

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

# LABOR ACTION

MARCH 7, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## Armistice Between Israel and Egypt Opens Way for Peace in Palestine

By AL FINDLEY

Peace is returning to Palestine and the Near East. Egypt, the most adamant enemy of Israel's independence, signed an armistice on February 24 and became the first Arab country formally to call off the war and, by implication, recognize Israel.

The armistice lines are almost the same as the present actual truce lines, with this difference—that broad areas are limited to "defensive" forces without tanks or planes. One area is demilitarized. Israel retains all of the territory won in the offensives since October 14. Egypt is left in control of only a small coastal strip, starting at Gaza. Trapped Egyptians at Falaya are to be released.

While this is not a peace, the preamble specifically declares that the agreement is a step toward permanent peace. The agreement also states that final boundaries are subject to peace treaties, but there seems to be little doubt that for the southwest of Palestine this will be largely determined by the present armistice line.

### FACTORS IN CHANGE

The factors that caused the Egyptians to accept peace are: (1) military defeat; (2) U. S. pressure and the promise of economic aid; (3) suspicion of Abdullah. While LABOR ACTION readers are familiar with these factors, a few new developments took place in the latter two points.

The Egyptian Premier publicly appealed to the U. S. for economic aid

in the week before the signing of the pact. In the past it was assumed that U. S. aid would take the form of the extension of the Marshall Plan to the Near East. It is now reported that the Near East will be the first region to receive the "benefits" of Truman's "hold, new program" for the development of backward areas by the export of American capital.

In relation to intra-Arab League feuds, two points are of special interest. First, the Egyptians have given the Jews a free hand in the eastern part of the Negev and in Beersheba. Beersheba is the main city of the entire area, is of the greatest strategic importance and was of the highest PRESTIGE value to Egypt. This is directly aimed at Abdullah. Israeli government officials shrewdly played the game of utilizing these rivalries to the full and announced a policy of opposition to the annexation of Arab Palestine by Abdullah in the fortnight preceding the signing of the armistice—a move which probably was important in bringing the long negotiations to a conclusion.

### NO CREDIT TO UN

The reader will note that I do not give ANY credit for the armistice to the UN, under whose "auspices" the armistice was arranged. It deserves none. At best, it was just the stage used. As a matter of fact, it was the UN's vacillation that contributed to keeping the fighting going since the second truce. The main hope of the Arab rulers since then was to force a shift in their favor by the UN.

The rest of the Arab states are expected to sign agreements soon. Lebanon may complete the talks within the week. Saudi Arabia and Yemen, which had no direct armies in the

field, have joined Iraq in accepting any settlement reached by the Arab states bordering on Palestine. Syria alone may hold out a little longer, not from strength or greater opposition to Israel than other Arab states, but because of greater fear of being absorbed into Abdullah's "greater Syria."

Formal peace talks between Israel and Transjordan began this week at Rhodes, after a continuous period of "contact" between the two governments. The Transjordan front was the front which has had the most effective truce. Last week an exchange of able-bodied prisoners of war took place, one of the greatest indications that peace is around the corner. Since the real borders of Israel and the fate of Arab Palestine will be decided at these negotiations, they are expected to take a long time and involve a great deal of haggling. The question of Jerusalem and the corridor to the sea will be one of the main issues in the negotiations.

### NEAR EAST UNITY

It is inconceivable that the Israeli government can prevent the annexation of Arab Palestine to Abdullah's realm, short of a resumption of the war. At the same time, it is highly improbable that Abdullah will recoup any sizable portion of the land assigned to Arab Palestine but occupied by Israel. The Egyptian-Israeli truce has greatly reduced the bargaining power of Abdullah. It is for this reason that the British Foreign Office did not hail the armistice, but announced that it was "satisfied" and would "study" the agreement. Abdullah himself, however, is not too troubled by the disappointment of his masters, as long as he can get an agreement which will advance his

dream of a "Greater Syria," that is, a united Transjordan, Eastern Palestine, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq—under his own rule.

The issue of unification of the Near East may not share the spotlight with Abdullah in current negotiations but is of prime importance and given much thought by the power politicians. The war has dramatically uncovered the disunity and weakness of the separate Arab states. There seems little doubt that the movement toward unification will be greatly stimulated. The question is what form it will take. Will it be a Bismarckian unity of "fire and sword" under imperialist auspices, or will it be a people's unity guaranteeing the national rights of ALL the peoples of the Near East—Arabs, Jews, Druzes, Kurds, etc.?

At present, two countries hold the key to this question—Israel and Transjordan. Abdullah is openly trying.

(Continued on page 3)

## Slave Labor in All Parts of the World Probed by Hearings

By WYATT LEE

Forced labor, in varying forms, is practiced on every continent of the world and, in areas controlled by Russia, is integrated into the economic and political pattern of society, it was brought out in public hearings held in New York on February 24-26 before the Commission of Inquiry Into Forced Labor, a group initiated by the Workers Defense League and sponsored by a large number of liberal and labor representatives, headed by John Dewey.

From the testimony of a parade of witnesses and the introduction of authenticated documents, the Commission heard details of Russia's gigantic convict labor camps, the United States' squalid, guarded compounds of Negro workers in the South, the peonage system of Latin America which keeps 40 per cent of the population in debt slavery, and other varying forms of involuntary servitude that men suffer all over the world.

