

Work for a Workers World;
Join the Workers Party!

LABOR ACTION

DECEMBER 1, 1947

A PAPER IN THE INTERESTS OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

General Finds Way to Turn Brass Into Gold

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Under other conditions Howard Hughes' latest production might have been funny. The multi-million dollar flying-boat which was not intended to fly anyway; Maj. Gen. Meyers with his \$4,000,000 in government bonds—and not even the excuse that the Little People slipped them under his pillow at night; the \$150,000 to be used to buy off the Catholic Legion of Decency so as to permit the exhibition of Jane Russell in the greatest bosom picture of all time—it all could have been sure-fire stuff, good for real belly laughs.

It could have been . . .

But the memory of the freighter somberly decked with blackened laurel leaves which pulled into New York harbor last month is still too fresh. Stacked in the holds, without dignity, were the coffins containing the bodies of hundreds of sons of the people who died miserably in the war, solely to permit Hughes and his friends to amass millions . . . to defile everything they touched.

To these men Noah Dietrich, executive vice-president of the Hughes' interests, compared the two-star scoundrel Meyers. "I don't think the man knows right from wrong," Dietrich said. "I think he is a war casualty." They defile everything, even the memory of the dead.

WHO IS MEYERS?

Who is Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, the current leading figure in the senate war investigating committee probe into wartime graft? He is not small fry. He was no less than deputy chief of air force procurement. He had a hand in the purchase of billions of dollars of air force material. It was a skilled hand. It was so skilled, in fact, that he was able to do what the alchemists used to go mad dreaming about—change his brass into gold.

What has this model exponent of the free enterprise system (the accent is on the "free") been accused of? Enough for the "retired," which follows his name to take on real meaning. Testimony at the hearing revealed the following:

1. That in 1941 Meyers pulled down \$28,000 from an aviation equipment firm of which he was the ghost owner. In his more earthly embodiment as an army officer he diverted Bell Aircraft contracts to his firm, raising the unit price of the fuse boxes his firm was supplying from \$11 to a less ectoplasmic \$44. Where Meyers got the money to create the firm in the first instance has not been revealed. It can be safely assumed that it wasn't through baby-sitting.

2. That during the war Meyers purchased \$4,000,000 in war bonds on margin. Just where the money originated for this operation also has not been made clear.

3. That in 1940 Meyers in his own name purchased \$1,000 of Republic Aviation Corporation stock for that shield and buckler of democracy, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, retired chief of staff of the air forces. This stock increased tremendously in value during the war as a result of the receipt of government contracts. That there is any necessary causal connection between these two facts is, of course, subversive propaganda.

4. That, according to Hughes, Meyers gave the Hughes recon plane a low priority number out of pique at Hughes' refusal to loan Meyers \$250,000 for the purchase of \$10,000,000 in war bonds on margin.

5. That Meyers similarly pressured Hughes for a loan to buy a trick bicycle factory in California. This bicycle was apparently specially designed for politicians, capitalists and ex-army officers to back-pedal at any moment during congressional investigations.

6. That during the time he was an air force procurement officer Meyers or his wife had large holdings in aircraft corporations with which Meyers dealt. This fact was hidden by Meyers at the time.

MEYERS' ACCUSATIONS

Meyers while on the witness stand made a number of accusations which in turn are not without interest:

He stated that Hughes had offered him a \$250,000 "loan" while Hughes' recon plane was under consideration by the air forces.

He asserted that before entering into the war bond deals he had obliquely consulted no less eminent persons than Henry Morganthau, jr., then secretary of the treasury, and Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board of governors of the federal reserve system.

He asserted that Hughes had

authorized him to offer what rude people might call a bribe if he could fix it with the New York City administration to permit the showing of Hughes' love-amid-the-hay opus, "The Outlaw."

He stated, further, that Hughes (for obvious favors to be derived) had offered him a job during the war and that he had recently offered him a \$20,000 a year "part-time" job to act as Hughes' Washington and Dayton representative, in which capacity he could capitalize on what are, in view of the evidence, his ample connections.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH?

In the filth of party girls, lies, normal capitalist business practices, corrupt army officers, greed, politics, waste, commercial friendships, lavish entertainment, and the breathless lust for money which envelops the Hughes case it is difficult to know where lies end and truth begins. The safest assumption, and the most probable one, is that all are guilty.

The labor movement and such veterans' organizations as the AVC should raise a storm of protest, demanding a full investigation of wartime corruption. The timid researches already made reveal muddy tracks leading to the officers of high-tech personages in political and military life.

When recent investigations bring to light names like those of representative May, Chairman, no less, of the house military affairs committee, Ira Eaker, chief of staff for the air forces during the war, Henry Morganthau, jr., former secretary of the treasury, Marriner S. Eccles of the federal reserve system, Howard S. Hughes, Mayor O'Dwyer of New York City, Elliott Roosevelt, and scores of others, the time is long overdue for smoking out the patriotic scoundrels who infest the government. Let's see who their friends are and the ramifications in industry and politics that their cupidity involves.

PRESSURE BEING EXERTED

Strong pressures are being exerted. Congressmen have pointed out, to hush the scandal up. For the army to protect its buddies is only natural. After all, for them it is not as if Meyers had been caught cheating at cards, stealing another officer's liquor, or fraternizing with enlisted men. For the capitalists the reasons for glossing over revelations are more potent—they reveal too much about the normal functioning of the capitalist system.

These are the scoundrels who piled up wealth while young men were dying in fear and pain all over the world!

These were the gods who disposed of our fates during the war and before whom we were forced to abase ourselves.

These were the curs who yapped at the unions during the war for trying to maintain a decent standard of living!

These are the stainless crusaders of a holy war against Russia!

Let the curses and cries of shame of an outraged working class fall upon them!

Investigate the United States war criminals!

By DAVID COOLIDGE

In last week's issue of LABOR ACTION, in discussing the United Automobile Workers (CIO) convention, we concentrated on the defeat of the Stalinist-Addes-Thomas-Leonard faction. This was the decisive question before this convention. Its importance cannot be stressed too much. There can be no compromise on the question of Stalinism, Stalinist burrowing in the labor movement, Stalinist posing before the working class as militant, and the sly and demagogic pretensions of the Stalinists that they are the defenders of democracy in the trade unions.

This question is important in connection with the UAW and its recent convention. We have discussed some aspects of the situation in previous articles. Right now we are interested in an adverse criticism which was made of the Reuther procedure at the convention in connection with the holding of the elections. It is charged by some that when the Reuther faction moved the elections from Thursday to Tuesday, this was done in order to center the convention on the elections and to forestall discussion

Real Price Control, Wage Raises Rest on Aggressive Labor Action!

CIO Members Quit Detroit Rent Board

By M. EVANS

DETROIT—The local Detroit Rent Advisory Board is preparing to decontrol all rents in the city of Detroit. They plan to decontrol rents on units of three rooms or more occupied by single persons as a first step toward boosting rents sky-high.

This will not relieve the housing shortage in Detroit, as they claim. The landlords have given no evidence to prove this claim. It will only relieve families of their present housing. Families will be evicted wholesale to make way for single tenants so that landlords can legally raise rents.

The local "Decontrol" Board is preparing to have a hearing of the tenants' position on this resolution. When it is going to take place nobody knows—except the "Decontrol Board."

RESIGN FROM BOARD

On November 3, William G. Nicholas, UAW housing director and chairman of the Greater Detroit Tenants Council, Ernest Bennett, co-op and housing director of the Michigan State CIO Council, and Blaine Marrin of UAW Local 157, members of the Area Rent Advisory Board appointed by Governor Kim Sigler, resigned from the board as a public protest.

The CIO members of the board called it a "farce" and refused to lend the presence of the CIO to making the board appear to be a democratic, representative group for the city of Detroit. On the 33 man board appointed by Sigler there were THREE members in favor of rent control, all CIO representatives. There is not one real, genuine tenant on the board.

The AFL in this area has carried

(Continued on page 3)

Big Business Propaganda Campaign Plays Down Profits, Asks Tax Mercy

By SUSAN GREEN

General Electric buys space in all the major newspapers for full-page advertisements to "prove" how reasonable are its profits. David Lawrence, editor of that businessmen's magazine, the United States News, devotes his double-page editorial to a defense of the mountainous profits of industry and besides runs an article in the same issue of November 14 giving businessmen the "class line" on profits.

Business is getting ready for what it terms labor's demand for "the third round of wage increases." Labor leaders have stated that if the cost of living continues to rise, as everybody expects it will, workers will have to get more money. At the CIO convention, President Murray indicated that labor's attack will be

on the profits of industry now at an all-time peak. At the UAW convention, President Reuther took the same line. He said: "A year ago, the much-criticized—from business—Nathan report was wrong, and history and the facts that have developed since it was published prove that it was wrong. But it was not wrong on the side which the NAM said it was wrong on. Instead of American industry making \$15,000,000,000 in profits after taxation, American industry in the first half of 1947, on an annual basis, made \$17,500,000,000 in profits, after taxes—two and a half billions more than the CIO Nathan report said."

Industry is acting on the theory that the best defense sometimes is to take the offensive. It has mounted its money bags and begun to shoot—

to shoot propaganda into the eyes and ears of the public. Industry would like the public to believe that, with 1947 profits after taxes over twice those of the boom years 1929 and over three times the pre-war year 1939, the capitalists are more to be pitied than scorned, more to be thanked than attacked.

WEEP FOR THE RICH

First, of course, we are supposed to weep for the corporations because they pay such high taxes. Profits before taxes for 1947 will be \$28,200,000,000; the government will get \$11,200,000,000 in corporation taxes; the poor corporations will have left a mere \$17,000,000,000. Don't mention the fact that this \$17,000,000,000 net after taxes towers about the \$8,400,000,000 after taxes for 1929, way above the \$5,000,000,000 for 1939, and

even above the \$12,500,000,000 for 1946.

Naturally the capitalists would like to keep all of that \$28,200,000,000 profits before taxes. But isn't it their system that requires a national budget of between thirty and forty billions? Isn't it their government that spends the money mainly for the needs of the capitalist class? Isn't it capitalist imperialism that has made expensive militarism the order of the day? Indeed, the capitalist class is getting away with murder when it comes to taxes.

Of the total government revenue of around forty billion dollars, corporation taxes amount to a good deal less than a third. On the other hand, 96 per cent of individual taxpayers are in the income brackets below

(Continued on page 4)

Democrats, GOP Spar On Strategy

Prices are of deepest concern to the great majority of people. The issue of prices is a very concrete one. For most, it involves daily need and urgent demand; for most, it is not merely something to talk about come the next presidential elections.

This has to be said because we now run the danger of letting the issue be manipulated by the campaign strategists of the Tweedledee Democrats and the Tweedledum Republicans, without a single positive gain for us on the price front.

The press, GOP and Democratic leaders, all of them, agree that prices will be the key issue of the 1948 campaign—and that Truman's message to Congress was the opening gun in this campaign. Though it has been temporarily displaced in the top headlines by other news, it will be the number one domestic issue for a long time to come.

