result of the recent hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee in Detroit, Lorraine Meisner, a Wayne student, was expelled from school for her alleged Communist Party affiliation and her refusal to "co-operate" with the committee. A protest movement which became the Committee for Student Rights (CSR) was immediately initiated by a group of Wayne students who refused to give in to the hysterical atmosphere created by the hearings. The rallying point of the CSR was its support of the democratic rights of any student to an education regardless of political views or affiliations. These events have been reported by Bob Dennis in his March 31 article for LABOR ACTION. Although the Dennis article raises certain valid criticisms of the way in which these students have conducted their campaign, it does a grave injustice to the Committee for Student Rights by its failure to point out the excellent achievements of this group against tremendous odds.

Today, for the first time in recent Wayne history, an academic freedom issue has been fought and lost—as had to be expected—without a complete breakdown of the morale of the campus' liberal wing. On the contrary, the group has remained confident and has succeeded in making itself organizationally secure. The view contained in the Dennis article is typical of the approach that fails to understand a new development precisely because it is new and does not come cloaked in stereotyped language and organizational forms.

Anyone who knows the history of Wayne University in recent years realizes that there was present in the Meisner affair a number of unique conditions which made any kind of work in the interests of academic freedom almost impossible. That the protest culminated in the formation of a responsible, organized group is in itself a major achievement under the existing circumstances. And that the work of the CSR was of such high quality and permanent value is even more encouraging.

To begin with, the panic created by the House Un-American Activities Committee reached such a magnitude that the students could look to no major element in the community for support. It is no exaggeration to say that a real lynch spirit prevailed, extending even into the labor movement. Suspected Communists were forcibly evicted from the plants by fellow workers and anyone who refused to line up with the Un-American Committee ran the risk of being himself labeled as a Red.

The work attempted by the CSR was further complicated by two additional factors. First, there have been a whole success-

ion of academic-freedom issues that have been fought and miserably lost at Wayne in recent years. Secondly, the CSR was created on a campus that lacked political leadership of any sort. The CSR has to create an entirely new leadership, something which cannot come ready-to-serve right out of the experience provided by the situation.

To their credit, the Wayne group has created a continuing organization, has gained experience, has kept a high morale and has remained free from any Stalinist taint. This latter point has been the issue that has killed or crippled many similar groups in the past. By acting at all times in a responsible manner the CSR has so far made it impossible for the administration to step on it and has made it clear to the community at large that the issue for Wayne liberals is not the defense of Communism but the future of democratic education in Detroit. They did not win their fight to have Mrs. Meisner reinstated. They did, however, wage a valuable fight, making it clear to the university administration that it is not free to do whatever it chooses without regard for student opinion. The CSR, in general, has been able to create conditions on campus more favorable for the future efforts of the liberal wing, which has been relatively quiescent for the past five years.

While some criticism can be made of the CSR, it becomes unimportant when compared to this group's achievements. What will be the real test is what the CSR does in the future. At present CSR plans to begin a campus publication and maintain a forum series. We can only wish them well on their ventures and again give them our fullest support.

Paul KIRK
Edward WILLIAMS
Jack GIBBS

The Dennis article, after discussion of the failings of the CSR in the course of the campaign—which, our three correspondents above agree, presented "certain valid criticisms"—went on to say in bold type:
"Despite these failings it must be remembered that this committee is the only student organization at Wayne University that has the support and wide representation which makes future plans and activities possible. The problem is to reactivate this group around a series of proposals which would extend its purpose and make it possible to move on to new perspectives. The committee members realize this and remains to be seen what will be done."

The proposals which followed included one for a publication and one for student meetings, as well as others. We are glad to hear that some of these are already being planned.—Ed.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

DANGER SIGNALS IN LATIN AMERICA, by Blair Bolles.—Foreign Policy Bulletin, April 15.

Writing of the coup d'état in Cuba by Batista, Bolles makes a connection with the U. S.: "Internal political upheavals and instability currently mark the affairs of Latin American countries. In Cuba on March 10 General Fulgencio Batista effected a coup d'état which removed President Carlos Prío Socarras from office. Batista has designated himself chief of staff, a dictator—a role he played in 1934-1940, assuming the office of president from 1940 to 1944. Batista's principal instrument in the March coup was the army, but he suffered little opposition from other elements in the Cuban population. Corruption is common in Cuban governments. The Prío administration was just as corrupt as usual, and its violent departure evoked few regrets."
"Through the coup Batista won by force what he might not have won by due process. He was the candidate of the Unitarian Action party for the office of president, with elections slated for June. His prospects for victory seemed less bright than those of Carlos Hevia, favored by President Prío, and of Roberto Agramonte, of the Orthodoxos party. Now Batista has postponed the presidential election indefinitely. In foreign policy, Batista has said that he will closely support the United States."
"Batista's pro-Washingtonism partly saves the wounds his violence has inflicted on democratic sensibilities. Cuba is one of the few American republics which have signed an agreement with the United States making them eligible to receive grants of military equipment. American military aid will now, in effect, strengthen the Batista dictatorship in Cuba. Germán Arciniegas, former Colombian minister of education now living in the United States, in his new book, *The State of Latin America*, points out that Washington, by giving military assistance to Latin American countries ruled by dictators, thereby helps not democracy but dictatorship. The Mexican government, affected by the rise of nationalistic anti-American spirit, has refused to sign a military aid agreement.
"Brazil signed a mutual aid agreement on March 15, 1952, but now the possibility has arisen that the Brazilians might repudiate or ignore the agreement if a dictator does not come forward to enforce it."

LONDON LETTER Tories Trowned in Elections

By DAVID ALEXANDER
LONDON, Apr. 9 — Labor won a resounding victory in the county council elections last week. Although a change of control over local government occurred in only two counties—Essex and West Riding, both gained by Labor—the Conservatives lost heavily in every county and Labor majorities increased.