"Wage slavery," universal under capitalism, did not come under the scope of the Commission's inquiry. Rather, the free exchange of labor, or the individual worker's ability to exchange jobs, a fundamental of classic capitalism, was accepted as an ideal still to be sought.

Formation of the Commission began last year after the United Nations, with the approval of the United States, refused to conduct an inquiry requested by the American Federation of Labor. The Commission was formally constituted last December 8 and the hearings in New York at the Bar Association and the Hotel McAlpin were its first public presentation.

The complexion of the Commission ranges from such stalwarts in the long fight for civil liberties as John F. Finerty, a lawyer who defended Tom Mooney and acted as counsel to the Trotsky Commission of Inquiry; Francis Heisler, a noted Chicago labor and civil liberties defender; Norman Thomas, veteran Socialist participant on innumerable commissions and committees; to several "professional anti-Stalinists" from labor and education. Among the latter are Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College and chairman of the commission; Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College; Sidney Hook, Matthew Woll and John Green, CIO shipyard workers' union head. The latter two did not attend the hearings.

Representing a younger generation are Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers; Arthur Slesinger, Jr., Harvard his-

(Continued on page 4)

## Truman Tears Into Republicans— While Dem Congress Does Nothing

By SUSAN GREEN

President Truman took the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner—to which naturally all rank-and-file Democrats were invited at \$110-a-plate admission—as the occasion once more to strut his stuff. In his best campaign manner he upbraided the "special interests" and shook his finger at the

Republicans and pledged himself to his dear, dear people. Only one thing was sadly asked.

When the President was campaigning for his re-election, there was at least some reason for his blaming the Republicans for the failure of his program—the 80th Congress was a Republican Congress. Today when he points his finger at the Republicans for the breakdown of his "Fair Deal," he doesn't have even that reason—the 81st Congress is a Democratic Congress.

The "mandate of the people" given the Democratic Party and its leader and its platform in the November election, is being swept under the carpet by the Democratic Congress. This fact the Democratic President chose to ignore. Today, two months after the 81st Congress went into session, all the most important measures are still tied up in committees of both houses.

### STALLED IN COMMITTEE

Every one of these committees has a Democratic majority—and what's the result? No law has come out of the Senate Labor Committee; the Taft-Hartley law is still the law of the land. It is likely to remain the law when the unions make their bids for new contracts this spring, thus militating against labor in the negotiations. The Labor Committee has a Democratic majority!

The housing bill which the Senate committee is reporting out is a much

abridged edition of the President's proposition, which means that reactionary Democrats have gone along with the reactionary Republicans. Again, though rent control is such a burning issue, no bill is yet ready for submission to either house. Why hasn't the Democratic majority done something about this?

Everybody—absolutely everybody—agrees that there should be a more adequate minimum wage law, but the issue is batted about in committee. Most of the Democrats are as reactionary as the Republicans when it comes to raising wages and thus trespassing on the domain of profits.

With unemployment rising, better social security provisions become urgent and many Democrats are probably thanking their lucky stars that there are the reactionary Republicans to take the lead in the fight for the former's own reactionary views.

As to the filibuster amendment and the civil rights program, not even the President can contend that the Republicans are responsible for the deadlock. His own Democratic comrades from the South are the Gibraltar of reaction they have always been.

Again, when President Truman in his speech referred with contempt to the lobbyists, he must of course have known that the Democrats are not impervious to lobbyists' pressures just as the Republicans are not.

Neither is the President less astute than the editors of the U. S. News & World Report in seeing that "Senator

(Continued on page 2)

### Presenting the First Full Account of Upheaval in Greek CP

## GPU Agent Replaces Markos in Greece

By MIKE STEVENS

When the announcement was made two weeks ago that Markos Vafiades was resigning as premier of the "Provisional Democratic Government" and as head of the "Democratic Army," it was obvious that the Stalinists in Greece were having difficulties. Nobody believed that Markos was resigning because of his health, as reported. This disbelief was not based on any actual knowledge, but because everybody now knows that the Stalinists are not to be trusted, especially when their propaganda is intended for the working class.

Reports now coming out of Greece, from Communist Party internal documents, and from CP members, reveal that everybody's suspicions were correct.

Markos was removed from his posts by the Central Committee of the KKE

(Communist Party of Greece). He was removed on the charge of holding views of a "right wing opportunist nature." These charges were made at the full meeting (fifth plenum) of the Central Committee of KKE held during the latter part of January. At this meeting it was decided to drop Markos as head of the "Democratic" army and premier of the "democratic" government. He was replaced by John Ioannides.

Ioannides is known as "Moscow's man" in the KKE. He entered the radical youth movement during the first World War and eventually was sent to Russia where he attended the School of Eastern Studies. Since that time he has been the "disciplinarian" inside the party. He headed a group of fanatics whose methods of discipline ranged from mere threats to outright murder.

Usually a capable GPU agent is

not used for work of this kind. The native gangsters are employed. But the KKE has had more difficulty keeping its members in line, and keeping oppositions from springing up, than most other Communist parties. So, Ioannides, a top leader, had to be used for the job. Now, the KKE has another job.

### HOW MARKOS BECAME HEAD MAN

Markos Vafiades was just another member in the KKE when the Stalinists decided last year to set up a "government" in opposition to the Royalist government in Greece. Nevertheless, the Stalinists chose Vafiades as head of their government and as "General" of their army.