Our readers will remember that Truman asked Congress for authority to effect, in his own way and at his own time, a 10-point program, included in which were proposals for limited price control and rationing, and a wage freeze. We took this program apart last week, calling particular attention to the menace of wage freezing, and to the inadequacy of the price and rationing proposals. Our opinion that labor, and the people generally, stand to gain little from the Truman program, despite all the furor it engendered, is confirmed by the developments of the last week.

Truman's inflation recommendations are now before a joint Senate-House committee on economic affairs headed by Senator Taft. The committee will hold general hearings on the recommendations, then submit the component parts to various other special committees, banking, commerce, etc., for individual treatment. One thing this procedure is guaranteed to achieve: it will consume time.

CONCUR ON ERP

Meanwhile debate has begun on the floor of the Senate on Truman's request for \$597,000,000 in stop-gap relief (Emergency Relief Program, or ERP) for Europe. As we, and everybody else, predicted, the Republicans will not stand in the way of the European Relief Program, except possibly to delay it a bit and to try to extract a little party capital from it. The fact is that debate was opened with a speech by Senator Vandenberg, a Republican, calling for fast action.

Thus, it is fairly certain that Congress will pass the emergency appropriations sought under the Marshall

(Continued on page 4)

CONTINUING AN ANALYSIS OF THE UAW CONVENTION

There Cannot Be Any Compromise With Stalinism!

By DAVID COOLIDGE

In last week's issue of LABOR ACTION, in discussing the United Automobile Workers (CIO) convention, we concentrated on the defeat of the Stalinist-Addes-Thomas-Leonard faction. This was the decisive question before this convention. Its importance cannot be stressed too much. There can be no compromise on the question of Stalinism, Stalinist burrowing in the labor movement, Stalinist posing before the working class as militant, and the sly and demagogic pretensions of the Stalinists that they are the defenders of democracy in the trade unions.

This question is important in connection with the UAW and its recent convention. We have discussed some aspects of the situation in previous articles. Right now we are interested in an adverse criticism which was made of the Reuther procedure at the convention in connection with the holding of the elections. It is charged by some that when the Reuther faction moved the elections from Thursday to Tuesday, this was done in order to center the convention on the elections and to forestall discussion

by the delegates on "important" convention resolutions and discussions.

We believe that it was a mistake for the Reuther leadership and the delegates not to provide time in the convention for a thorough discussion on wages, the Marshall Plan and the vital question of political action. We believe that this could have been done; the time was there and the convention calendar could have been adjusted to meet this need. We believe further that Reuther was not anxious to have political action given an important place on the convention agenda.

The reasons for this are fairly obvious, or should be fairly obvious to anyone who has followed Reuther's career on this question. Reuther knows what is involved in any discussion of political action. He knows that it is not so easy today, after the passing of Roosevelt, "the friend of labor," to hold labor to the support of the Democratic Party, "the party of labor." It's not so easy to sell Truman to labor. No one in the CIO will attempt to sell Taft or Dewey. In other words, it is not easy to sell the Democratic or Republican Par-

ties to labor, or at least to the UAW. This is particularly difficult in face of the Taft-Hartley Act and in view of the fact that the convention voted to sign the "Communist Party" affidavits on recommendation of the Reuther leadership.

CANNOT BE SOLVED
ON MERE UNION LEVEL

The Taft-Hartley Act and the wages question are matters which could not have been discussed in the convention on a mere trade union level, but only at a political level. To talk at a political level means to talk in terms of political organization. Political organization now cannot mean the PAC with its all-out activity in behalf of the Democratic Party and Truman. Reuther knows that independent working class political action is involved in the matter of wages and wages in the matter of the Taft-Hartley Act.

He is not ready to make the leap to independent labor political action. He is not ready to break with Truman and what Truman represents. He is not ready to challenge Murray and make an issue of independent class politics. If the wages question or political action had come to the floor

of the convention, there were delegates present who would have related wages and defeat of the Taft-Hartley Act to political action and the formation of a Labor Party. Emil Mazy would have been forced into leadership on this issue because he is on record for a Labor Party. Reuther apparently wants to confine this discussion to the IEB for the present, and to the sporadic initiative of individuals in the various locals.

While all of this is true, there is something more to be said. We re-emphasize that the above are the real reasons why certain important and relevant matters did not get into the convention. But this was in no manner due to the fact that the elections took place on Tuesday instead of on Thursday. There was ample time after Tuesday and Wednesday for such discussion. Time was available on Thursday, Friday and Saturday for consideration of the wages and political action resolutions. Such procedure was indicated after the defeat of the Stalinist-Addes forces and the triumph of the Reuther forces. In fact it would have been better to have the main programmatic resolu-

tions come up after the Stalinist question had been disposed of. Those who do not understand this either underestimate the danger of Stalinism or they are spitting mere factional demagoguery.

COST OF STALINISM
TO LABOR MOVEMENT

It is interesting that the Addes-Thomas-Leonard faction did not raise this question. They too were willing to have the elections earlier than originally scheduled. They knew what everyone else knew: that after the long period of pre-convention conflict and after the struggle around the important issues which had occupied the membership before the convention, it would have been a farce to proceed as though there were nothing on the mind of the delegates except the usual matters which always come before trade union conventions. The reality is that the lines were tightly drawn and the delegates were primarily concerned with the question of who would assume leadership in the International: the Reuther faction or the Stalinist-Addes-Thomas-Leonard faction.

The situation in the UAW conven-

tion was just another instance of the cost of Stalinism to the labor movement. When the question of Stalinist control arises, the issue must be sharply drawn and an attempt made at settlement. In the interest of democratic trade unionism, the Stalinists must be defeated and defeated decisively. In practice this defeat must be in the form of a numerical majority against the Stalinists. Anyone who suggests or winks at compromise on this question is only aiding and abetting the Stalinists. This is not some mere abstraction, but stark reality. The membership of the UAW is beginning to learn these things in some elementary way. They have had adequate experience with the Stalinists and Stalinism.

It has been said that the delegates to the convention, in revolting against the Stalinists, were reacting to the "anti-red" wave which is passing over the country. In some degree this is correct. It is certainly true of the real reactionary elements in the Reuther caucus. It is true that there was a social-patriotic element in the anti-Stalinist opposition. It is true that

(Continued on page 2)



Analyzing the Results of the Auto Workers' Convention

There Can Be No Compromise With Totalitarian Stalinism --

(Continued from page 1)

Reuther himself is anything but free from this social-patriotic stigma. But to stop here is to leave out important facts in connection with Stalinism and also to leave out the paramount fact that the majority of the militants in the Reuther group reacted against Stalinism in a progressive way. It is they who will be dominant in the UAW and not the ACTU and other conservatives and reactionaries.

RELATION OF ACTU TO REUTHER CAUCUS

Right here is the place to discuss the relations between Reuther and the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU). It is either inexcusable ignorance or the most blatant factional-shysterism to attempt to make bed-fellows out of Reuther and the ACTU. They are bed-fellows of course in the sense that both support capitalism and both are practitioners of class collaboration. But everybody in the United States and in the world, except the Marxists, the revolutionary socialists, support capitalism and practice class collaboration. This includes Truman, Reuther, Lewis, Murray, Cardinal Spellman, Taft, du Pont, members of the ACTU, anti-ACTU militants, real red-baiters and non-red-baiters.

Where does this leave us? Firmly in mid-air. To leave the matter here settles nothing. We still know little about the concrete situation in relation to the ACTU and Reuther. What is relevant and significant has been ignored or obscured. This is not all. For to say that "Red-Baiters Sweep Convention," as did the Militant, the organ of the Socialist Workers Party, is in fact to say that the ACTU and its program was the dominant note in the convention; that the base and core of the Reuther caucus was red-baiting, and that by virtue of the victory of Reuther and the defeat of Addes, the UAW has now become the genuinely reactionary international in the CIO. This is what the Socialist Workers Party is attempting to establish. They will have some difficulty, for the brute facts do not support them. They are merely a defeated and discredited, hat-in-hand group of adventurers on the periphery of the Stalinist-Addes caucus.

What is primarily important is to establish correctly what the basic Reuther group is and how it is to be distinguished from the ACTU and from the Stalinists. In doing this we will demonstrate what is implicit in the "Reuther program" as related to capitalism, capitalist politics and support of either the Republican or Dem-

ocratic parties. Furthermore we can expose the contradictions in which Reuther is enmeshed.

To brand the "Reuther program" as a "red-baiting" program or the Reuther caucus as a "red-baiting" caucus because the ACTU is active there, is nonsense. The ACTU joined the Reuther caucus because this is the anti-Stalinist group in the union. There are militant workers in the ACTU but even they are in the Reuther caucus primarily because they too are anti-communist and anti-socialist. They are not mere red-baiters, but anti-reds; that is anti-communist, anti-socialist. They consider the Stalinists reds, that is, real socialists or communists. The ACTU is reactionary in a dual way; it is anti-socialist, while it at the same time helps spread the illusion that the "Communist Party," this totalitarian, GPU-dominated aggregation, is a genuine socialist party.

Herein lies the danger in the program of the ACTU. Being what it is, the organized expression of the Catholic Church in the labor movement, it must have the labor program of this church. The ACTU is, for the U. S. and under the conditions existing in the U. S., the same as the trade union movement organized by the Catholic Church for Catholic workers. In Europe, under different social and political conditions the Catholic Church splits the labor movement and establishes its own Catholic unions.

Is there any other affinity between Reuther and the ACTU except what we have mentioned? That is, both are anti-Stalinist and both support and adhere to class collaborationist policies. This is important but far from the whole story. Furthermore, even on the question of anti-Stalinism, there is a difference between them. Reuther knows that the Stalinists are not "reds." He knows they are not socialists or communists. He knows that politically they are totalitarian and he knows the difference between socialism and totalitarianism.

PROGRAMS ESTABLISH REAL DIFFERENCES

The important and relevant distinction between Reuther, the Reuther militants and the ACTU is what is implicit in the "Reuther program" and what is explicit in the ACTU Catholic Church program. These two programs are dissimilar and antagonistic. They will lead to conflict between Reuther and the ACTU. Implicit in the "Reuther program" is class struggle, the class organization of labor along political lines and for

independent working class political action. The "Reuther program" has revolutionary implications while the ACTU program has reactionary implications. The "Reuther program" tends away from class collaboration, while that of the ACTU program stands implicitly and explicitly, either for the perpetuation of class collaboration or for the recrudescence of the reactionary medieval political and economic notions of the Catholic Church.

These notions are and will remain in conflict with the interests of the working class. The hope for breaking large sections of Catholic workers away from the ACTU lies just here: in their coming to understand that this organization, for the reasons given, cannot play a progressive role in the labor movement.

These are the considerations which are relevant in any discussion of the relation of Reuther to the ACTU. That there are militant workers in the ACTU goes without argument. We know this. So long, however, as they adhere to the priest-controlled ACTU, they are captives and can go no further than "militant" action on the picket line.