In London, for instance, which has been run by Labor since 1934, the Labor majority went up. Previously 65 to 63, Labor now occupies 92 seats to the Conservatives' 37. The London Times remarks that Labor rule of London has become almost a tradition. In other counties, like Middlesex (adjacent to London), Conservative majorities were decreased considerably. They lost 35 in Middlesex, 23 in Kent, 17 in Hertfordshire, etc.

Not only did the total number of votes polled increase from 39 per cent in 1949 to 41 per cent in 1952, but also Labor's percentage of those votes went up and the Tories went down. Here are the proportions:
Labor 1949 1952
47% 55%
Conservative 51 44
While a Conservative member of Parliament admitted that "we have been thoroughly whacked," Herbert Morrison interpreted the situation: "It was also a manifestation of contempt for the manner in which the Conservatives at Westminster have broken their election promises."
The Stalinists, Liberals, Fascists and Independents were ignominiously defeated, receiving only 1 per cent of the vote.

Labor is now thoroughly confident that, were an election to occur soon, they would be swept into office with a big majority as in 1945. The announcement by the Conservatives of a considerable improvement in the balance of payments did not seem to make any difference at all to the municipal elections, although it must be admitted that this announcement came after the London results but before the rural ones.

BEVAN'S BOOK

The other item of considerable importance to socialists is the publication this week of Aneurin Bevan's political testament *In Place of Fear*. This book has already produced a considerable impact on the political world. I expect the LABOR ACTION staff will arrange to have it reviewed in detail; let us note here only that the reactions of various other Labor politicians have been of considerable interest. Bevan's book is a personal autobiography, a sociological study, a series of political essays, and a theoretical perspective for a movement of democratic socialism. While he dislikes Communism, his book openly states how important he thinks the Marxist contribution is. He modifies it, however, by a discussion of Parliament as a social force. He desires a parliamentary revolution and believes in other forms of action only when this has been useless to the full.

U.S. Vote on Tunisia Denounced by AFL, CIO UN Council Followed Washington's Lead in Rejecting Any Discussion

Joint responsibility for the crimes of French imperialism in Tunisia has now been taken by the United Nations Security Council and most especially by the United States.
This was done when the UN body rejected the proposal of the Arab and Asian nations to place the Tunisian question on its agenda for discussion. The proposal had been put forward by Pakistan's representative, who is president of the council for this advance that the action of the council depended on the U. S. An affirmative decision would have needed 7 votes cast in favor; abstention, therefore, was as good as a negative vote in stopping discussion, even though it indicated a reservation. The lead given by the U. S. was abstention; and Greece, the Netherlands and Turkey followed suit. Not only did France vote against, but also Churchill's Britain. Pakistan's resolution got only five votes, including those of Russia, two Latin American states, Brazil and Chile and China.
Even when Chile introduced a modified proposal, under which the UN council would postpone discussion unless there were "developments of a grave character," the same lines held.
An unusually strong denunciation of the U. S. stand was made by a joint statement of the AFL and CIO on Tuesday:
"The American labor movement can only condemn such a policy of neutrality," they said, referring to the abstention vote, "which is not neutrality but, in reality, is an implied endorsement of the French colonial government in Tunisia."
"The democratic world has suffered a defeat," declared AFL President William Green.
The joint declaration was announced at a luncheon given by AFL and CIO leaders for Farhat Hached, secretary general of the General Federation of Workers of Tunisia, who is now visiting the U. S.
U. S. representative Gross kept mum this time, playing it safer than he had last year, when an attempt to put Tunisia on the agenda was also turned down with open support given by Gross to the action in a necessarily quite hypocritical speech. Gross had let it be known last week that the U. S. line which he was following had been set on top in the State Department.
Whatever qualms he had now were openly voiced by Mrs. Roosevelt, who is no longer a member of the permanent U. S. delegation to the UN. She said that "traditionally we have stood for certain ways of handling such questions," and criticized as not particularly democratic the procedures which had been followed. But Mrs. Roosevelt, speaking at a press conference, then immediately reversed her field to add that the State Department had "a great deal more information" than private individuals and that "we would have to acquiesce as being probably the wisest decision."
There is no one older than 10 around the UN who does not know, as well as Mrs. Roosevelt, what the consideration of the State Department is. Washington is choosing to go along with, rather than antagonize, its French ally in the Atlantic alliance, even though it means a most cynical rejection of UN and U. S. oratory about the rights of peoples, aggression, etc. If there is any decisive information which "private individuals" do not have it is simply the precise threats which the French have made if the U. S. crossed them up.
If the sequence of events of a few months ago is a precedent, it is likely that the Tunisian situation will now be stepped up in intensity. The outbreak of fighting in January-February followed a similar rejection by the UN.

How NATO Squeezes Scandinavia

By OLE F. OLDEN
OSLO—... It is not hard almost anywhere to hear the roar of "thunderjets," American in Denmark and Norway. Swedish in Sweden. The Swedes contend that their "Torna" is better than its American counterparts: it can use shorter runways and can climb faster, they say. But it is much smaller.
The division of the planes reflects the position of the three Scandinavian countries. Norway and Denmark are members of NATO, while Sweden is not. In spite of these differences, which go back far and deep in history, location, and outlook, all three are following the same line in foreign policy, including military preparedness.
Import of American war material, chiefly tanks and airplanes, is considerable. Although figures are not available, some guesses might be made. Of jet planes, the number in Norway alone will certainly run into hundreds. Norwegian pilots, together with those from Denmark, are trained in the United States. Some feel proud of this, while others look at it with a sense of anxiety. There will be no end to the training, for things change so rapidly in aeronautical matters that new courses will have to be gone through again and again.
This is only one aspect of the burden. The preparedness budget will, in the course of three years, cost the taxpayers no less than three billion kroner, which amounts to about \$130,000,000 (U. S.) each year. This is a large sum for a country of three million inhabitants. Officials hope that this expenditure will be possible without causing inflation or a reduction in the standard of living. This hope is based on the very large income from shipping, which at present is bringing into the national earning power nearly \$600,000,000 annually. The shipping boom, however, is largely due to the Korean war and general rearmament.
CO's HIT
The "man in the street" also feels the burden. The period of compulsory military service is now 12 months and is to be extended to 18 months under pressure from NATO, and this has to be compared to prewar times, when it was no more than about three months. The idea of NATO is not only better training, but to have on hand and under arms from a half to a whole year's recruits. There is not much enthusiasm about this program among officers, still less among ordinary soldiers, but most of them will accept it as a bitter necessity.
—Socialist Leader (London)