Markos had been in the movement for many years, leading the life of a typical radical militant until the resistance movement developed and he became second in command of a guerilla section in the north. Dozens of other underground military and political leaders were far better known to the working class than Markos, but the Stalinists chose him as "leader" for a number of obvious reasons.

Many of the KKE members with military backgrounds objected to the party entering into a coalition with Papandreou in 1944. This was the coalition government that took over in Greece when Hitler's army retreated out of Greece. Papandreou's government, with the Stalinists in it, was so rotten the workers rebelled against it within a matter of months, and fighting broke out. The Stalinists hoped to work out a new coalition and did everything in their power to stop the fighting. The thousands of guerilla fighters who were awaiting in the north were never permitted by the KKE to come to the Athens area where the fighting was going on.

It is known that at that period and even later in the party fights, both policies were widely condemned. But not by Markos. He wanted to prove he was a good boy, because he wanted to show that he had learned not to disobey the party leaders as he had done once before.

In the early thirties, the KKE had yielded to Moscow pressure and had accepted the slogan of an "autonomous Macedonia." This slogan really meant the incorporation of Greek Macedonia into Bulgaria. Markos refused to accept this slogan and walked out of the KKE. For the next few years, Markos was involved in strike struggles as a worker and eventually was imprisoned for two years. Here he rejoined the KKE, and when he was released followed orders faithfully to show that he had repented.

All of the above made Markos a natural for the KKE's purposes when they set up their "government" last year. He was the one man in the KKE who had a reputation that was linked with the best traditions of the liberation movement against Hitler's Nazis. Even the critics WITHIN the KKE or in the working class could not accuse him of any of the political errors of the Coalition government or the December Days. He was a soldier up in the north and wasn't involved. All of this, plus the fact that for fifteen years he had followed the party line consistently, even though he was abused and never permitted to remain in any one place too long, made Markos a "natural."

(Continued on page 3)

## Sees Gain for GM Labor Despite Escalator Cut GM Makes Gesture to Public With Trifling Price Cut on Cars; Profits Still Tremendous

By JOE HAUSER

On Friday, February 25, the General Motors Corporation announced that its workers would get a two-cent-an-hour cut in pay because of the decline in the cost of living. At the same time it announced price reductions on its five lines of automobiles, ranging from \$10 for Chevrolts to \$40 for some Cadillac models. This situation, the first wage cut for the GM auto workers since they gained a union contract, and the first reduction in car prices in ten years, raises many questions for the auto workers, and for the rest of this country's workers.

On May 29, 1948, the United Auto Workers (CIO) and the vast General Motors Corporation signed an agreement which, for the first time in the United States on such a wide scale, established an escalator clause in the wage contract. The terms were that the hourly paid workers were to get an automatic six-cent raise plus a five-cent cost-of-living bonus. Further, as the cost of living increased or declined, according to Bureau of Labor statistics, wages would correspondingly go up or down, with the very important provision that in no event would wages go more than five cents below the May 29, 1948, level. Furthermore, on May 29, 1949, GM employees would get a three-cent an hour additional raise for "increased productivity."

When this contract was signed last year, LABOR ACTION hailed it as an important gain for labor. The sit-

uation up to then was that industry had succeeded in maintaining a united front against wage increases. Steel, meat packing, electric and auto joined in defying the demands of the unions for wage concessions to offset the continuing inflationary trend. Ford had even asked that its workers take a six-cent wage cut. The signing of the General Motors contract was a victory for labor in that it broke the industrialists' front and led to the third round general increase. Besides, it introduced the escalator clause on a large scale for the first time.

Now that this new wage adjustment clause has led to a two-cent wage cut, what do we have to say? Workers do not like to have their pay cut, even for two cents an hour. Many resent it, and the Stalinists in particular, ever eager to utilize any advantage in their unceasing factional fight against the UAW leadership, have been alert to inflame the workers against Reuther and the GM Department of the UAW. An answer must be given these workers.

### ADVANTAGE & DISADVANTAGE

The ordinary wage contract sets a certain fixed pay rate. This rate cannot be changed for one or two years, depending on the terms of the agreement. Prices go up or down during the life of the contract (up only, since wartime) and the workers have to take the risk as to what their pay can buy. Their standard of living is at stake and the risk is all theirs. During the past period, workers have

made gains only to see them taken away by price increases. They would then press for further wage raises only to be met by additional price gouging. Each time they came out losing more and more.

Now, what did the escalator clause do? IT PROTECTED THE STANDARD OF LIVING. As prices fluctuated, so did wages, and the workers no longer took the risk. If prices increased steadily, so did wages, and they could buy the same necessities of life. If prices decreased, wages could drop only five cents below the May 29, 1948, figure. This meant that if prices made a real drop, wages would be pegged at this floor and then workers would make a real gain in their purchasing power. What has happened now is that there has been a small drop in the cost of living, mostly in food. The two-cent cut is a wage cut but not a cut in the purchasing power of the General Motors workers.

So far, there has been no marked all-around trend of price reductions. The food drop is at least partly seasonal. There may yet be a resumption of the general inflationary spiral upwards, and in that event the GM employees are still protected for their purchasing power. If prices actually go down drastically, the floor on the escalator clause means their standard of living will really advance for the first time in years.

So much for the cost of living situation, but what about the other economic factors of interest to auto

workers? Ford and Chrysler workers will fight this year for pensions and a health program, both to be financed by the employers. General Motors workers must sit by and watch.