The "Reuther program" is in contrast to the program of the ACTU. That is what is decisive in the first instance. The Workers Party member will function therefore in the Reuther caucus but he will not function in the ACTU. We will chastise Reuther for his wavering, for his vacillation, for his class collaboration. We will give no political support to Reuther. We will function in the Reuther caucus because it is the progressive group in the UAW. We will ignore or oppose openly Reuther's nonsense about "outside interference" in the UAW, just as we will ignore or oppose Murray's nonsense on the same subject. The Workers Party will function in the UAW or anywhere else in the labor movement for the propagation of revolutionary socialist ideas and a socialist program for the labor movement. We do not hide this now, just as we have never concealed it.

WHOM DOES SWP POSITION SERVE? We have referred more than once to the position and activities of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and its paper, The Militant, in connection with the UAW and the convention. It is necessary to resume this discussion. In an article by Art Preis, in The Militant for November 24, the SWP continues its attack on Reuther and his conduct of the convention. We see nothing wrong in attacking Reuther. He needs to be attacked but the attack of the SWP is reactionary. Their attack on Reuther is in defense of Stalinism and the Stalinist party. In the attack the SWP resorts to distortion, falsification, omission and the pettiest sort of factionalism. We will examine the Preis articles point by point. Preis writes that he was denied a place at the press table. This is difficult to believe. We are of the opinion that no member of the SWP wanted to be at the press table; it might prove embarrassing to explain, to the variegated group of correspondents seated there, what was the motivation of the SWP for its UAW position. Preis might have asked questions about whether the SWP participated in the editing of "FDR," the fifth sheet put out by the Stalinist-Addes-Thomas-Leonard faction. There were other questions which might have come up for discussion and which would have been embarrassing to Preis. Also, it is necessary to ask why Preis did not appeal to the leader of his faction to intervene and get him a press badge? Does he really believe that Addes, who had some control over press badges, could not secure one for him? And where were vice president Thomas and delegate Paul Silver? Could they do nothing?

THE REUTHER RESOLUTION ON THE SAME POINT

"RESOLVED: That we affirm the position of the International Executive Board requiring 'protective clauses' in all of our contracts to safeguard our membership against lawsuits by employers. . . . As we said above, both groups dodged the real question: the matter of independent political action as a means of defeating the Taft-Hartley Act. Reuther put the question on a purely practical basis; the Addes faction took a purely demagogic and eleventh hour factional position. And what was the courageous fight of Thomas—the same Thomas who supported the war and the no-strike pledge? Let Thomas answer from his 'courageous' convention speech. 'Look, fellow delegates, I signed a loyalty pledge during the war when I was appointed by President Roosevelt to the War Labor Board, but I signed that pledge because management sitting across the table from me also had to sign it.' This is enough on Thomas.

Preis remarks that there were fewer Negro delegates than at former conventions. He writes: "This reflected the growing conservative mood in the UAW." How? Preis does not say. He also does not report that the majority of these Negro delegates were in the Reuther caucus. He also does not report in his diatribe, on the "hand-picked" Reuther slate for trustees, that one of them was a Negro who was elected for the two-year term. He also does not tell The Militant readers that the Negro delegates were not fooled by the fake efforts of the Stalinist, Tappes, to secure the vice-presidency as a representative of the Negroes. He also does not tell his readers that the spokesman for the Reuther group on the resolutions was a Negro, Abner from Chicago. He fails also to mention that in the main speech by Abner, on the affidavits question, the Stalinist-Addes position was cut to shreds. Abner reminded the Addes group that they had supported the NAM in 1943. . . . I remember when the work or jail bill was up, who was it who wanted to sell out our union then? Some of the ones here who are crying 'We are militant!'"

Preis does not relate that after Reuther's father had congratulated the UAW for its militant non-discrimination stand, it was a white delegate from Atlanta, Ga., who made the motion that Reuther, Sr., be made a lifetime honorary member of the UAW.

had voted in the IEB to sign the affidavits. Why did the Addes group decide to switch from their vote for in the IEB to against at the convention? Furthermore, what was the difference in the two resolutions on the Taft-Hartley Act and the signing of the affidavits? There was no difference except the bare fact that one resolution was for signing and the other against.

There was no difference between them on how to fight the act—which is now the question. This is important for the reason that neither group had any effective answer to this problem. This can be demonstrated by quoting from the resolutions.

THE TWO RESOLUTIONS ON TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Here is a relevant section from the Addes-Thomas resolution:

"From this day forward we dedicate ourselves to the mission of obtaining a repudiation and forthright repeal of this infamous act and of the reactionary program of which it is a part. We will expose to the entire American people the reactionary forces which have produced this Act. We will bring our message not only to workers but to farmers, small businessmen and other groups whose economic welfare this Act threatens. We hereby dedicate our entire membership to work unceasingly in the political field in complete unity with all labor organizations and other progressive groups to insure the political repudiation of those reactionaries who are responsible for the Taft-Hartley Act. Be it further:

"RESOLVED: That this Eleventh Convention of the International Union, UAW-CIO, go on record to carry on a vigorous, militant and unceasing drive in the political field to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Be it further:

"RESOLVED: That our incoming officers and International Executive Board be directed to test the constitutionality of the Act and its respective parts while fighting for its repeal. Be it further:

"RESOLVED: That we use our full political strength to remove those congressmen from office who are responsible for the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. . . .

The Addes resolution: "RESOLVED: That to protect the financial status of our individual members, our locals and our International contracts be approved by Regional Directors or the International Executive Board unless such contracts exempt the local unions, the International Union, the union membership, the local officers, the Regional Directors and the International Officers from the union-busting liability provisions in the Law. Therefore, be it further . . ."

"RESOLVED: That we affirm the position of the International Executive Board requiring 'protective clauses' in all of our contracts to safeguard our membership against lawsuits by employers. . . .

As we said above, both groups dodged the real question: the matter of independent political action as a means of defeating the Taft-Hartley Act. Reuther put the question on a purely practical basis; the Addes faction took a purely demagogic and eleventh hour factional position. And what was the courageous fight of Thomas—the same Thomas who supported the war and the no-strike pledge? Let Thomas answer from his 'courageous' convention speech. 'Look, fellow delegates, I signed a loyalty pledge during the war when I was appointed by President Roosevelt to the War Labor Board, but I signed that pledge because management sitting across the table from me also had to sign it.' This is enough on Thomas.

Preis remarks that there were fewer Negro delegates than at former conventions. He writes: "This reflected the growing conservative mood in the UAW." How? Preis does not say. He also does not report that the majority of these Negro delegates were in the Reuther caucus. He also does not report in his diatribe, on the

"hand-picked" Reuther slate for trustees, that one of them was a Negro who was elected for the two-year term.

He also does not tell The Militant readers that the Negro delegates were not fooled by the fake efforts of the Stalinist, Tappes, to secure the vice-presidency as a representative of the Negroes. He also does not tell his readers that the spokesman for the Reuther group on the resolutions was a Negro, Abner from Chicago. He fails also to mention that in the main speech by Abner, on the affidavits question, the Stalinist-Addes position was cut to shreds. Abner reminded the Addes group that they had supported the NAM in 1943. . . . I remember when the work or jail bill was up, who was it who wanted to sell out our union then? Some of the ones here who are crying 'We are militant!'"

Preis does not relate that after Reuther's father had congratulated the UAW for its militant non-discrimination stand, it was a white delegate from Atlanta, Ga., who made the motion that Reuther, Sr., be made a lifetime honorary member of the UAW.

QUESTIONS TO PREIS ON POLITICAL ACTION

On the question of political action Preis says: "A minority of the committee, T. Ray Tucker of Flint Local 581, and Paul Silver, of Detroit Local 351, submitted a resolution calling for the UAW to initiate a program aimed at building a new national party of labor. The Reutherites were particularly anxious to keep this resolution from the delegates, because it could have exposed his pretense of political progressivism."

This is very interesting but not the whole story about this resolutions committee. What does Preis mean by "a minority of the committee?" The Reuther faction was a minority in the Resolutions Committee as it was in all the convention committees. We take it that he means a minority of the Addes majority in the committee. But there is an important question to be asked. Why did the Resolutions Committee fail to come out with a resolution on independent political action or any kind of political action. Why didn't Addes, Thomas or Leonard write a resolution for the committee? They were the leaders of the faction. They had a majority on the IEB. Thomas had bolted the faction on the affidavits in the IEB. Why didn't he write a resolution calling for a labor party? Why was this left to Tucker and Silver, mere nobodies in the faction? According to what Preis writes, it was only Reuther who was anxious to keep a labor party resolution out of the convention. We ask again, why was it that Addes' own resolutions committee had none?

Preis talks of "Reuther's steamroller methods." His whole piece is beginning to become merely ludicrous. Reuther had a caucus and Addes had a caucus. They both met and decided their strategy and tactics. It so happens that the Reuther caucus had more members than the Addes caucus. This means that Reuther had more votes in the convention than Addes. Reuther had a bigger faction. Surely a member of the SWP understands these things.

On the trustee election Preis says: "After the first two Reutherite nominees had been put over overwhelmingly. . . . What does he mean by 'put over'?" The Reuther faction had picked a slate for trustee. The slate was printed on a card. The delegates voted. Reuther had twice as many delegates as the Stalinist-Addes faction and the SWP combined. Does the SWP have any suggestions as to what Reuther should have done? Preis attempts to make a big point of the speeches made during the election of trustees, about "the steamroller," and the fact that the Reuther caucus had picked a slate for trustees. But who was making these speeches? The Reuther opposition.

Preis remarks that there were fewer Negro delegates than at former conventions. He writes: "This reflected the growing conservative mood in the UAW." How? Preis does not say. He also does not report that the majority of these Negro delegates were in the Reuther caucus. He also does not report in his diatribe, on the

"hand-picked" Reuther slate for trustees, that one of them was a Negro who was elected for the two-year term.

He also does not tell The Militant readers that the Negro delegates were not fooled by the fake efforts of the Stalinist, Tappes, to secure the vice-presidency as a representative of the Negroes. He also does not tell his readers that the spokesman for the Reuther group on the resolutions was a Negro, Abner from Chicago. He fails also to mention that in the main speech by Abner, on the affidavits question, the Stalinist-Addes position was cut to shreds. Abner reminded the Addes group that they had supported the NAM in 1943. . . . I remember when the work or jail bill was up, who was it who wanted to sell out our union then? Some of the ones here who are crying 'We are militant!'"

Preis does not relate that after Reuther's father had congratulated the UAW for its militant non-discrimination stand, it was a white delegate from Atlanta, Ga., who made the motion that Reuther, Sr., be made a lifetime honorary member of the UAW.

QUESTIONS TO PREIS ON POLITICAL ACTION

On the question of political action Preis says: "A minority of the committee, T. Ray Tucker of Flint Local 581, and Paul Silver, of Detroit Local 351, submitted a resolution calling for the UAW to initiate a program aimed at building a new national party of labor. The Reutherites were particularly anxious to keep this resolution from the delegates, because it could have exposed his pretense of political progressivism."

dark and only emerged for feeble flank attacks.