ISL Branch Discussion Series

Wednesday	Thursday
THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION	IMPERIALISM
April 16 Trotsky's Contribution Reva Craine	April 17 Lenin's Theory Herman Fenwick
April 23 The Colonial World Today Albert Gates	April 24 American and European Imperialism Today Albert Gates
May 7 The U. S. and Europe James M. Fenwick	May 8 Russian Imperialism Gertrude Blackwell

Evenings at 8:30 at Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NEW YORK

ISL May Day Banquet

DINNER promptly at 7 p.m.
LABOR FILMS at 9 p.m.
DANCING at 10 p.m.

Saturday eve, MAY 3

Contribution \$1.50 at Women's Trade Union League
247 Lexington Avenue (near 34 Street)

Readers: Send in your **May Day Greetings** for Labor Action
Your personal greetings on May Day belong in the May Day issue of LABOR ACTION.
Greetings must be in our hands not later than Tuesday, April 22.
They're \$2.00 per column-inch for your own box. Individual-name greetings are \$1.00.
Send text for greetings, accompanied by payment, to: Labor Action, 114 West 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 16 April 21, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.
Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 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.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

The Basic Problem of the Polish Resistance

The People Will Not Fight for Capitalist Restoration and German Expansion

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The Polish resistance against the Stalinist totalitarian regime has great social and political reserves and a very promising political future. It counts for its strength on the spontaneous passive resistance of the Polish workers as this is expressed in such forms as absenteeism from work, sporadic strikes and the fight against raising the labor norms (production quotas for workers). This workers' opposition is only in small part directed by the PPS (Polish Socialist Party) from abroad.

There is also the spontaneous opposition of the peasant masses against the taxes, quotas and other impositions of the regime—in the first place against forced collectivization, which is rightly considered by the peasants as the opening door to their complete enslavement by the "Stalinist magnates."

There is also the nationalist opposition of the city middle classes, the backward "intelligentsia" and the Catholic opposition. Abroad, in exile, there is a broad political emigration, in which are represented all the political currents and traditional Polish parties.

The working-class, peasant and bourgeois opposition in Poland has not been destroyed and annihilated as in Russia but only banished abroad and underground.

The Polish emigration in Great Britain and in the United States is divided into two principle tendencies:

(1) The "democratic camp," which is led by its "Political Council" and supported by the Polish Socialist Party, National Party and Christian Social Party, as well as by a wing of the Peasant Party and other smaller groups. This tendency has remain in opposition to—

(2) The Polish "London government," represented by the president-in-exile, Zaleski, and backed by General Anders, the ex-servicemen's organization and the former Pilsudski camp.

These exist, and there will remain strongly expressed, important differences between the political tendencies in exile and the resistance inside the country, on the program and aims of the ideological and social program for a future free and independent Polish republic.

What Workers Want

The Polish resistance to the Russian power also gets great social and political reinforcement from the deep-going tradition of the revolutionary fight against czarism; and it can again become a political factor of international importance. It could be a real danger for the Stalinist autocracy not only in Poland but in all Eastern Europe and perhaps even in Russia, if it can adequately solve the social and political problems which it faces. Lenin once said that the Polish nobility's fight for national freedom was of prime importance not only for the liberty of the Russian people and all Slavs but also for all of Europe. And the workers and peasant masses today are stronger and not so isolated as was that nobility, as they fight against the totalitarianism of Stalin.

It is true that no one in Poland expects the destruction of Stalin's empire without a third world war between the U. S. and Russia. All Poles wait for the defeat of Russia, for a new free, democratic Poland. But this is only the starting point for the real difficulty and the real problem:

While the right wing of the Polish emigration thinks in terms of the capitalist regime, that is, of capitalist restoration, the spontaneous thinking of the workers' opposition in the country (and also of the workers' wing of the emigration) does not want a return to the native capitalism of pre-1939 Poland, and still less to the regime of the Colonels. The nationalization of industry must remain, in the eyes of the Polish workers, as the economic basis of the future "free democratic Polish republic." They want socialized production plus political and social democracy; and what is that? It is socialism. The Polish workers feel this instinctively very clearly.

Though no one presents this basic problem frankly either in the emigration or in the country, it is this that will be the dividing line in the

future Poland after the defeat of Stalinism, and it is also this that will be basic for the future of the Polish opposition.

The dynamism and activity of the Polish resistance against Russia inside the country and the attitude of the Polish soldiers under Russian command depend on a clear solution to this problem. If the American or European soldiers come into Poland as the bearers of capitalist restoration, the Polish workers' resistance will probably be passive in its fight against the Kremlin, as will be "Marshal" Rokossovsky's soldiers. If they come as the representatives of the American workers, American liberty and socialist democracy, then the Polish workers will greet them as brothers, and will clean the Stalinist oppressors and hangmen out of the way.

This is the first crucial problem of the Polish resistance, and it is not only a problem for Poland but also an international and human question for all the European workers on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

The second problem is a "national" question to a greater extent: it concerns the future national existence of the country, the borders of the future Polish republic and its international position.