Their two-year contract prevents any gains in this field until 1950. The two years of "peace" the General Motors Corporation gained made this contract an expensive one to the workers. This lesson should be learned and the determination should come to provide for one-year contracts in the future.

### CUT IN CAR PRICES

Now, we need say just a word about the price cuts on GM cars. General Motors recently announced a quarterly dividend far above normal. It is making money at a fabulous rate, yet it cuts wages two cents. It must do something to justify itself in the eyes of the public. So it announces price cuts.

But what trifling cuts! The United Auto Workers Union has shown on several occasions that the auto manufacturers can make real price cuts and real wage increases and provide pensions and other needs, and still make profits.

There will be much fuss made about the ten-dollar reduction on Chevrolets, but they aren't kidding the workers who make them. Cut prices so workers can buy the cars and give them a decent standard of living, and then they will know they have made some gains.

## Schapiro Talk on Art and State Jams Second Labor Action Forum

NEW YORK, Feb. 28—The second in the series of Labor Action Forums—Professor Meyer Schapiro of Columbia on "Art and the State"—last Sunday brought out a maximum crowd of 150 to fill every square foot of the hall, while at least an equal number were turned away for lack of either seats or standing room. Most of the latter came at 8:00 p.m., the scheduled time, but the hall had already been filled by earlier birds.

The first of the forums, which had heard Ruth Fischer on "The Conspiracy Within the Cominform," had also seen an overflow attendance. The readers' attention is called to the announcement of further programs in the series appearing in this issue.

The main theme of Professor Schapiro's lecture was the effect of state-sponsorship of art in emphasizing and favoring the more conventional, academic and unoriginal elements in art as against experimentation with new forms, creative initiative and individual expression. He traced the modern trend, flowering in the nineteenth and present centuries, toward viewing art as the expression of individual, personalized feelings, ideas and reactions rather than as an expression of some institutional aim, whether of state or church. The policies and consequences of the totalitarian regimes in the field of art were discussed and illustrated within the context of this over-all tendency.

While it is difficult to single out for special attention any of the subjects covered in the lecturer's well-knit and meaty presentation of over an hour and a half, interest was aroused especially by his sketch of the development of Russian painting just before, during and through the revolutionary period.

He first noted the current fellow-traveler apologetics for the low state of Russian art on the ground that it is "young" and will improve in time, noting that the greatest outbursts and highest points of artistic creativity have historically come on the heels of important social changes which shook the fabric of established mores and not as gradual developments following them. Secondly, he pointed out that Russian art on the eve of the revolution was not backward but among the most advanced in Europe. Avant-garde experimentation was given a fillip by the revolution and flourished up to about 1921. Schapiro made it clear that while, with the exception of Lunacharsky, none of the Bolshevik leaders was (probably) familiar with the field or perhaps even personally appreciative of the new movements, there was no question under Lenin of any state intervention in artistic questions.

The change that became visible about 1921 was also not due to state intervention, but to the feeling devel-

(Continued on page 3)

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Philly Strike Sequel Vital to Labor

By JOSEPH WILLIAMS

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 27—The aftermath of the recent ten-day strike of Local 234, Transport Workers of America, CIO, against the Philadelphia Transportation Company has been as interesting and of as much importance to organized labor as the strike itself.

The past week has witnessed hearings in Harrisburg on the Kephart amendment to the Utilities Strike Ban Law which extends the ban to transportation, a request by the PTC to the Public Utilities Commission for an immediate increase in transit fare and the development of the split in Local 234 which started on the last two days of the strike in connection with acceptance of the eight-cent-per-hour increase offered by the company.

It will be remembered that the strike ended on Sunday, February 20, when Michael Quill, international president of the TWU, declared the strike over. Quill's declaration of the end of hostilities came after there had been a decisive affirmative response at a membership meeting to his request for a show of strength by those in favor of returning to work. The return to work actually signified acceptance of the eight-cent raise although legal approval was given by the secret ballot held on Monday, February 21.

DISSATISFIED WITH CONTRACT

There is a substantial amount of dissatisfaction in the local over the strike settlement. The new contract contained, in addition to the wage gain, only slight concessions on sick benefits and uniform allowances. The demands for improved working conditions, such as elimination of the "swing" shifts, a guaranteed work week and elimination of commission pay basis for cashiers, were not granted.

At the secret ballot, less than half of the membership voted for the new contract. Of the approximately 55 per cent of the total membership who cast ballots, one-fifth voted to reject the contract. More serious than the objections to the new contract was the resentment shown toward Quill and Local President Kaelin for refusing to put before the membership on the final day of the strike the Executive Board's proposal that the eight-cent offer be rejected.

Previous to the last membership meeting, the executive group voted 23 to 9 against the proposal for which Quill and Kaelin were seeking approval. After the settlement, the executive again voiced its disapproval and voted 16 to 15 to condemn Quill and Kaelin for using "lies, trickery and deceit" to gain approval of the contract. Quill at the membership meeting had labeled his opposition as "job seekers, liars and thieves."

One of the leaders of the opposition was Vice-President Robert High, who, according to Quill, is "a Communist Party wheelhorse." The Stalinists are a vital part of the opposition, but are far from being all of it. President Quill has played into their hands by using such undemocratic and high-

handed procedure at the ratification meeting. Later in the week, the condemnation resolution was withdrawn unanimously.