Of course the Stalinists may end by trying to "blow up" the Addes caucus. That is the way of Stalinism. They will attempt to wreck any group which they can no longer use or which does not have the strength necessary for Stalinist aims. The Stalinists know that the majority of the leading members of the Addes group are not genuine Stalinists. Who thinks that Thomas, Leonard, McGill, Lloyd Jones and many others are Stalinists? On the night of the very day that Addes was defeated, Lloyd Jones appeared in the meeting of the Reuther caucus. The Stalinists know that this will be the case with many of the rank and file, and of the careerist leaders who were riding on the Addes train. The Stalinists may quite well attempt to form another faction in the UAW tomorrow. But the fact remains that the Addes caucus was their caucus.

SOCIALISM CANNOT BE PROMOTED BY FILTH

Finally we come to the best part of the Militant story as contained in "UAW Convention Sidelights" by Art Preis.

We quote: "Saddest sight in the convention hall was a little band of eager-beavers of Shachtman's Workers Party, whose views are expressed in LABOR ACTION. They were up in the gallery screaming their heads off for Reuther, while the Reuther machine put over compliance with the Taft-Hartley 'yellow dog' oath. Reuther and his ACTU allies repaid the Shachtmanites for their small but earnest services as shoe-shiners and finger-men by excluding them from the Reutherite slates for local delegates. In the Reutherite-ACTU camp, the Shachtmanites are known as 'Reutherites.'"

We will not stop to discuss the "screaming" of Workers Party mem-

bers from the gallery. We will let this pass in order to get to the real heart of this quotation. We want to discuss the services which the Workers Party rendered Reuther as "shoe-shiners and finger-men." The Socialist Workers Party should be careful here. They are standing on very thin ice. They know something about finger-men, to be sure, but none that belong to our party. They know something about the sheet "FDR." They have heard, we think, about an attempt at the frame-up of Reuther in true Stalinist GPU fashion. They know that this desperate attempt at framing Reuther was the effort to link Reuther to Gerald L. K. Smith, the fascist; and to Taft, the Republican extreme reactionary. But it seems that they have been unable to write about all this in their press. Perhaps for lack of space. Perhaps for another reason.

It is true that there were "shoe-shiners." But it was Stalinist shoes which were being shined, and not by the Workers Party. There was at least one finger-man but he had no connection with our party. No member of the Workers Party touched the filthy frame-up sheet "FDR," except to read it and then vomit. We did the same thing when we read quotations in The Militant from "FDR." No member of the Workers Party distributed "FDR." No member of the Workers Party is even alleged to have been associated with the Stalinists in any form.

The Workers Party did none of these things because the WP is opposed to Stalinism and all its works. We do not believe in frame-up nor in frame-up techniques. Had Reuther resorted to such practices against Addes and the Addes caucus, we would have opposed it—and openly. We have seen enough and too much of these anti-working class tactics. We believe that socialism cannot be founded or even promoted on frame-up, filth or any other characteristic of Stalinism.

Notes on West Coast Labor Movement...

By WILLIAM BARTON

OAKLAND, Nov. 14 — The much publicized Friendship Train toured California last week picking up a surprisingly large amount of donated supplies. To the big profit makers who contributed, the little they gave was hardly enough to compensate for the big money they have made and will continue to make from the world's misery. For the others, the small people who are interested only in aiding their European brothers, this columnist has only warm praise. It is damned unfortunate that this trickle of nourishment to the hungry must be, despite the intention of some of its sponsors, a part of American foreign (for example, imperialist) policy.

It remained for Oakland's labor-backed mayor, Joseph Smith, to put the entire thing in its most vulgar form. Addressing a public meeting to greet the train, he explained that its purpose was to show Europeans that the only way was "the American Way." Was he merely snobbishly talking down to the people of the countries that are our ancestors, or was he out to explain the reason for the whole affair right off the bat? That's not too clear—but it is clear that he managed to effectively let the cat out of the bag.

The way the local press reported the contributions was especially revealing. The American Legion's contribution of \$113 in the East Bay Area received quite a play, but practically nothing was said about the more than a thousand dollars in cash and goods donated by the local labor movement. One hesitates to charge a conspiracy, but will someone please explain why almost the entire press throughout the country will do its utmost to ignore anything that might encourage some sympathy for the labor movement among that part of the population who are not union members? Don't answer, it's obvious as the latest bank accounts of Messrs. Hearst, Roy Howard, and our local Joe Knowland.

Speaking of the press, it would have done the boys on most foreign desks much good to have attended a forum on India at the University of California last week. The speakers were students at the University from India representing different religious and communal groups. Despite many political differences expressed among them, all attacked the coverage by American newspapers of recent events in India, particularly the emphasis on the communal riots in certain areas. The amount of cooperation between Hindu and Moslem is a thousand-fold greater than any clash, they all agreed, and the recent conflict was described as a direct result of the policies of the British Imperialist rulers and their Indian agents, the capitalists, landholders, and native princes. None saw any solution that did not start with a completely independent India, whether united or divided. The "smart" people who love to point to

India today as evidence of the inability of colonial peoples to govern themselves could learn much from actually listening to what Indians have to say.

California's own witch-hunt extravaganza, the State Legislature's Tenney Committee, has resumed its sessions. In the style made famous by its Washington counterpart, it has attempted to bludgeon many accused "Communists" in Alameda County this week. Some of the witnesses are undoubtedly Stalinists, who instead of being politically exposed, have now become martyrs in the eyes of much of the public.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

Particularly dangerous is the spirit which the "hearings" have engendered among reactionary elements. There is in Oakland a screwball character named Richard Ely, a sign-painter who has plastered the outside of his small shop with attacks against just about everybody in political life, from Governor Warren to Harry Bridges. Last week, his criticism became more than vocal as he rushed out of his shop to slug Vernon Lantz, labor-supported City Councilman who happened to be reading his signs. Ely admits that he simply shouted, "You red —" and swung. He is now awaiting sentence after pleading guilty to a battery charge. People like Ely are hardly dangerous, but there is little doubt that his open current madness is directly inspired by the officially sponsored "anti-red" hysteria. Let some of the so-called liberals (and even "socialists") who support the Thomas and Tenney Committees and defend the Truman Loyalty Oath take note.

With the Workers Party

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

- AKRON: Write to Box 221.
BALTIMORE: International Fellowship House, 21 West Preston St., 2nd floor.
BUFFALO: 639 Main St., 2nd floor.
CHICAGO: 1501 W. Madison Ave., 2nd floor.
CLEVELAND: VP Branch meets Sundays, 8 p.m.
DETROIT: 6341 Gratiot, Room 10.
LOS ANGELES: 3314 So. Grandd Los Angeles 7.
LOUISVILLE: Write to Robert Durant, Box 1181.
NEWARK: 248 Market St., Newark 2.
NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St.

INTRODUCTORY OFFER TO LABOR ACTION
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
Please enter my subscription to LABOR ACTION as follows:
6 month subscription (26 issues) for 50c.
1 year subscription (62 issues), together with pamphlet "Plenty for All," to be mailed to me, for \$1.00.
Name (please print)
Address
City Zone State

This Sunday Evening: Symposium on "Current Trends in Popular Culture"
Speakers: DAVID T. BAZELON, CLEMENT GREENBERG, IRVING HOWE
November 30 8:30 P. M.
Next Sunday Evening (Dec. 7) NATHAN GLAZER and CONRAD LYNN
Speak on "Recent Novels on Racial and Religious Bigotry"
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL FORUM
114 West 14th Street, NYC
Admission: 50 Cents. Phone: WA 2-4222

Detroit Forum: "UAW Convention—Report and Analysis"
Hear: HERMAN BENSON
Detroit Organizer, Workers Party
Friday, Dec. 5, 8 P. M.
275 Craftsmen's Club
Upper Lounge
275 East Ferry
(bet. John R and Brush)
Adm. 25 Cents Discussion Welcomed

WORLD POLITICS

STALINISM'S CRUCIAL CAMPAIGN

Under the direction of Moscow's "Cominform," the Stalinist parties in Italy and France have launched a series of political and strike actions that have quickly taken on the shape and form of a coordinated campaign. This campaign has spread widely and rapidly, and is far from ended. It must, from the outset, be clearly labeled and branded for what it is: *A criminal and treacherous campaign of political adventurism and madness whose effect upon the working classes of Italy and France runs the risk of being nothing short of a major disaster.* Not every aspect of events in Western Europe is clear; there is much that is puzzling, but one thing we see. Once again we see with startling clarity how little interest or concern Stalinism has with the real welfare of the proletariat as such. Let the workers be shot and beaten in these hopelessly adventurist actions—they are just so much capital to be expended by Moscow. So long as these demonstrations serve Moscow's game of rivalry with America it is justified! This is the Stalinist credo.

The working class masses of Italy and France are today on the defensive, under sharp and frontal attack by the solidifying forces of the Right, backed in varying degree by America. Only the blind can fail to see this. The leftist upsurge which rose throughout Europe with the triumphs of the movements of resistance and the downfall of Hitler has now ebbed, thanks above all to the policy pursued by Stalinism. Who built up de Gaulle as a national hero? Who disarmed the workers' militia in France and Italy? Who pursued, up to a few months back, a policy of governmental collaboration with the capitalist parties? Who opposed strikers and launched the slogan of "Produce!" to the workers? The answer is common knowledge—the Stalinist parties of Europe.

The consequences of these policies have become lightning clear within the past few months. Faced with the continuation, even aggravation of the economic situation, together with the apparent impotence of the "leftist" parties, the forces of rightist reaction have succeeded in winning over the great middle class strata and have prepared the consolidation essential for their eventual assumption of power, in its openly oppressive form. The atmosphere of France and Italy has been transformed, thanks to the so-called workers' parties, from one of militant leftism to one of aggressive and swaggering rightism.

WHAT LIES BEHIND STALINIST STRATEGY?

But this transformation in the atmosphere has been accompanied by yet another development. It is the clash of these two developments that accounts for the launching of aggressive Stalinist actions precisely at the worst possible time (from the workers' standpoint); a time when the working class should be seeking to renew its lost leadership over the nation. This other development is the imminence of the Marshall Plan; the fact that—despite Congressional delay—this imperialist scheme for the penetration of Europe by America is coming to life and reality and therefore taking on concrete form as a menacing rival to Russian domination of Europe. The closer to realization American imperialism's Marshall Plan becomes, the more violent will be the Stalinist campaign.

The actions of Stalinism can be understood in no other way than as a limited offensive launched with the strategic purpose of getting back into reorganized governments in Italy and France and there striking at the potential effectiveness of the Marshall Plan of their rival. The aim of Stalinism to get back into government coalitions is revealed in their formula, "For a democratic government, in the heart of which the working class and its Communist Party could at last play a determining role" (L'Humanité). They wish a return to a Bygone period of two years ago.

This entire action is subordinated to Moscow's struggle against Washington and utilizes the legitimate anger and difficulties of the workers for this purpose. The ultimate effect of this campaign, the fact that it has no conceivable future or outlook, is of no concern to Moscow. Its sole criteria is: Does it strike a blow at America and its Marshall Plan? Will it facilitate our sabotage campaign against American aid at a later date? Will it make Congress delay its action in support of credits and loans still a bit longer? How can we manipulate these French and Italian workers against our rivals?