As a result of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, Poland lost half its territory to Russia,

Poland's New Stalinist Constitution

By A. RUDZIENSKI

In an issue of the *Robotnik* (Worker), the organ published in London by the Polish Socialist Party in exile, the ideological leader of the PPS, Adam Ciolkosz, analyzes the draft for a new Stalinist constitution for Poland.

The wartime "Lublin Committee" and also the Warsaw government which was set up by Moscow adopted as their basis for "state activity" in Poland the old democratic constitution which had been drawn up and passed by the parliament (Sejm) of the independent Polish republic on March 17, 1921. This 1921 constitution was a typical radical bourgeois-democratic document, one of the most radical in Europe at that time. It was voted in under the pressure of the masses during the revolutionary period in Europe which the Russian Revolution had initiated. It gave the Polish republic a democratic basis, and gave modern social laws to the Polish workers. It served as the framework for Polish parliamentary democracy until Pilsudski's coup in 1926.

The Bonapartist "regime of the Colonels" then imposed a new authoritarian constitution, in which the rights of the Sejm were limited and all power was handed over to the dictatorial president of the state, who was made "responsible only to history and God." This "constitution of the Colonels" was hated by the Polish workers and peasants. It was an adroit move by the Stalinists when they adopted the 1921 constitution as the basis for their post-war regime, for the Polish masses remembered the document as the work of the independent democratic republic. In this way the Stalinist party fed the hopes of the masses that it would indeed be a democratic regime like that which existed from the time of the republic until Pilsudski's seizure of power.

Totalitarian Setup

Of course, under the Stalinists the 1921 democratic constitution remained on paper; Moscow gradually introduced the regime of the NKVD, the Russian secret police, into the country. Now that the opposition has been driven underground, Moscow has ordered a change in the constitution and the adoption of a new authoritarian document which is disguised only by the kind of "democratic" demagoguery typical of Stalinism.

The new draft constitution, which has been presented by the parliamentary commission for "discussion" all over the country "by the masses," leaves the parliamentary democratic forms and introduces the totalitarian absolutist power from behind. Theoretically all power belongs to the Sejm, which is supposed to set up all the or-

gan and the "country on wheels" was simply transported some hundreds of kilometers to the west. Poland lost 12 million Polish citizens to Russia and a territory of 200,000 square kilometers. The country was moved over to the Oder and Neisse Rivers—the territory of origin of the Polish state which was later conquered and Germanized.

German Threat

The Russians dismantled a large part of the machinery and industrial installations and transported them to their own country. The Poles re-constructed their industry, mines and agriculture, as well as the destroyed cities (Wroclaw, Gdansk, Stettin, etc.) in the abandoned territory.

Now the same "allies of Poland" who delivered Poland into Russia's hands and approved the transplantation of Poland to the West are planning to pay the German bourgeoisie for its rearmament by giving them back the former German territories which had been adjudicated to Poland.

Stalinist propaganda in Poland will have a very easy task in persuading the Poles to remain loyal and to fight in defense of the "national integrity." It will also be very easy to convince the Polish underground resistance to remain quiescent in the face of a new German invasion, not to sabotage defense. The Polish workers and peasants now living in the western territories of Silesia, Pomerania and East Prussia have won a higher stand-

(Continued bottom of next page)

gans of government and public administration as under the democratic regime. But the Sejm holds sessions only twice a year and the constitution does not specify the time for these sessions. Instead, the new Stalinist Sejm will choose from among its membership a State Council of 15 persons, which is to be the all-powerful state organ.

It is the State Council which will not only name the ministry councils and every minister, but also conduct the elections to parliament and decide when and for how long the Sejm sessions shall be held. It will also decide questions of war and peace, mobilization and parliamentary immunity for the Sejm deputies; it will name diplomatic representatives abroad and receive foreign diplomats; when the Sejm is not in session, it will also recall ministers and, if necessary, the whole government, which is responsible to it; it will make appointments to all public and administrative posts; it will also have the right to legislative initiative on an equal plane with the deputies.

Constitutional Parody

Since it makes the controlling decisions on elections and parliamentary sessions, it is more powerful than the Sejm; it is in fact an absolutely totalitarian power unknown in any democratic regime and corresponding only to the "presidency of the All-Russian Soviet" in the Russian Stalinist constitution.

Thus the new constitution is a parody of democracy, and especially a parody of the 1921 constitution. It is a typical Stalinist fraud for the deception of the laboring masses. Behind the "democratic" forms and formulas hides an absolutist totalitarian spirit and power.

Of course, the new Stalinist constitution is even more dictatorial and reactionary than the old "colonels' constitution." In the case of the latter, the president was "responsible to history and God" and not to the Sejm or to the electorate. The all-powerful Stalinist "State Council" does not even have any responsibility to "history and God," not to speak of the Polish people. It is responsible only to the 10 members of the Politburo of the Stalinist party, that is, to the NKVD and to the NKVD's God and spirit, the "great Stalin."

For the Polish workers and peasants and for the whole Polish people there remains one way only: to fight for the complete destruction of the Stalinist "prison of the peoples"; that is, the way of the social revolution, which will bring to the Polish masses political and social democracy and their national liberty.

What's UAW's Political Line?

(Continued from page 1)
one question posed for discussion. Reuther replied, in sum: If this should happen, we serve warning that we will be unable to mobilize our workers to the polls and we will face a problem.

The big failure of this conference, then, was its inability to give leadership, guidance, or understanding in the crucial political struggles to come, not in some dim future but in the very next months. This was a political weakness and it was an "educational" weakness; for the political and social training of the union will come less from classroom-type discussions than from conscious participation in real politics.

FOR REALIGNMENT

Yet, despite this serious shortcoming, the conference was an important political event. It was more than an "educational" gathering. It was a political rally called by the Reuther administration to mobilize and train new cadres of the union on the basis of the kind of left-wingish, left-laborite ideology characteristic of Reutherism as a special current in the labor movement.