SPEED VICIOUS BILL

Despite the fact that the new contract has many weaknesses, it is doubtful if a prolonged strike would have gained much more, because the anti-union forces were fast narrowing the arena in which the union could maneuver. On the legal front, a transit strike ban was being rushed through channels with a clause that would make it retroactive to apply to the PTC strike. The end of the strike did not halt this legal assault but the retroactivity has been removed.

On Tuesday, February 22, the Pennsylvania State Labor and Industry Committee voted to send an amendment aimed at outlawing strikes in transportation to the floor of the Senate. The amendment, sponsored by Senator A. Evans Kephart, (R., Phila.) had been conceived by the Philadelphia City Council as a means of forcing a settlement of the transit strike.

Hearings on the Kephart amendment were held in Harrisburg for only one day preceding the committee decision to approve the measure. Pennsylvania labor was united in its opposition to the transit strike ban. Harry Boyer, president of the State

Industrial Union Council, CIO, said the addition to the Public Utilities Dispute Act was "another law directed at imposing involuntary servitude on employees seeking decent terms for sale of their labor." James L. McDevitt, head of the State Federation of Labor, said that the AFL considers the bill "a forced labor law."

Local 234 President Andrew J. Kaelin said that he was opposed to singling out transport workers for punishment by "hysterical legislative action."

The Philadelphia Transportation Company also struck at the unions and the general public by asking an immediate fare increase. Several months prior to the strike, the PTC had petitioned the Public Utilities Commission for a fare increase to guarantee a profit in operation. After hearings at which labor and even the city officials protested, the PTC ordered a delay in these fare increases until at least July. Now the PTC has asked that these pending increases of about three cents take place immediately to cover the wage increases and that further rate increases be permitted to take care of the profit requirement.

Since the last fare increase the salaries of the six highest officers of the PTC have been increased about 50 per cent and the huge sinking fund has been substantially increased.

OHIO NOTES:

URW Policy Committee Votes To Press for Economic Demands

By JOE CLARK

CLEVELAND—Perhaps the most important recent development in Ohio labor circles was the meeting of the 164-man international policy committee of the United Rubber Workers, which was held in Cleveland last week.

After much discussion a program was presented by a special committee and was approved by the executive board. This program calls for "fourth round" wage increases of 25 cents an hour, as well as company financed pensions of \$100 per month for all the 180,000 members of the URW.

It appears that, owing to present contracts, the URW will not be able to seek pension programs from three of the "Big Four" rubber companies this spring; only the Goodrich Co. contract permits this. But they will all be asked for pensions at the earliest opportunity. Meantime, the 25-cent raise is on the agenda for all companies.

L. S. Buckmaster, URW president, said the wage-pension program "is a constructive approach to two of the most pressing problems facing our country, declining purchasing power and insecurity in old age." The policy committee made no recommendations on a proposal by Buckmaster for a guaranteed annual wage.

The program adopted calls for ne-

gotiation of health and welfare plans by local unions, elimination of area wage differences, broadening of future negotiations to an industry or company-wide basis, and a greater effort toward a uniform six-hour day nationally.

The fact that the rubber workers did not, like many other unions, place pensions before wages is perhaps due to the peculiar conditions in the rubber industry at this time. Employment is high in the South, where employees average 46 to 48 hours per week, while many employees in Akron and other sections of the North have been laid off or are working short time.

The national work-week in the industry is 37 hours. Production is high but much of it is concentrated in Southern plants where the average wage is 30 to 40 cents lower than the \$1.60 of the Akron plants.

Average weekly earnings of rubber workers (Bureau of Labor statistics) climbed from \$28.44 in 1940 to \$58.32 last year. Union members assert they have been losing ground trying to maintain their living standard on present wages. An increase of \$2.00 a day is necessary, they say, to restore purchasing power they have lost since the end of the war and to bring their living standard up to what it was in 1946.

Truman Tears Into Republicans—

(Continued from page 1)

George, of Georgia, is becoming the real majority leader of the Senate, not only on tax policy but on spending policy, foreign policy and some other policies as well—the Georgia senator inclines to a conservative viewpoint on most issues of policy." A very conservative evaluation of Senator George's conservative viewpoint!

FOOLED NOBODY

The President's tirade against the special interests, the lobbyists and the reactionary Republicans, carefully omitting the Democrats who are in control of Congress, fooled nobody who knows the score. His threat to get on his choo-choo train once more and make another whistle-stop campaign for his program is an admission that his leadership of his party is something less than effectual. The Democrats in Congress are not with the Democratic President.

In passing, it must be noted that the President is not nearly as liberal and progressive as his tirades against the special interests, the lobbyists and the reactionary Republicans, carefully omitting the reactionary Democrats, would imply. A few weeks ago, in the Senate Labor Committee discussion on the question of anti-labor injunctions, the proof of this pudding was made in the eating, so to speak. It was amply clear that the President consented to leave the provision for anti-labor injunctions out of the new administration labor bill only on as-

surance from his Attorney General that the right to obtain anti-labor injunctions is implicit in the "inherent powers" of the President.

But this point of the dubious liberalism of the President is made in passing. The conflict between Congress and the President, and the failure of the Democratic majority to implement the program of their party, is something for the people who gave their mandate on election day, to think about. It is not that this kind of renegeing on campaign promises has not happened before. On the contrary, this is standard conduct on the part of the capitalist parties of both names. But in the 1948 election labor put more effort into a Democratic victory than heretofore, and the people as a whole seemed to place more hope in the Truman promises. A little thinking is therefore called for.