Thus we see the incredible scene of mass strikes, chaotic actions, undisciplined clashes, etc.—all stirred up by the Stalinist leaders—in the midst of a gathering storm of rightist reaction. Of course, due to the harsh inflation and the constant squeeze of sky-high prices, the workers are in a fighting mood to begin with; but they do not wish to be used solely as Stalinist political pawns. Thus there is increasing resistance to the strike calls, as we shall indicate.

Can there be any other explanation to the events in Western Europe? Not unless we are prepared to accept the idea that the Stalinist parties actually are moving for the seizure of state power; that these are preliminary clashes prior to an attempted seizure of power coordinated with marching orders from Stalin to the Russian troops—their is, the total Stalinization of Europe. But we cannot accept such a prognosis as being in the cards unless some basic factor—unknown to the rest of the world—has led Stalin to a point where he is prepared now to take the plunge into a world-wide war. An effort to seize power in a planned and systematic fashion, together with the march of Russia, would cut all bridges, force the world into two armed camps and leave but a brief space of time for the outbreak of the Third World

War. Given the known condition of Stalin's Russia, we cannot see this.

If this analysis is correct, then we can summarize the purpose behind Stalinist actions as limited in scope, even though the campaign itself will not soon die out and may well broaden out considerably as it is now doing in France. We have already indicated the principal objectives of the campaign—resurrection of coalition governments with Stalinist membership; mobilization against the Marshall Plan. There is also the undoubted desire to test out their strength; to see how far they can go—short of power; and to attempt to force certain concessions and withdrawals on the part of Marshall at the scheduled Foreign Ministers Conference in London. The entire campaign adds up to a cynical game of swindler's blackmail, in the truest fashion of Stalin, with masses of workers used as his means of exerting pressure for Moscow's program.

WHAT SHOULD REVOLUTIONISTS DO?

What must be the attitude of a socialist movement to these events? If it were merely a question of the Stalinist leaders, and a matter of their skills being cracked exclusively, there would not be much of a problem. If it were merely a matter of the obviously Stalinist-inspired political actions (gangsterism against opponents' headquarters, etc.), there would still be no problem. But, unfortunately, by demagoguery and by manipulation of working class demands that are grounded in need and want, the Stalinists can still mobilize substantial sections of workers for their criminal misadventures. Many of the strikes in progress are genuine strikes expressing genuine economic demands of the workers (metal workers' strike in Paris, nation-wide teachers' strike, etc.) It is unlikely these actions can win—their Stalinist leadership dooms them to defeat.

But precisely because it is so concerned with everything that affects the workers, a revolutionary party such as the Trotskyist movement in France and Italy must participate in and take its place in these struggles. It must strive to replace Stalinist political aims with rounded economic and social aims in the real interests of the workers. It must try to cushion the blows struck by the police and military forces; it must try to turn the entire course of events to its advantage by a constant and unhesitating attack upon the Stalinist leaders and their criminal motives.

The aim of revolutionists in these strikes must be to win them, for the working class; and to organize forces within the unions (socialists, syndicalists, honest unionists) with the idea of taking the union away from and back from their criminal Stalinist leaders and driving them out of the ranks. The correct way of mobilizing the workers against the equal threats of de Gaulle reaction (from the outside) and Stalinist blackmail (from the inside) can only be shown by a simultaneous participating in the strike movements and the sharpest denunciation of the Stalinists. In this respect, the slogan launched in their manifesto by the French Trotskyist party—for an assembly of all socialists, communists, anarchists, revolutionists and CGT workers in "popular committees of vigilance" to bar the road of de Gaulle to power is correct, but insufficient.

We know that neither the Socialist Party leaders nor the new MRP cabinet headed by Robert Schumann will fight de Gaulle. Rather will they facilitate his stepping to power by beginning the process of breaking the workers' organizations. (How significant is it that de Gaulle sits back in silence today while the Ramadims, Blums and now Schumanns do his work for him?) What is tragically lacking in the Trotskyist manifesto is a frontal attack upon the Stalinists, an explanation of why they act as they do and, above all, why their way is a certain road to defeat and, eventually, the coming to power of the Right. The French Trotskyists should lead the campaign to break the Stalinist hold over the labor movement.

CORRECT POLICY CAN SAVE SITUATION

The effect of these events is clear. The entire process of rightist consolidation is speeded up. The shifting of the frightened peasantry and middle class is hastened. Large sections of the workers are thrown into confusion and, not desiring to be used as puppets by Stalinism, become inactive. How significant is the fact that half the Marseille proletariat failed to respond to the Stalinist strike call; that where secret strike votes take place, the workers vote no strike; that a division in labor's ranks has been created. Stalinist adventurism is responsible for this. The Social Democratic leaders, the MRP leaders, the entire Right is encouraged in its acts of further repression and violence against the workers.

A new phase has begun in the history of France and Italy. No one can foretell its evolution in any final sense. In all likelihood, the strikes will tend to die away and Stalinism will find it has lost much ground and many forces by its actions. Unfortunately, so will the workers as a whole, but there is by no means a decisive defeat in the offing. They can recover from these defeats because, among other factors, de Gaulle and the Right are still far too weak and disunited to administer a really fatal blow. A center, semi-democratic regime is still favored by Washington and will probably continue to stagger along somehow. But again we see a situation in which a correct policy will not only save the workers from defeat, at a moment when they are hardly prepared for a serious struggle, but will go a long way toward breaking the Stalinist grip over them. Again the revolutionary movement has an opportunity to prove that revolutionary strategy, skillfully and correctly applied, can influence the course of events.

Henry JUDD.

THE OLD MAN In Memory of L. D. Trotsky

By VICTOR SERGE

He was not quite forty-five and was already called The Old Man, as before him Lenin had been called at the same age. In popular Russian usage this meant oldest in understanding, deserving of the utmost confidence. And this was really the feeling which he inspired in all those who came into contact with him during his lifetime: a man in whom thought, action, "personal life" formed one solid whole, without fissures, who pursued his road to the very end, without faltering; a man who could be relied upon under any circumstances, who did not change in essence, who did not weaken in defeat, did not recoil before responsibility, before danger, and who remained level-headed under stress. He dominated circumstance, sure of himself; he contained an inner pride so great that it made him simply and truly modest; he contained the pride of being the lucid instrument of history. In prison, in exile, in the furnished rooms of an emigre, on the field of battle, at the height of power, he was, with total disinterestedness, simply the one to do exactly what was necessary to serve peoples on the march. Having convinced himself at an early age of his capacity to serve (at twenty-seven, in 1905, he was chairman of the first Soviet in Petersburg), he never doubted himself and came to view glory, burdens of state, the most absolute power, with neither attachment nor disdain, as a matter of necessity.

Given to analysis, to contemplation, he had a great lyric sentiment for life which made him akin to the poets. On the flight from Siberia he admired the snow-covered fields; in the midst of the most arduous task of insurrection, he conceived a work of creative imagination; surrounded by assassins, in the solitude of Coyoacan, he admired the somber plants of Mexico, those cacti which to the European reveal an impressive form of vital energy; beset by the frenzy of the lie, in the liberation of the Dewey Commission on the Moscow trials, he advanced a hypothesis on the birth of a new religion when future revolutions will have come to an end and humanity will have tired of the struggles which opened up a new future before it. He was an unbeliever, but he believed in the worth of life, in the greatness of men, in the duty to serve and was no more capable of doubting this than of believing in the old faiths which are a poor remedy for doubt. The certainty of possessing the truth made him intractable at the end of his life and blurred his scientific spirit. He was authoritarian because in our epoch of barbaric struggles, thought converted into action must become authoritarian. Nevertheless, in 1924-25, when he had the forces, he refused to take power, believing that a socialist regime cannot resort to rule by decree without entering into major complications (and being basically convinced, no doubt, that since history imposes ignoble tasks, it is preferable to leave them to others born for them and to reserve oneself for the defense of a more distant future).

"WITHOUT OUR VALIANT DEFEAT..."

I never knew him more great, he never was dearer to me than in those miserable workers' quarters of Leningrad or Moscow, where, having been one of the two indisputable leaders of the victorious revolution, I saw him many times speaking for hours on end to some few people from the shop or street. He was still a member of the Political Committee and was on the point of losing power and perhaps his life (a fact which we all understood as well as he and of which he spoke to me on one occasion). He believed that the time had come to struggle to gain the proletarians, one by one—as before, in illegality, under the old regime—to save or to create the revolutionary democracy. Some thirty or forty workers would listen to him and some woman sitting on the floor at his feet would ask questions and weigh his answers... (1927). We knew that the probability of our being defeated was much greater than of our being victorious; but this, too, was useful. Without our valiant defeat, the revolution would have been vanquished a hundred times worse.

Books and Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

The New Course (with an introduction, "The Struggle for the New Course," by Max Shachtman)	265 pp. Cloth	\$2.00
Stalin	516 pp. Cloth	5.00
Living Thoughts of Karl Marx	184 pp. Cloth	1.50
The First Years of the Communist International, Vol. I	384 pp. Cloth	2.50
The Revolution Betrayed	308 pp. Cloth	2.00
Marxism in the United States	44 pp.	.35
Their Morals and Ours	48 pp.	.20
Stalinism and Bolshevism	32 pp.	.10
Leon Sedoff	32 pp.	.10
The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International	64 pp.	.25
The Suppressed Testament of Lenin	48 pp.	.25
Fascism—What It Is—How to Fight It	48 pp.	.15

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.
All orders must be prepaid. Orders of \$25 or more receive 10 per cent discount. Make checks payable to LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE.

LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Ass'n
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel: IRONIDES 6-5117
Vol. 11, No. 48 Dec. 1, 1947
EMANUEL GARRETT, Editor
Editorial Board: Albert Gates, Henry Judd, Irving Howe
Business Manager: Paul Bern
Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada, Foreign). Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879

His personality was only an exceptional phenomenon within a common social grouping. All the traits of his character, of his spirit, of his "Weltanschauung" belonged to that of the revolutionary Russian intelligentsia of more than a half a century. This consisted of tens of thousands of militants, among them many who fought at his side—not excluding from this number a great part of his adversaries. As with Lenin and in the case of others whom the chances of battle left in lesser prominence or threw into obscurity, the characteristics of these generations were brought to the greatest degree of individual perfection. The generations which engendered and formed him, lived in him; and his generation, the product of the same historical circumstances, was, as a whole, identical with him, though individually its members were, in one form or another, inferior to him. In writing these lines there come before me so many faces, so many names, that I see it as an incontestable truth that a whole generation had to be destroyed to lower the level of our times; it approached more the man of tomorrow and was therefore separated from the majority the moment the masses began to yearn for a respite.