While he was unable to grapple with the immediate political issue of the day, Reuther repeated his long-term political objective: for the unification of all "liberals" into a single political party, with a really progressive social program; in a party with integrity, which would carry out its program if elected and would give the people a real choice between progress and reaction.

The conference agenda seemed especially designed to show the delegates that such a realignment was possible and to show in practice that a whole new popular movement was possible. Here among the speakers, answering the questions of UAW members, were senators, scientists, teachers, economists, and labor leaders. All seemed to share the same social aspirations, to work for the same brave new world. Why can't we all get together? ... this seemed the lesson of the conference.

CLIMATE CHANGED

Undoubtedly, many elements of illusion still persist or are first being stimulated in the minds of workers who are getting their first political lessons. Many years of political activity and class struggle may be necessary before the liberalism of these liberals is fully tested. That is for tomorrow. What is important for today is the continuing existence,

with all its illusions, of this tendency in the American labor movement.

The rank-and-file spirit, so characteristic of UAW gatherings in the past, was not evident here. There were no caucus meetings; no leaflets or handbills published by opposing groups; there were no demonstrations; no heated debates. Rank-and-file democracy is undoubtedly weaker and the official stronger and more permanent. With the exception of a small disintegrating, oppositional group, Reuther has succeeded in uniting the active cadres around him, by convincing some and compromising with others.

The old militants, the vociferous and ostentatious men who sparked Reuther's rise to power and who were the leaders and fighters during the days of the fight against the no-strike pledge have been drawn into the paid, appointed officialdom and their outlook changes from that of the militant in the shop to that of the well-paid responsible official. They find no important reason for criticizing the top leadership and they don't intend to risk their security for the sake of what they consider unimportant criticisms.

INTEREST HIGH

In this respect, the UAW has changed. The crumbling away of the old lively caucus life, so necessary to vigorous union democracy, is a great loss. Nevertheless, the delegates at this conference displayed a keen concern with and interest in problems of society far more to be expected in a political party or tendency than in a union movement.

The hall was jammed from early morning until late evening as the delegates participated in discussions or listened to speakers. And when the official sessions were over, hundreds of delegates went to special panels lasting until after midnight. It was a political conference as much or more than a union gathering. And this increasing political awareness is a distinct gain.

The Reuther tendency begins to face irritating internal problems. The top UAW leadership is not uniformly radical, in its outlook and includes men who sneer at attempts to broaden the union's perspective. Hundreds of thousands of workers have joined the union without knowledge or feeling for its heroic and militant past; many of the shop leaders who rose with the union from its early sit-in days are now full-time officials, removed from the shops and no longer in daily face-to-face contact with the rank and file.

The Reutherites, properly so-

called, those who are imbued with the leftist social outlook of Reutherism, now feel themselves to be a thin upper strata in a big mass union whose membership reflects all the social views found in American life. Research director Nat Weinberg told the conference that the international office in Detroit maps out many fine plans only to find that they are somehow lost before reaching the shop level. Meanwhile, the conservative pressures of the cold war build up and the reactionary winds of McCarthyism blow throughout the country and into the union.

ON THE TIGHT-ROPE

The Reutherites begin to walk a tightrope. Serious efforts are made to build a progressive cadre in the union that can withstand these pressures—as witness this conference. But at the same time the administration feels the pressures itself and begins to meet conservatism inside and outside the union half-way by yielding partially to it. Witness: the failure of the top leadership to carry on a political campaign against the House Un-American Committee when it came to Detroit recently and the hasty search for respectability by placing an administrator-ship over Ford Local 600.

The conference was likewise pulled in two different directions on this same question. McCarthy was the most unpopular name of the week in Cleveland. One of the invited guests was Senator Benton of Connecticut, the man who is trying to unseat McCarthy from the Senate. That alone guaranteed open season on that reactionary demagogue. Yet, with one honorable exception, not once at the whole conference was a clear-cut, forthright stand taken for the civil rights of all political views, including Communists.

ONE COURAGEOUS VOICE

Senator Humphrey of Minnesota, another invited speaker, climbed all over the anti-McCarthy bandwagon. (He, by the way, had voted in the Senate for the Kilgore concentration-camp proposal but no one was so impolite as to query him on this score.) His clinching argument: I have the greatest respect for the FBI; let this efficient organization of experts handle the Communist problem, not inept, bungling amateurs like McCarthy.

It remained for one courageous old man, frail in body, conservative in social views but vigorous and youthful in his loyalty to democratic principles: to make the most inspiring speech of the conference. Speaking for over an hour and a half on civil rights, Zech-

ariah Chafee, university professor of law at Harvard University, gave the UAW its first real lesson in the meaning of democracy.

He spoke of the wave of fear and hysteria that was threatening to swamp American democracy and called for courage and integrity in upholding the rights of all; he denounced and ridiculed the loyalty procedures and star-chamber processes instituted by the administration in Washington; he excoriated the spy and stoolpigeon methods of the FBI. "What do we have to fear from the ideas of Communism?" he asked over and over again. "If we can't be the land of the free," he said, "then let us at least be the home of the brave." He spoke ironically of the trend toward a one-party system in the United States around "the American party with the American party line," while, as in Stalinland, any deviation from this party line is now on a par with treason.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to quote at length because this was the only speech not released in full by the conference organizers; only an inadequate and skimpy summary is available.

OUTRUNNER CURBED

Walter Reuther must have been somewhat embarrassed, perhaps because the conduct of this old man was so different from his own reaction to the visit of the House committee. At any rate, when Chafee finished, Reuther, chairman of the session, felt compelled to make a brief speech, de-

fensive in tone, irrelevant and disjointed, in which he again justified the expulsion of the CP-controlled unions from the CIO and assured the delegates that the UAW fought the Stalinists just as hard as it fought McCarthy.