SAME OLD PARTY

How did the "Fair Deal" program of the Democratic Party in the 1948 election come into being? We might say: "Well, it's only fly paper for catching votes." True, but why this particular fly paper? Why the planks for more democracy through a civil rights program, why the planks for more social security, for housing, health, etc. Why the promise to repeal the Taft-Hartley law?

Why? Simply because these are now issues in the minds of the people, not deep in their subconscious, but consciously, actively and fightingly in their minds. There are enough top shelf men in the Democratic Party

who know this, and who feel that a little something will have to be done in these directions.

Another factor that helped produce this particular campaign platform is the current fight against Stalinist "communism." Fear has made some capitalist politicians believe that unless some of the peoples' demands are granted and conditions are made more satisfying, capitalism will be vulnerable from within to the communist ideology.

So the pressure of the people—not the good of the people—and fear for the capitalist system combined in making the 1948 Democratic Party platform what it is. These are the reasons why the "progressives" won against the conservatives in the 1948 Democratic Party convention.

WHAT IS NEEDED

However, the Democratic Party remains the same old party. It still shelters in the folds of its bedraggled skirts every grade of degraded reactionary! It is still held together by the same boss politics and by the spoils system. Its campaign chest is filled by the same methods. It is beholden to sections of the special interests Mr. Truman so vehemently lambasts. The candidates the party puts up are still lawyers, businessmen, professional politicians hardened in the game, in no way directly accountable to the people. So after the votes are counted and the winner is declared, the same old machine begins to function in the same old way.

The party platform is not expected

to be a plan for united action. A capitalist party does not demand loyalty to the platform adopted by the majority in convention. Any Democrat can get by with a little lip service, if he wants to be a "progressive." Actions are again something else. His actions are guided not by the party platform but by the interests he wishes to serve. No one is ever expelled from a capitalist party for disloyalty to a platform adopted by the majority.

Far from it. The practice is to make deals all along the line, way down into the camp of the bourgeois Dixiecrats. The party platform is remembered by the majority of the "people's chosen representatives" to see how little they can adhere to it and still be able to come before the people for re-election.

From all this it is clear that another train ride by the President into the hinterland is nothing for the people to pin their hopes to. What is needed to fill the void is a new kind of political party: A party organized by the unions and other people's bodies; a party whose leaders are made directly responsible to the rank and file; a party whose platform is the embodiment of the majority opinion of the party on what American productivity can do for the masses; a party whose candidates are held to loyalty to such a platform; a party which will be as different from the capitalist parties as the working people are from the capitalist class.

This kind of party LABOR ACTION calls an Independent Labor Party.

YOUTH and Student CORNER

By JULIUS FALK, National Secretary SYL

At Queens College, Olivet, University of Washington, Oregon and elsewhere the attacks on academic rights have spread like a political rash. There is no evidence of "conspiracy" between the administrations of these institutions, but the assault on student and faculty rights in each of them is politically related to the intensity of the cold war and the general uneasiness which grips the academic powers-that-be in such a pre-war atmosphere.

The attempts of civic and school administrations to stifle dissent is nothing new in the United States. But there are a number of unique aspects to this particular drive which need to be indicated and discussed.

The traditional source of inspiration, as well as the initiative for and leadership of the drive to "kick out the Reds" from the school system, is no longer the same. In the past it was the most prejudiced and reactionary forces—Hearst, for example—which virtually monopolized this "crusade." Today, however, the spokesmen for suppression of classroom freedom include "socialists," liberals of high academic standing and the like. These gentlemen have introduced a new ingredient into what is essentially the same anti-democratic stew. Unlike the Hearst followers of yesterday, they do not emphasize chauvinism or jingoism but use a much more subtle approach, what they claim is the best interests of academic freedom.

The argument goes as follows: a teacher who is a member of the Communist Party is not a free agent but, on the contrary, must follow the dictates of his Russia-dominated party. He must bring into the classroom not only the curriculum but the various political twists and turns of his constantly gyrating organization. Therefore, the Stalinist as a teacher cannot be objective or allow for honest investigation and the free play of ideas, but must constantly channelize lecture and discussion in such a manner as to indoctrinate students with totalitarian concepts. Thus, the argument concludes, the Stalinist teacher falls outside the pale of academicians, privileged to teach in conformity with accepted democratic educational techniques.

POLITICAL MOTIVATION

The story looks almost convincing on the surface but a bit of reflection is all that is necessary to unmask the superficiality of this approach.

To begin with, it must be pointed out that the Communist Party is not the only reactionary institution which has its spokesmen on the campus. There are many others who must follow the dictates of their organizations. For example, a member of the Catholic Church who teaches, and there are many such, is bound by a discipline no less insistent than that of the Stalinists, to teach in accordance with his theological views. Otherwise he may be excommunicated by the church and as a result damned to the fires of everlasting hell. Therefore, isn't it fair to conclude that the tie of a devout Catholic teacher to his church has at least as much compulsion as the obligation of a Communist faculty member to his party? At least the Communist Party has not as yet asserted its powers over individual destiny in the hereafter.