A LEGEND FOUNDED ON TRUTH

The end of his life was a drama of solitude. He paced rapidly, alone, his study in Coyoacan, talking to himself (like Chernyshevsky, the first great thinker of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, who transcribed the language of the Yakubs among whom he spent twenty years of imprisonment "talking to himself while gazing at the stars," according to his jailers). A Peruvian poet sent him (L. D.) a poem entitled "Solitude of Solitudes." The Old Man had it translated word by word; struck by the title, he found it most beautiful...

Alone, thus, holding discourse with the shot Kamevnev, he was heard on several occasions to mention his name. Still he remained at the height of his intellectual power. His latest writings are of no less worth than his works of other periods.

At times one forgets that intelligence is not an individual gift. What would Beethoven have done among the deaf? The intelligence of an individual, even that of a genius, needs air. The intellectual greatness of Trotsky remained a function of his entire generation. He needed the direct contact of men of his own mental caliber, capable of understanding him even before his ideas were expressed, of opposing him on the same plane. He needed Bukharin, a Pyatakof, a Probrabrensky, a Rakovsky, an Ivan Smirnov, he needed a Lenin to be truly himself. Already even we younger ones—and there were among our generation illustrious figures like Eltzin, Solntzeff, Yakovim, Dinkelstadt, Pankratov (living, or among the dead?) could not remain on an equal footing with him; we lacked ten years of exceptional experience and thought. Some of his most fertile ideas were jotted down on simple discussion postcards as was almost the entire theory of permanent revolution.

He was murdered at the moment the entire world was entering through the insensate paths of war into a new phase of the permanent revolution. He was murdered precisely because he could once again have become the greatest by entering into direct contact with his land and the people of Russia for whom he possessed an extraordinary intuition. They tried first to kill his legend, an epic legend, completely founded on truth.

The logic of his passion and of secondary errors flowing therefrom also contributed to his murder: to gain and to try once more to convince some obscure person whose existence was nothing but simulation and perfidy, he permitted such a one to enter his study of solitude, and that someone, carrying out orders, drove a pickaxe into the back of his head while he was bent over a worthless manuscript. The pickaxe entered his brain, making a wound six centimeters deep. (Translated from the Spanish. Originally published in the Chilean magazine, *Babel, Review of Art and Criticism*, July-August, 1947.)

SALUTE TO A SOLDIER OF THE REVOLUTION

VICTOR SERGE

By MAX SHACHTMAN

It is with a deep shock that we have just received the news of the death of Victor Serge in Mexico City. He passed away suddenly, succumbing to a heart attack, at the age of 57. With his death we lose one of our oldest friends and comrades.

It is hard to call Victor Serge a revolutionist of any particular nationality. He was a "Belgian" revolutionist, a "French" revolutionist, a "Spanish" revolutionist, a "Russian" revolutionist; in a word, he was an international revolutionist.

Victor Lvovich Kibalchich—his true name—was born in Brussels of Russian revolutionary parents, emigres in Belgium. At the age of fifteen, he was already a member of the famous Young Guard of Belgium, the organization of the militant socialist youth, and from that time on he never ceased his activity in the movement for socialist liberty. His revolutionary activity took him from Belgium to France; and in France to five years of imprisonment after a trial in which several of his anarchist comrades were condemned to the guillotine. Freed in 1917, he moved to Spain, where, as a member of the anarcho-syndicalist National Confederation of Labor (CNT), he became an active and prominent militant, a contributor to the press and a fighter in the revolutionary attempt of July, 1917. The Russian Revolution drew him, as it did other militant anarchists, to Moscow. On his way, he was arrested in Paris and interned in a concentration camp. He reached Russia only because the Bolsheviks exchanged an officer of the French military mission, who was being held in Russia, for the prisoner of Clemenceau.

SOLDIER IN THE REVOLUTION

In Soviet Russia, a new period of his life began. He threw himself passionately into the work of building up the new workers' regime and of extending the socialist victory to other lands. He became a member of Zinoviev's "cabinet" in the Executive Committee of the Communist International and was one of the first editors of the *International Press Correspondence*. But his contribution was not confined to what flowed from a vivid and eloquent pen. He fought as a gunner in the Russian civil war and afterward worked actively in the Communist movements of Germany and Austria.

When the first big signs of the decay of the revolution were visible, he did not take long to align himself with the Trotskyist Opposition when, in 1923, it began its fight for workers' democracy and socialist internationalism. He fought by the side of the great leaders of the revolution against the Stalinist empoisonment and, like the other Trotskyist militants, stoically took the punishment that came with the fight. With most of the Oppositionists he was expelled from the Russian Communist Party in 1928, then imprisoned and deported to Orenburg in 1933. Like the others, he too would undoubtedly have been tormented to death by the Stalinist regime but for his good fortune in having intimate and powerful friends in the French, Belgian and Spanish labor and revolutionary movements. Their determined and persistent intervention finally forced the jailers to release their victim and in 1936 Victor was released from Orenburg, banished from Russia and deprived of the Russian citizenship he had happily assumed in the early days of the Bolshevik Revolution.

He was a tireless writer and a talented one. At least two of his works are available in English—"From Lenin to Stalin" and the ampler work on "Russia—Twenty Years After." It is a real loss to us, which must one day be made up, that his best and most durable

book, "The Year One of the Russian Revolution," which deserves at least equal rank with John Reed's classic, "Ten Days That Shook the World," is not yet available in an English translation.

Victor was one of us during many of the most difficult and oppressive years of the struggle against the big Stalinist lie and the big Stalinist horror, and sided with the Trotskyist movement before and after his banishment from Russia, in the days when Stalinism was the vogue in some of our best circles, when revolutionary opposition to it—or any sort of opposition—was anything but popular. Older memories and experiences drew him so strongly to the revolution in Spain, especially in the days of the civil war in that country, that he even overstepped the bounds of the course which we considered the only admissible one for a revolutionist. It brought him into conflict with us and with the man for whom he always had a respect that was almost reverence, Trotsky. There were other questions in which, these last years, we did not always see eye to eye. But it seems to me that this is not the occasion to underline our differences. What we held in common is dearer to us and keeps the memory of Victor's services dear to us.

WORKED ON TROTSKY BIOGRAPHY

Only a very few months ago, I had the pleasant opportunity to meet Victor for the first time during a visit to Mexico. Up to then I had known him only through his writings and his personal correspondence with me. We had only a short time together, and we nursed every hour with discussions of questions important to us both and to us all. Now I regret the shortness of the visit even more than I did then.

A writer of great intensity, industry and passion, he was finishing the last two chapters of the book into which he was pouring all his knowledge, experience and ability. It was a full-length personal and political biography of Leon Trotsky. He was writing it in the closest collaboration with Trotsky's widow, Natalia Sedova, and of course with her entire approval. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to glance at the manuscript—there was not even time to read it carefully. But the glance was enough to show that the work was faithful, rich, grand-scale and worthy of its subject. It was, I think, Victor at his best, closest and truest to himself and to the best years of the life which he shared with Trotsky in the fight for the socialist triumph. It was flattering when Victor agreed to have me translate and edit the manuscript for publication in English. We can all hope that its publication will not be long delayed.

A tiny foretaste of the book is the fine tribute which he paid, only recently, to the memory of Trotsky in an article he wrote for the Chilean review, *Babel*, of July-August, 1947. It is translated from the Spanish version for *LABOR ACTION* (see adjoining column—Ed.). Only an ardent participant in the Bolshevik Revolution, only a fighter in the later struggle to save the Revolution, could have written it. He shows his sensitive, keen and sympathetic insight into the character of the man who shared with Lenin the leadership of that greatest event in the history of mankind. And it shows that Victor, for all that separated us at times, remained united with us in his honest and untiring devotion to the socialist cause.

Of the earlier, and great, generation, he was one of the very few to remain. Now he too is gone. To his widow and orphaned girl in Mexico, our sincere and profound sympathy. To Victor, our fraternal embrace and last salute.

Quit Rent Board in Detroit --

(Continued from page 1)

on a policy of siding with the real estate interests as opposed to the interests of their own membership, let alone the membership of the CIO and tenants generally. The NAACP representative certainly was not representative of the Negroes in the city of Detroit by remaining on the board. Real estate interests in Detroit, as in the rest of the United States, segregate Negroes, force most of them to live in slum areas and then charge exorbitant rents on the apartments in these areas.

TENANTS PRESENT CASE

The Detroit Area Rent Advisory Board has been trying to decontrol rents. The Greater Detroit Tenants Council and the CIO have been fighting them all along the way. The tenants presented their case at a hearing set on November 6, at which only a handful of the Advisory Board was present.

The JAW called a special meeting of tenants and UAW members which passed a resolution condemning the

local board, supporting the action of the CIO members in resigning from the board and demanding of Sigler and the housing expediter that tenants and union members, those in favor of rent control, be given equal representation on the Detroit Area Rent Advisory Board.

The only answer the tenants can have is controlling rents with their own board and in their own way. Boycott the local rent advisory boards! Don't abide by their decisions!

These boards were set up not to control rents but to decontrol them. The whole housing and rent act of 1947 is, in Harry S. Truman's own words, "a step backward for the tenant." Therefore, let the tenants set up their own rent control boards. Let the landlords plead their case before the tenants. Let the landlords open their books.

PREPARE TO FIGHT

Only militant mass actions by the tenants and the CIO can get real rent control, with the freezing of rent at

June 30, 1947, OPA levels and a moratorium on evictions. The Flying Squads of the UAW should be prepared to fight the landlords as they have done in past years. The Tenants Council should keep on organizing more and stronger building councils in the city.

Meet the law of the landlord with the law of the tenants! Don't pay more rent! Fight for the passage of a real rent control law that protects tenants, not landlords!

Limited Number of Copies:

ROSA LUXEMBURG
Her Life and Work
By PAUL FROELICH
\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.
(All orders must be prepaid)

NAACP Pamphlet Deserves Considerable Attention

Medical Care and the Plight of the Negro

By KATHERINE LEONARD

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has published in pamphlet form ("Medical Care and the Plight of the Negro"), price ten cents, its report on the present status of medical care for the Negro in the United States, prepared by an outstanding Negro physician, Dr. W. Montague Cobb, professor of anatomy at Howard University and president of the Medical-Chirurgical (medical-surgical) Society of the District of Columbia, an affiliate of the National Medical Association. Dr. Cobb is also a member of the NAACP's national medical committee.

Walter White in his introduction points out that this report follows in the wake of a report of the 30s, prepared by the Carnegie Foundation, entitled "Opportunities for the Medical Education of Negroes." This report showed that there could not be any "equal but separate" medical education or treatment in the U. S. This is Dr. Cobb's thesis and he proves it amply in this reserved and factual report.

He begins by showing that life expectancy within the Negro population has shown a constant lag of about 10 years behind the white, and that the Negro mortality rate is 71 per cent higher than the rate for whites. Not a bit strangely, nearly all diseases that show excess mortality in the Negro group are classed as preventable. Not at all strangely, because conditions like tuberculosis, maternal and infant mortality, and venereal disease regularly occur much more frequently in any group where there is overcrowding, poor nutrition, bad sanitation and lack of medical care.