Some of the Reutherites a few rungs lower seem anxious to run ahead of their leader in an over-zealous haste to take cover in a respectable orthodoxy. Leonard Woodcock is a case in point. On Friday afternoon he was asked: "Don't you think there ought to be a political realignment in the U. S. through the formation of a new party?" His reply was startling. No, he replied while distorting the question, he was against taking the "barren road" to a labor party. Furthermore, he felt the union had to work through the existing political institutions, the two-party system.

On Saturday afternoon, the session was sprinkled with questions, all along the same line, directed this time to Senators Benton, Morse and Humphrey. Needless to say, none of them noticed any real need for a new political setup. Morse thought that if all the liberals were in one party and all the conservatives in the other, it would cause class conflict and class-consciousness and that isn't the American way.

Much to Woodcock's dismay, Reuther, again chairman, was impelled to make his most vigorous speech of the conference, restating again the position of the UAW for a "new political realignment."

FBI Stoolpigeons — —

(Continued from page 3)

"Frankly, I never paid any attention to anything read or said in the Communist Party meetings unless in my opinion it expressed danger to the United States."

Thus, Werbe appears to wish himself known as even pathetically naive about the CP although he was active in the party for years—naive but patriotic, anxious to defend his government. But he was a paid informer "who joined the Communist Party in 1944" at the suggestion of the FBI, a job which supplemented his income as typewriter salesman and repairman.

Werbe testified April 1 that a "left-wing" Stalinist was thrown out of the CP for "left-sectarianism," for advocating revolution. This piece of testimony was cleverly exploited by defense attorney

Margolis in order to prove the CP is so reformist and conservative that it expels those members who advocate violent action. The government tactics and the use of the sedition act leaves the CP little recourse and justifies, perhaps, its attempt to palm itself off as a left liberal group.

Margolis read an article to the court from *Political Affairs*, Stalinist journal, which attacked "those who voiced revolutionary proposals to the left of the party." Werbe, declared the *Mirror* (April 1), said "he hadn't read it, echoing his previous statement that he never read any of the Communist Party literature, never knew what it was about and hoped to God he never found out."

Werbe may rank as the first stoolpigeon to come into the court with the boast that he didn't know what it was all about.

The Basic Problem of the Polish Anti-Stalinist Resistance — —

(Continued from page 6)

ard of living than that in the lost eastern territories of Volynia, Polesia and Lithuania, even though Poland as a whole suffers from Russian exploitation. It will be very difficult to make the industrial and general economic development of Poland recede back to pre-war standards.

MAKING IT EASY FOR MOSCOW

It appears that the vanguard of the American-European army, in a war with Russia, will be the German army

—that is, the same army, as far as the Polish people are concerned, which invaded Poland and left the memory of horrors and gas chambers, of Tremblinka, Oswiecim (Auschwitz), Majdanek, etc. How can the Polish soldiers under Rokossovsky or those abroad, how can the Polish workers and peasants, be expected to help these invaders, their former hangmen? How can the Poles be expected to help the German army, which will invade their national territory as the bearers of a new partition of the country, of retrogression in economic and industrial development, of a new annexation and of a new domination of East Europe by German imperialism?

Yes, indeed, the Kremlin will have a very easy task in Poland, with powerful means to convince the Polish workers, peasants and soldiers to fight in "defense of the socialist conquests, in defense of national integrity and liberty"—against the German spearhead of the Allied invasion. For the "democracies" offer the Polish people only a new partition, a new subjugation, a new capitalist restoration, a new retrogression; and all this in exchange for a very dubious article, the "free democratic life" as it is to be instituted by the conquerors.

All the tendencies of the Polish political emigration are likely to support American bourgeois policy in its struggle against Russia, but this policy is very dubious and problematical as far as the Polish workers and peasants in the country are concerned.

A free and independent Poland can exist, and the Polish people can live freely and decently, only in a free socialist Europe, in a United Socialist States of Europe.

Only the working-class movement, the working class of the U. S., Britain and continental Europe, can ensure this future for the Polish people. Only in the name of a

Readers:

Send in your

MAY DAY GREETINGS

for Labor Action

Your personal greetings on May Day belong in the May Day issue of LABOR ACTION.

Greetings must be in our hands not later than Tuesday, April 22.

They're \$2.00 per column-inch for your own box. Individual-name greetings are \$1.00.

Send text for greetings, accompanied by payment, to: Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Socialism in America

A Reply to Recent Writings of Sidney Hook, Daniel Bell and Will Herberg

Irving Howe

Co-author, *The UAW* and *Walter Reuther* Author, *Sherwood Anderson*

THURSDAY, MAY 1 at 8:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Steel Union to Maintain Pressure on Truman

By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, April 12—With the steel mills in government hands as this is written, the steel union is continuing a resolute policy of steady pressure on the industry and the president. As the smoke from Truman's seizure order began to clear away, the union's policy committee again threatened to strike, even against the government, by loudly stating that the time for a settlement was long overdue and that their patience was not inexhaustible. The obvious strategy for the union is to push for a contract with the government in which the union will receive the WSB package. (This is how the mine workers got the welfare fund—in a contract sign-

ed with the government while the government was in control of the mines.) The threat of this may be enough to get the companies to give in first.

The rank-and-file steel workers showed their readiness to fight by jumping the strike deadline of April 8, in some cases by several days.

At the same time, the strikers were pleased by the government seizure order. First, it seemed to side with the union, and secondly, it held out the possibility of the union's winning without a costly strike.