The answer lies outside the realm of educational philosophy. It is not an academic problem primarily, but a political one. The motivation for the drive against the Stalinists flows from the conflict between Russian and American imperialism and the desire on the part of the American ruling class to eliminate opposition to its ideology in our great halls of learning. It is the campus counterpart of loyalty purges and Taft-Hartleyism. What is more, this pressure is being felt, not only by the Stalinists, but, as is inevitable, by non-conformists of all types, liberals, pacifists, socialists, etc.

EXCHANGE OF IDEAS

What must be pointed out next is the simple fact which is so freely overlooked by the sophisticated exponents of thought regulation. That is, that the Communist Party, fortunately, neither writes the textbooks nor makes up the curriculum for the course of study. It is impossible for any Stalinist, no matter how hard he tries, especially in the physical and

natural sciences, to make his own Stalinist views more than incidental to what is the normal course of study. The fact that a Stalinist history teacher may distort certain phases of his subject, is no more reason to fire him than the typical bourgeois teacher who is hardly objective in his approach.

One function of the classroom should be that of a laboratory wherein all ideas can be discussed and examined. From this point of view, the presence of Stalinists on teaching staffs serves a useful function of introducing students to this particular ideology. Students are not so intellectually frail that contact with Stalinist ideology via either other students or teachers will make them succumb to it in a democratic atmosphere. We should not fear, but rather welcome the opportunity to combat Stalinism in the open. The legal suppression of Stalinist teachers will not even accomplish its purpose of delimiting the influence they have had on the student body. On the contrary, it will afford the Stalinists the opportunity to utilize their mistreatment, pose as martyrs of the progressive cause and thus gain additional support from the student body which might not be the case if students are permitted contact with all ideologies.

Let us see how valid it is. The methods of fighting totalitarianism are not absolute. That is, they vary from situation to situation and from one kind of totalitarianism to another. The above question does not take this into consideration, and therein lies its essential fallacy. The teacher who teaches race hatred cannot be regarded in the same light as the one who tries to convince us of the blessings of Russian life. Today, those who can be swayed by a Nazi will not be the same element as those convinced by a Stalinist. The former will be the most backward students who are predisposed to racist propaganda; the latter are invariably the more rebellious students and they are the ones whom we must be most concerned with. The suppression of the Stalinist teacher will not break the rebellious student from Stalinism but only increase its prestige in his eyes.

ANALOGY WITH FASCISTS

But aren't you in favor of dropping fascists and Nazis from teaching staffs when they preach anti-Semitism, racial discrimination and labor-hating, the earmarks of this genre of totalitarianism? If so, why quibble over the dismissal of those who demonstrably owe allegiance to Stalinist totalitarianism? This argument by analogy is another clever approach employed to justify the recent firings.

In a comparison of the right of the Stalinist and the Nazi to teach, we must bear in mind the base of support each of these totalitarian forces has off campus. In the one case, the Stalinists have their support in a section of the working class; the Nazi or fascist organizations have support in the most backward wing of the middle class, land and capitalist class. We should be interested in winning away the Stalinist worker from his party; we do not show the same concern for the social base of the Nazi or fascist movement. We cannot break the Stalinist worker from his party by refusing his intellectual leaders the right to teach in the school system.

Standard of Competence Another reason why progressives must defend the right of a Stalinist to teach, and not necessarily that of a fascist, is the fact that anti-Stalinist legislation on campus can be more easily broadened to include all those who are genuine opponents of American imperialism; off campus this kind of legislation can always be extended to include real left-wing parties and the labor movement itself.

No teacher should be barred from his profession on the basis of his convictions. The prime determinant must be, not political ideology, but competence in his particular field. If a Stalinist can teach math effectively then he is entitled—as is the Catholic or the advocate of "free love"—to be a teacher. For once the standard of competence is dropped and that of ideology substituted for it, no matter how "democratic" the motivation given, the consequence will spell disaster for freedom of education.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

Wants Dismembered, Policed Germany

Editor:

Being in sympathy with your movement and sharing greatly your opinions regarding international socialism as well as regarding many domestic issues, I have never been able to understand your attitude towards Germany, the erstwhile murderer of six million Jews and destroyer of all human values, which, if successful, the whole world today would have been sunk in total darkness and subjugation to the "master race" for the next thousand years, as envisaged by Hitler.

Mr. Philip Coben, in his otherwise magnificent article in the January 31 issue, laments the fate of "the German people who lie at the feet of their conquerors." He maintains that the German people were the first victims of the Nazi power. This is absolutely untrue. The contrary is the truth. This had been proven by the overwhelming vote in the Reichstag, which brought Hitler to power in 1933, and by the cataclysmic slaughter brought upon the European continent by Germany in 1930-40. One who thinks that the German people were unhappy and considered themselves victims of the Nazis is either a person who talks in his sleep or else, one whose conscience is asleep.

The writer of these lines happened to pass through Berlin in the summer of 1938 and has observed the faces of the German people—the people, not politicians or Nazis in uniform—in the streets, at the railroad stations, in the restaurants, and from the promenades along Unter der Linden, and

Friedrich Strasse to the Tiergarten, and around the Reichstag building. Not only were those faces happy looking but sparkling with arrogance and defiance of the world which they were going to conquer. For the war was in the offing and as far as Germany was concerned it was ready to start the march any day. The whole country was one great arsenal of war weapons. This could easily be noticed along the whole way between Aachen on the Belgium border and Berlin, and further east to Koenigsberg. What followed after is history known to everybody.