The report summarizes the actual situation with regard to medical care for the Negro by stating that the Negro medical man is working in a "nationally dispersed professional ghetto." From this point of view, it first discusses professional opportunities, standards of training as they relate directly to the Negro physician. While stressing that the following figure has value as information only, since it is not the premise of the report that the number of Negro physicians should be determined by the number of Negroes, it states that if physician-population ratio is considered on a racial basis, the number of Negro physicians is less than half the number there should be to meet the minimal standards of safety (one physician to every 1,500 people). The national average is one to 750.

TRAINING FACILITIES

At present about 145 Negro doctors are graduated each year, the big majority from Howard and Meharry medical schools, as only about twelve are graduated annually from schools in the North. As late as the middle of the 20s it was an acute problem to find approved internships for the graduates. Today the number of available internships slightly exceeds the average number of graduates. There are 158 such openings in the country, 109 of them in Negro hospitals. There are 116 openings for approved training beyond the internship, 85 of these residencies being located in eight Negro hospitals.

There are 87 qualified Negro specialists in the U. S.

Dr. Cobb emphasizes that the problem is a much greater one than a matter of new openings in professional schools. He states that while Howard has over 1,300 applicants for 70 places in its freshman class and Meharry likewise, neither school will be able to fill its class with first-line applicants. There are unfilled openings in other medical schools as well, for which qualified applicants have failed to appear. This infers that there has been "an inadequate preparation carrying back through college, secondary and primary school levels," caused by the segregated and unequal educational facilities afforded Negroes. This is aggravated by the paradox that while few Negroes from the South attend Northern universities, thousands (4,000 in 1939-40) from the North go to Southern colleges.

The same inadequacies found in the opportunities for the training of physicians is found in the general medical picture. There are 112 Negro hospitals in the U. S., but only 25 of these are accredited and 14 approved for the training of internes. The number of hospital beds available for Negroes is around 10,000. This inadequacy for a population of at least 14,000,000 is obvious, but reinforced when it is learned that the current accepted standard is 4.5 beds per 1,000.

SECOND-HAND HOSPITALS

Very aptly the report calls the situation with regard to hospitals giving "old clothes to Sam." With a few exceptions, such as the Homer G. Phillips Hospital in St. Louis, the Negro hospital is a second-hand hospital. Examples such as Provident Hospital, Chicago, Sydenham Hospital in New York are given and discussed.

A "meditation"—no doubt of a very philanthropic philanthropist—is well worth quoting: "I'm getting a new suit, but this old one is too good and cost too much to throw away. I'll turn it over to Sam. He needs a suit. This one isn't new, but it's better than anything he has or can get now. With a few alterations this will be just about right for him. He ought to appreciate it, even be grateful enough to pay as much as he can afford for it. Maybe he'll pay more than it's worth, prices being what they are. After all, for him this means progress. Sam is getting a little sensitive, though. Time was when he would thankfully accept whatever was offered. Now he talks about not wanting 'cast-offs.' I'll have to find a way to give this an 'anointing with oil.' After all, this suit was designed and made by one of the world's leading tailors. How could he get one like it?—and it's practically as good as new. I'll just tell him frankly that his needs have been recognized and received a great deal of thought for a long time. In his economic position he will understand that he can't have everything at once and something as good as this is ten times better than nothing. Don't we all have to be realistic? Sam will be realistic and not be misled by any of his dreamer friends."

This epitomizes the attitude of the white community faced with the need of providing a solution for the pressing health problem of the Negro.

They would solve it without eliminating segregation or rather would try to make it "comfortable or endurable to the extent that it will not produce trouble."

Many proposals to alleviate the situation have been advanced within the segregated pattern. Proposals such as further improvement of conditions in the two existing Negro schools (which have raised standards continuously and done a good job under adverse conditions), a proposal which in itself is good but which is no panacea. A proposal to extend segregated training further by the formation of another Negro medical school. A plan for Southern states which may be compelled to provide medical training for Negroes, to contract with Meharry for the training of their students. Another proposal whereby Meharry upper classmen would be assigned for clinical training to Negro hospitals in the South with supervision on a "visitation" basis. These proposals are ones enabling the white community to dodge its local responsibility. Concerning this it is remarked that among Negro physicians there is some feeling that the segregated pattern is the only one possible, and some accommodation to this system based on financial interest. An attitude and a policy opposed by the NAACP, as for instance in its refusal to consider the Veterans Administration's proposal in 1945 to build a nice, big veterans' hospital for Negroes near Meharry or Howard.

BASEMENT WORKS

Dr. Cobb discusses many other ramifications of the problem all of which add up to the fact that the Negro gets sub-standard health care. He characterizes our hospital system as awkward, illogical, but firmly established, classifying all citizens into two categories, the indigent and those who can pay. "In municipal tax-supported institutions facilities and quality of service range from excellent to damnable." In the North and West Negroes who qualify as indigent will generally be admitted as patients to tax-supported hospitals. Negroes may or may not be admitted in voluntary hospitals. Most often the Negro doctor surrenders his patient by sending him into a voluntary hospital.

South of the Mason and Dixon line the situation is incredibly worse. One prominent white physician said in print on July 1, 1947 "In the past we have profitably used the Negro as our guinea pig in clinical medicine." The basement "colored ward" is notorious, no attempt at an acceptable hospital setup being made. There are white hospitals that admit Negroes long enough to be operated upon, but remove them in a few hours to a Negro institution without staff, equipment or technical knowledge to supply modern post-operative care.

In the South the Negro doctor "tends to regress." Younger men will not come where their training cannot be applied. Older-age physicians, who realize that they are back numbers, that their community knows it, and that there is nothing they can do about it are the sole resource of a community. Figures can be vivid—Mississippi has one Negro doctor for every 18,527 Negroes.

HISTORY OF NMA

This study contains a short historical survey of the National Medical Association, the professional society of the Negro physician. It contrasts its record on social issues with that of the American Medical Association. Clearly demonstrates that the record of the former is the better, and has become more progressive. After the first world war the NMA approved the segregated veterans hospital at Tuskegee, and Dr. Cobb comments, "one was enough." The attitude of the NMA to current legislation is much more progressive than that of NMA.

Example: In the 79th Congress the National Health Bill was defeated, but has been reintroduced. This measure had the support of national medical and dental associations, but was opposed by the AMA. The AMA's

counter measure, the Taft Health Bill, proposes organizational procedures which would give the AMA control of the plan, and contains a provision for the administration by the states, nullifying non-discrimination clauses in its administration.

It is of interest to note that the reason-to-be of the NMA begins in the fact that membership in the AMA is contingent upon membership in a local county and state association, and 17 southern states and the District of Columbia deny membership to Negroes. The American Nurses Association, in contrast, in 1946 authorized a direct national membership to surmount the same policy.

COMPETENT JOB

I note briefly other significant material. The report in some detail discusses many of the hospitals in the "ghetto." It examines an "inter-racial" hospital—Sydenham in N. Y. For those interested it lists the Negro Diplomats of Medical Specialty Boards, and memberships in the American College of Surgeons, and the American College of Physicians. (Negro membership in the latter having been increased since the publication of the pamphlet.) In text, but not exhaustively, it mentions contributions by Negro physicians in the field of research. For instance, the outstanding work of the surgical department of Harlem Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Louis T. Wright. The study contains a summary of its findings which is a model of concise statement.

This is a long commentary on a 38-page booklet, but it is not often one meets with such a competent job on such an important subject. It is evident that Dr. Cobb is a competent, ethical physician and teacher. His study is made within the framework of the NAACP's philosophy. It deserves much more attention than it probably will enjoy. Prejudice and segregation may effect the individual as intimately in other areas, but nowhere more vitally than in the field of health.



Big Business --

(Continued from page 1)

\$5,000 a year. Through income and other taxes they provide the capitalist government with much more revenue than do the corporations. These little people who are taxed unfairly to maintain an expensive imperialism for the benefit of another class have every ground for rebellious protest and for demanding that the capitalist class pay more, not less, for their imperialist needs.

HARDLY MAKE A CENT

Another propaganda point made by industry, as false as the one about taxation, runs as follows: Of the \$17,000,000,000 corporation profits, around \$6,000,000,000 will be paid out to stockholders as dividends leaving only \$11,000,000,000 in the treasuries of the corporations. Out of 1947 gross income, a total of \$4,000,000,000 has been withheld for depreciation allowances. This trifle is not reckoned as profit and we could say rightly so, if not for the fact that we know how corporations pad this item of depreciation. At any rate, corporations admit to having the \$11,000,000,000 undistributed profits and the \$4,000,000,000 depreciation allowances, a \$15,000,000,000 total, for operating purposes.

The reader must have patience with all these figures; here is a case where patience will be rewarded. The next figures we are fed by industry's publicity boys is that industry needs \$8,000,000,000 for inventory investment, meaning raw materials for manufacture, and "at the rate of" \$15,000,000,000 for new plant and equipment. That would make a total of \$23,000,000,000 for expenditures as against only the above mentioned \$15,000,000,000 they have in their treasuries. Therefore, corporations "are forced to go to the banks for \$8,000,000,000."

As far as expenditure for new plant and equipment "at the rate of" \$15,000,000,000 is concerned, I for one am from Missouri. It seems that steel and other industries are holding off on new plants and equipment, getting the utmost of profit from present machinery. Again, why have the publicity boys not included wage outlays, without which raw material and equipment are useless? Undoubtedly they have their reasons. Another point is that corporations have money from past profits. Be all this as it may, what the capitalist propagandists want is for the public to draw the following conclusion: Corporations are not getting away with stupendous profits at the expense of the whole people and the whole economy, BUT ARE ACTUALLY RUNNING \$8,000,000,000 SHORT.

FLAYING IT DOWN
Such brazenly crooked propaganda, such a reliance on ignorance, must be seen to be believed. When has capitalist industry operated on a cash

basis? Credit has been the very lifeblood of capitalism. The whole financial and banking structure is founded on business making loans for its operations and paying interest charges for the service. The salient point is that with this time-honored custom of being "forced to go to the banks," business made profits of \$8,400,000,000 in 1929, of \$5,000,000,000 in 1939, of \$12,500,000,000 in 1946, and of \$17,000,000,000 in 1947. Weak indeed is the case of the profit-grubbers when they have to resort to such obvious tricks.

A favorite method of playing down profits, used by the General Electric in its recent full-page advertisement, is to give the amount of profit per sales dollar instead of bulk profits. First, the publicity genius responsible for the ad assures the people that they "people think ten cents on a dollar of sale is right." Why, even the government in a pamphlet it put out for ex-GIs going into business told them that ten cents on a sales dollar is accepted practice. But see how reasonable is General Electric, this great industrial philanthropist. In the thirty years of its operations it has averaged only 8.9 cents on each sales dollar, and as time goes on it gets more and more philanthropic. For in the first nine months of 1947 it has averaged a mere seven cents on each sales dollar.

So what? Doesn't everybody know that the whole point of mass production as far as capitalist profits are concerned, is to pile up profits on VOLUME of sales. At any rate, workers whose 1947 average weekly earnings for 1947 is around \$48.86—which, less taxes and the reduced value of the dollar, makes an actual average wage of around \$30.16—do not much care how the General Electric Company figures its, bonanza profits on electrical equipment they can't afford to buy.