POTENTIAL TRAP

Actually, however, aside from the moral support of Truman's speech, government seizure is no gain for the workers. Its effect is not much different from a Taft-Hartley injunction. Formally, management is in the hands of

the arch-conservative millionaire secretary of commerce, Charles Sawyer; actual management rests with the steel barons, the same as before; the corporations keep their profits, the same as before; and the union works for the terms of the old contract, the same as before. Obviously, this is a potential trap, as the railroad workers well know—they have been in such a dilemma now for several years under a similar government seizure. Obviously the union should bring every bit of pressure to bear for a new contract either from the government or from the companies.

In the meantime, President Truman and the Democratic Party are deep in their regular election-year pro-labor act. As in 1948, the tired and corruption-ridden Fair Deal is offering the labor movement and the liberals demagogic "drive the money-changers out of the temple" oratory. This is supposed to cover up for Truman's complicity in injunctions against the railroad workers and the miners, for his role in the witchhunt, for his aid to Franco, for his role in launching the Korean war, for his inactivity on the mounting racial terror in the nation, and a host of other crimes against democracy and progress.

STILL ON THE SPOT

But there is no doubt that the seizure speech was an astute political move. As one Pittsburgh newspaper commentator observed, Truman's speech chastising the steel industry made ten million votes for the Democrats, and the reply the next night by Inland

Steel Corporation President Clarence Randall made ten million more votes for the Democrats.

Nevertheless, Truman is still on the spot. Both sides in the dispute are still unhappy. Sooner or later, Truman will have either to sign a contract with the union which meets its demands, or else face a strike and the loss of what political capital he has won. The union is aware of this, and is being very guarded in praising Truman until the dispute is actually won. The capitalist press has tried to make a big issue of the fact that Steelworker Secretary-Treasurer David J. McDonald referred to Truman as "rather friendly" at the recent Pennsylvania State CIO convention. Actually, McDonald was reserved—as the term "rather friendly" indicates—and that has been the line of the union, at least for the present.

In the meantime, the arrogant steel barons must be finally realizing that they have been conducting themselves stupidly. They were not satisfied with enormous profits; they were not satisfied with an administration which has worked hard to make them masters of the entire globe. The Democratic administration depends for office on paying lip service to reform and granting a few crumbs to labor and the people generally. The steel barons tried to smash even this harmless (to them) administration by insisting on further inflation, which would only hurt the party in office. The Democrats were aware that the steel industry's political maneuvers were aimed at the administration as well as the labor movement. Therefore, Truman and his ad-

visors fought back by laying the blame for inflation where it belongs—at the feet of the greedy magnates—and by seizing the industry.

SUN STILL RISES

After a double tantrum—first, after Wilson's dismissal, and again after the seizure—cooler heads can be expected to finally prevail in industry councils.

For one thing, there is the threat of the government's making a contract with the union. The industry fears this precedent. Even more fearsome to them is the example of even temporary nationalization of the mills. These gentlemen would like the public to believe that the sun would stop in the heavens if American industry were nationalized. So far, the sun is still on schedule, and they don't like it.

During the 1949 steel strike, James Gerard, a large United States Steel stockholder who has lived much in Europe and therefore has a higher political I.Q. than the average American capitalist, read a lecture to Fairless, Gerard sided with the union during the 1949 strike. He told Fairless that the union's demands were really very moderate; that the company could well afford to pay them; and that Fairless should be thankful that he was dealing with a man like Murray, who only wanted a raise once in a while, instead of with labor leaders who wanted not a raise but the steel mills themselves, lock stock and barrel. It seems likely that men like this will now make themselves heard in industry councils, and that a contract will be signed shortly.

A Letter to the Detroit News By UAW's Education Director

The following, reprinted from the Reading Labor Advocate for April 11 is a letter sent by the educational director of the UAW-CIO, Brendan Sexton, to the Detroit News, in connection with the anti-Communist hysteria aroused in that city by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Labor Advocate notes that the letter "was not published in Detroit but has had a wide circulation elsewhere." —Ed.

To the Editor of the Detroit News:

I can't see that the cause of American Democracy is served by the discharge of an artist on the News, a fourth row fiddler in the Detroit Symphony Orchestra, an art teacher by the Superintendent of Schools, nor an undergraduate at Wayne University.

Some of these people probably are Communists, but none of them, so far as has been shown publicly, has been convicted as such. I suppose that it is regarded as trite to say so, but all of us in this country are still presumed innocent of any crime alleged against us until we are proved guilty.

This, of course, is one of the essential and crucial differences between us and the unfortunate people who live in countries under Soviet domination.

And if these people were convicted of being members of the Communist Party, would it follow therefrom that they should be discharged from their jobs? No rational person, having any knowledge of the activities of the Communists, could argue that the government does not have the right to secure the discharge of all such people from so-called "sensitive" positions, but does it follow that they should be denied an opportunity to earn a living? That "cruel and inhuman penalties shall not be imposed upon any accused" is provided in Article VIII of the Constitution. Certainly it seems to me that to deny a man the right to earn a living is about as cruel and brutal a penalty as can be imposed. And if there is a dependent family involved, it means, furthermore, that the penalty has been imposed upon altogether innocent and defenseless people.

The belief that a person alleged to be a Communist ought to be discharged from his job, which now seems to gain frighteningly widespread acceptance, has a logic which seems to me abysmally cruel. For this is to say, without bringing the question out in the open, that they are to be condemned to starve. I think that by inflicting such a penalty upon these people we reduce ourselves to their level, and to the level of their Soviet masters.

Furthermore, are we not, by adopting this policy, ruling out all possibility of reform, of any chance that these people will change their minds? We know that tens of thousands of our fellow Americans have joined the Communist Party only to regret their act in later years. Why assume these few to be different? Why do we glorify a Budenz, who sat in the top councils of the party for years as a member of the inner circle, and who necessarily must have been involved in the most awful machinations of the party, while we at the same time condemn to starvation a few still loyal followers, of whom the worst that can be said is that they are nasty, bad-mannered, stupid, and misguided. Certainly I don't think that any of us is naive enough to believe that the kind of underlings who were turned up in Detroit are taken into the confidence of the top party leaders and the organizers of the Soviet espionage system, as a person of Budenz's importance must have been.