Another story we hear is that profits have "not changed materially in respect to total national income." This is absolutely a fairy tale. In 1944 the share of corporate profits in national income was 6.2 per cent. In 1946 the percentage was 9.1. This is nearly a 50 per cent increase in percentage. On the other hand, the share of wages and salaries in national income FELL ELEVEN PER CENT from 1944 to 1946, in spite of unprecedented employment.

But the irrefutable argument against the corporations is the obvious one, the big-as-life one, namely, that the high prices that cut the purchasing power and standard of living of the people, are translated into these biggest-in-history profits.

Yet the President of the United States, presumably tackling the problem of high prices, said not one word about holding the profits line, but had something to say about holding wages down—these wages whose purchasing power for 1947 average around \$30.16 a week.

Price Control, Wage Raises --

(Continued from page 1)

Plan. Democrats and Republicans alike concur in manipulating the misery of Europe's people for U. S. imperialist purposes. If it were simply a question of relieving the starvation that wracks millions of Europeans and Asiatics, AS IT SHOULD BE, it would be different. But there is hard, imperialist reasoning behind this; dollars, at the moment, are the most potent weapon in the hands of U. S. imperialism.

There is, therefore, little campaign advantage to either party in the European relief program. But on prices, that's a different matter. There is reason to believe that the Republicans will modify their stand on controls somewhat, Senator Taft's blistering attack on the Truman message notwithstanding. Taft's remarks against any kind of governmental action evidently produced a major crisis in the Republican Party. Some of its leading members insisted that they could not go out and ask for votes on that basis. The Senate Policy Committee of the GOP is therefore meeting to draw up its own anti-inflation program, about which all that can be said at present is that it will not include rationing.

WHAT CAN LABOR DO?

What is labor to do while all this bickering and "strategizing" is progressing full steam ahead? Stand by and wait for the capitalist politicians to decide on what they will talk about next November? To be sure, next November should definitely be in labor's mind—but not as Truman or Taft want it to be. Labor ought to be thinking in terms of compelling its leadership to break with both these capitalist parties, in terms of putting its own Labor Party into the field.

We do not hold with those who spurn demands upon the government. No, we definitely advocate mass pressure to compel governmental legislation for price control. True enough, it is not our government; from labor's point of view, it cannot be relied on to do anything but promote the interests of the profiteers. But it is not so strong that it can afford to disregard our expressed wish, provided we express that wish in the language of organized strength.

That alone, of course, is not enough. With that done, it becomes our job, using that same organized strength, to see that control is placed in the hands of those who have a real interest in control—namely, in LABOR.

TIME TO ACT

Taft spoke one truth. He said that Truman's program would revive the OPA. And so it would—at most. Now, Taft's objections to OPA are not ours. He objected to and objects to OPA because it represented any kind of price control. We objected and object to it because it represented a rotten kind of price control. Piddling measures and controls are not enough. The situation is so desperate as to require drastic measures of control and supervision. These can come only from bodies that will not

be influenced by trying to maintain high profits.

But the greater point is that these bodies can operate whether or not Congress legislates price control. If Congress does give Truman the authority to control prices, and if Truman does exercise that authority, it will still be necessary for labor, through its unions and in cooperation with housewives and others, to police, to put teeth into that control. But we cannot wait for that possibility. It is something that has to be, that can be, done today.

The problem is not that prices are going to rise. They already are rising, and the facts were well enough documented in Truman's message, though he did not document the correlative facts of staggering profits. Prices of almost all commodities are sky-high, and going higher. Rents are going up and so-called rent control is due to expire on February 29. The real estate lobby is still busy; and it has a judge ready to make a test decision that rent controls are illegal. Obviously, the time for action is now, not a year from now, when Congress has finished debating and prices have continued to go up and up.

That covers possible and essential action on one side—holding prices in check. It means little unless it is joined with action to OVERCOME the effects of rising prices. How? By seeking wage increases, and such wage increases as really counteract the effects of rising prices while they propel the labor movement to a new stage of influence and development.

BASIC WAGE DEMAND

We speak here of the demand that was used to such excellent effect in the General Motors strike of 1946, and which was voted a year ago by the CIO—and, unfortunately, forgotten: WAGE INCREASES WITHOUT PRICE INCREASES.

There is much talk of the unions demanding "a third round of wage increases." Whatever "third round" is intended to mean, we know one thing: wage increases will mean nothing if they are eaten up by price increases. Speaking at the recent UAW sessions, Walter Reuther argued that the Nathan Report, on which the CIO based its stand last year, proved to be wrong—the facts since then have demonstrated that industry was far more capable of paying wage increases without raising prices than the Nathan Report had indicated. Very well. That seems to speak for itself. It argues plainly for a coordinated union-campaign for WAGE INCREASES WITHOUT PRICE INCREASES.

And such a campaign will serve a triple purpose. First, it will represent a real wage achievement. Second, it will concretely serve the working class—and win the sympathy of the lower middle class, the poor farmers, the professionals and others who are ground down by inflationary prices. (Such a campaign would make consideration of the November elections, and labor's opportunities under the banner of an in-

dependent Labor Party, especially pointed.) Third, it will effectively scotch all plans for wage freezing!

Naturally, this does not stand by itself. It needs to be protected and strengthened by other means—by demands for a guaranteed annual wage, by demands for the inclusion of escalator clauses in every union, clauses that provide for wage boosts with every lift in the price spiral.

COORDINATED CAMPAIGN

We say, a coordinated union campaign, and we mean just that. A couple of years ago we called for democratically elected joint union strategy committees, and we have since repeated the call in connection with various of the problems that labor confronts, Taft-Hartley, and so forth.

A democratically coordinated union strategy cannot only make Congress bend legislatively to labor's will; it can put over successfully a national campaign for WAGE INCREASES WITHOUT PRICE INCREASES. If the CIO hesitates because the AFL big-wigs will not go along, let the CIO ranks demand that their own organization coordinate its efforts. And locally, AFL unions will be found that are willing to go along.

Let the Congressmen and party strategists tangle each other in their own campaign schemes. Let us get down to the business of checking the price rise, and winning wage increases! Let us get to work on defeating their whole campaign strategy by repudiating the lot of them for our own political party, our LABOR PARTY.

Philly Gets Negro Judge, But..

By J. RADER

PHILADELPHIA—Herbert E. Millen has been appointed the first Negro judge of the Municipal Court. His appointment was made by Governor Duff, the political head of the state Republican Pew-Grundy machine and the man who helped defeat FEPC in the State Legislature earlier this year, in spite of an election promise to support FEPC. Governor Duff made the announcement six days before election.

For weeks, ever since the death of Judge Clarence Brown, the Negro press has been campaigning for a Negro judge. Now we have one. The campaign is over and it was successful. Judge Millen received his political appointment and this will be used to gather Republican votes from the 325,000 Negroes of Philadelphia.

Whom does this appointment benefit, who will gain by it? The answer is Judge Millen and the corporation-owned and controlled Republican Party. Will Judge Millen be a "representative of the Negro people"? No, because he is part and parcel of the Republican machine. He is a cog in the wheel, and a small cog at that. His sole function will be to act as a symbol, as a front man, as a Judas sheep to keep the Negro

people safe in Republican control. Millen was appointed because he is a Negro, by a Jim Crow-supported political machine, in order to keep the Negro people in line.

That is the way the machines of the capitalist class work! Instead of an FEPC which would benefit the whole people, instead of outlawing restrictive covenants which would permit the people to live where they please, a single "leader" is selected. The same thing was done when William Upshur was made leader in the 30th Ward by David Harris, who helped defeat state FEPC.

Who is Millen? He has been a Republican machine politician for many years. He was deputy attorney-general and secretary of the City Board of Assistance. In all these jobs he was climbing high, not with his people but over the backs of his people, who were left far behind, still living in Jim Crow ghettos and poverty. Because of his loyalty to the party and for learning how to keep the people in line, Millen was appointed assistant director of public safety in 1940. He is now a member of the City Rent Commission, the office which has legalized hundreds of evictions, Negro and white. With all these political connections, Millen has also established a profitable law practice

and is president of the Mutual Life Insurance Company.

Millen is a rich man. He has nothing in common with the 96 per cent of Philadelphia's Negroes who work for a living. His color is a biological accident which he has turned into personal profit. He is not a Negro leader, he is a Republican leader. He is obedient to the program, the discipline and the leadership of that party. As such he is a political agent of the big monopolist corporations which control Pennsylvania politics. He is no different in these respects from any other politician, regardless of color.

His elevation is not the same as the personal success of a man like Jackie Robinson. Robinson fought through to his victory against all odds by simply being better than those around him. His is symbolic of the fight against Jim Crow. Robinson broke traditions, he broke into a lily-white field in spite of prejudice and against prejudice. He is a great and rightful source of pride. Buck Millen or any Negro who accepts Republican office is misleading, the people into thinking that the Republican Party is the party of the Negro people. Millen has joined the oppression of the entire working class. Robinson stands out above them.

"Our Decision Not Lightly Arrived At"

We lack the space to print in full the text of the statement which appears below. We have excerpted several paragraphs from the four single-spaced pages of the original. Other statements and an article by Max Shachtman welcoming the SWP members into the Workers Party appeared last week.—Ed.

Socialist Workers Party
Buffalo, New York

Comrades:

Please accept our resignation from the Socialist Workers Party. Our decision to resign is not one lightly arrived at, but is based upon a fairly long period of close observance of the organizational and political tendencies of the party.

It is true that we have developed political differences which are seriously different from the majority position on the Soviet Union, the role of the Stalinist parties throughout the world, the tempo of the coming American Revolution, and other questions; but it is not for these political differences that we are leaving, but for organizational reasons.

We are leaving because the Socialist Workers Party at the present time gives only the barest tolerance to political minorities. From the time that we developed conscious differences with the party, we have been objects of suspicion and mistrust. Every time we attempted to state a minority position in branch meetings we were forced to watch every word, each phrase, knowing that some minor slip would be seized upon by the branch organizer to distort and misrepresent our whole argument. We take the political problems of the world too seriously to be concerned with couching our opinions in the language of diplomats....

The Socialist Workers Party is deluding itself about its own size and importance. This, coupled with a mistaken estimate of the tempo of the coming American Revolution will result in serious tactical errors. (We are about to undertake a presidential campaign, but of course we just haven't forces enough for a Zionist picket line.)...

We are leaving to continue our work in the unions and other fields. We intend to apply for admission into the Workers Party. We hope that some time in the near future the Socialist Workers Party will democratize itself enough so that the two Trotskyist tendencies will unite into one larger, richer party, with the idea, not of eliminating a rival political tendency, as is the present SWP concept, but rather of enriching the Trotskyist movement, arming it for the tremendous revolutionary tasks ahead.

We hope to continue association with all comrades as a fellow Trotskyist tendency, freed from the suspicion prevalent in all our recent discussions.

Comradely,
Bill Johns,
Pete Randall.