I may not recall his precise words, but I remember the sense of Bishop Fulton Sheen's very wonderful moral axiom regarding treatment of Communists, which went, "I hate Communism, but I love the Communists." It would seem to me that we can remain clean and decent in this very difficult situation only if we try to live according to the kind of moral code that is so beautifully set forth in those few words. In the present situation, this would mean specifically that we wouldn't harry alleged Communists off their jobs, even though their presence be wholly obnoxious.

Brendan SEXTON

An Encyclopedia of Current Politics . . .

That describes the

BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION

Still available for the years 1945 to 1950

\$3.00 a volume

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

Yes, Nationalize—

(Continued from page 1)

dustries, sent telegrams to the owners of the steel companies informing them that the government was operating the companies. The presidents of the companies were ordered to continue to operate the companies on behalf of the government! The U. S. flag was ordered flown over the plants—in some cases, this was no change, either. The strike of the steel workers' union was called off, and the disputants were ordered to continue to negotiate. As we write, negotiations after seizure have been broken off. It is not known what the course of the government will be. Truman and Sawyer indicated no changes would be made in the wage rates and conditions of work so long as negotiations were in progress. So far, at least, the seizure has added nothing tangible to the pocket-books of the steel workers. They have given up their effective weapon, the strike, honoring the tradition that "you don't strike against the government." Steel production, with concomitant profits and dividends, continues, without an increase in wages or betterment of conditions.

As we write, negotiations after seizure have been broken off. It is not known what the course of the government will be. Truman and Sawyer indicated no changes would be made in the wage rates and conditions of work so long as negotiations were in progress. So far, at least, the seizure has added nothing tangible to the pocket-books of the steel workers. They have given up their effective weapon, the strike, honoring the tradition that "you don't strike against the government." Steel production, with concomitant profits and dividends, continues, without an increase in wages or betterment of conditions.

As we write, negotiations after seizure have been broken off. It is not known what the course of the government will be. Truman and Sawyer indicated no changes would be made in the wage rates and conditions of work so long as negotiations were in progress. So far, at least, the seizure has added nothing tangible to the pocket-books of the steel workers. They have given up their effective weapon, the strike, honoring the tradition that "you don't strike against the government." Steel production, with concomitant profits and dividends, continues, without an increase in wages or betterment of conditions.

RULE-OR-RUIN POLICY

The hue and cry about "seizure and socialism" serves to camouflage the attitude and position of the steel companies. This was detailed neatly in Truman's seizure message. Truman is promoter not of class warfare but of the political fortunes of the Democratic Party, and a particularly keen promoter of them in this election year. Yet so incredibly selfish, arrogant, greedy, contemptuous and contemptible is the attitude of the industrial barony that bilks the nation that the simple recitation of the facts in the steel case was enough to bring their combined wrath down upon him.

The facts showed that the profits in steel were higher than ever before; that the wage increases could be easily absorbed out of profits without raising the price of steel, that the steel owners were

ready to provoke a strike; that the union had been patient and modest in its demands; that the owners had used a rule-or-ruin policy.

The seizure carried out by the government is of a pattern with previous emergency seizures; it is not without precedent, as claimed by the propagandists of the steel industry. Truman has urged again and again that he wants the disputants, industry and labor, to bargain collectively. He does not want to "hold" the industries a minute longer than necessary. Sawyer holds them reluctantly altogether. While the steel workers have an extremely strong case, and their demands come at an opportune time, and while the president has been outspoken in their favor, this resort to government seizure is by no means any kind of automatic guarantee that their demands will be met.

STEEL'S WEAPONS

In the case of the seizure of the mines in 1946, the government did make a contract essentially embodying the miners' demands, which then subsequently had to be ratified by the mine owners when they resumed legal control. However, the railroads have been functioning under government seizure since August 1950 and have still not yet solved their major disputes, including the union shop for nineteen non-operating groups and pay raises for three operating unions.

If the government were to enter into favorable contract with the steel workers while the seizure was in effect, there is evidence to indicate that the steel companies would engage in long, costly litigation of dubious outcome to challenge such procedure. There is also precedent for the companies to sue the government and recover funds, at the taxpayers' expense, for the period of government operation.

There are also indications of further compromises, on both the wage and price sides, in continuing negotiations under govern-

ment seizure. Price allowances higher than the liberal stabilization formula allowed were hinted at, as was also a longer-term contract for the union.

Continuation of essential ownership, profits, dividends; delay and compromise on union demands—this is the seizure that is supposed to equal socialism.

IT COULD BE DONE

Yet the steel propagandists do mean something in all their shouting about "socialism." What do they fear in the "simple twist of the presidential wrist" that puts a basic industry in government hands? What is behind their apprehensive talk of more and more seizures? One business magazine looks ahead to the period of layoffs and paycuts, when it predicts that the real test of "seizure-socializations" will come.

If seizure is not socialism or nationalization, it shows how the government could REALLY nationalize industry, and substitute democratic ownership and control for the present greedy clique that puts its own interests ahead of those of the people.

The seizure points up the failure of the steel industry, on its own, to satisfy the needs and demands of its workers and consumers. Why, then, should it be left in the hands of profiteers? Why not nationalize it and run it in the public interest? The government has had to intervene in industry, particularly steel, every step of the way, and the steel moguls have never responded voluntarily to public interest. At one period it was over-capitalized and charging it off to the taxpayer. It expanded for war production only on the basis of guaranteed contracts and cost-plus. Now it threatens to shut down rather than give its workers a minimum decent standard. What function in the public interest do the steel owners exercise properly?

Steel, the basic industry of the country, should be a "public utility," run without profit, for the benefit of all, for the steel barons have shown that they cannot handle it properly.