Now, I ask you, my dear editor, how can you explain the strange, indeed mystifying and unjustified attitude of your paper towards beaten Germany? True, as Mr. Coben points out, the German people lie at the feet of their conquerors. Would you or any one of us feel better if the reverse were the case? Would you want to see again a united strong Germany? Would you risk another chance like that after the experiences of 1914-18 and 1939-43? True it is that the two contending powers in conquered Germany today are seeking their own imperialistic ends and designs upon the world. So what do you suggest instead of this? A united Germany, free from foreign domination and interference. Is this your solution for securing a lasting peace? Would you feel better, if instead of two imperialistic contenders there were three or more, with Germany among them? Does it not stand to reason that a fight between two has more chances to resolve itself in peace than a fight between many which assumes the character of a free-for-all melee and may end most certainly in a catastrophe

for all involved? For this is precisely what happened in 1914 and was repeated in 1939. The mutual jealousies and suspicions between Italy and France, etc., brought about both World Wars and are bound to bring about a third one, if Germany, the classical war monger, is permitted to unite and become strong again. It seems to me that a prerequisite to world peace is, splitting up of Germany into several smaller states and policed by those states nearest their borders, such as Russia, Belgium and the Netherlands in the West.

MEYER KIMMEL  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

We print Ruedel Kimmel's letter as a remarkably (and naively) clear expression of that insidious state of mind often known as inverted anti-Semitism, or anti-Semitism standing on its head, or anti-Semitism in reverse. We can fully understand how it arises in the minds of people shocked out of thought by the barbarities of Nazism, but cannot give it a whit of sympathy. Friend Kimmel is thinking of the German people in the same terms as the anti-Semites think of the Jewish people—they're all tarred with the same brush; some of my best friends are Germans, but...

The "evidence" cited cannot be taken seriously, not even by Kimmel if he thinks for a minute. The "vote" in the Reichstag in 1933, as everybody knows, was NOT what "brought Hitler to power." It took place AFTER Hitler had seized power and crushed all opposition by terror and blood—opposition by the German people—at a time when the "democracies"

were still aiding and abetting him.

And as for "the faces of the German people," as observed by our passing traveler—now, really! Friend Kimmel's letter reminds us of the spate of similar articles and books written about the "happy, smiling faces" of the street crowds in Moscow. And if Friend Kimmel promises not to be offended by the comparison, it also reminds us of the few conversations we have suffered through with anti-Semites, who invariably regard the world with "impressions" of Jews they have met. It seems that they can merely look at a Jew and deduce from the expression on his face that he is hand-in-glove with the Elders of Zion who are planning to conquer the world...

We have no more sympathy with this kind of anti-German racism than with anti-Semitism, but go on the basis of the heroic struggle waged by the German people for years. If Kimmel believes that Hitler's regime REALLY gave the German people "happy" and "sparkling" faces, then he is a lot more complimentary to the Nazi barbarism than any other anti-Nazi we have seen. Those whom the Hitler despotism made happy were feeding on the oppression and misery of the mass of the German people. We recommend a slightly more scientific approach to the problem to our reader.—Ed.

Offers Postscript On Vogel Letter

Editor: Virgil Vogel has a remarkable degree of intellectual flexibility. His letter in the February 14 LABOR AC-

TION struck a familiar chord. I browsed around my pile of periodicals and came up with the Fall, 1945, issue of Enquiry ("A Journal of Independent Radical Thought") in which Mr. Vogel cites the characteristic actions of Social-Democracy "during the last thirty years," among which he notes:

"Was it basically socialist and progressive for the Socialist-Democratic minister of War, Gustav Noske, to order the slaughter of the German Spartacists?"

Mr. Vogel's attitudes concerning this particular event are certainly volatile if he can assert in his recent letter to LA:

"You also state that Liebknecht (and Luxemburg) were 'murdered by the forces of the Ebert-Scheidemann-Noske social-democratic government.' Despite the many crimes with which that government can be charged, this one is, at least, open to grave doubt... there is no evidence that the social-democratic leaders ordered or even wanted this murder to take place."

A fascinating phenomenon of repression, hmmm?

William MISHKIN

Correction and Apology

In a January 10 issue article by Dave Morgan on West Coast teamster union boss Dave Beck, an article on Beck which appeared in the magazine Fortune was incorrectly bracketed with, one on the same subject which appeared in Time magazine. Comrade Morgan and the editors of LABOR ACTION wish to apologize for their error to our readers and to the writers of the Fortune article.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents One year (52 issues) at \$1.00 NAME (PLEASE PRINT) CITY ZONE STATE ADDRESS APT. Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

Stalin Line on "Independent Macedonia" Seen as Key Issue

# Moscow Dictates Markos Ouster—

(Continued from page 1)

In addition to this, if any situation developed where it became necessary to remove Markos, his break with the party during the thirties could be brought up to show he was always no good and a "right wing deviationist." Markos, we repeat, was a natural.

## DEVIATION APPEARS AGAIN

But a couple of things have happened since last year which make it a little difficult to announce to the "democratic" army, to the KKE members and to the world as a whole that Markos is a "right wing deviationist."

For one thing, the Stalinists had built Markos up too high to knock him out that fast. In the United States, you may remove an Earl Browder without too many questions from the membership, except that some will leave the party, while others may remain with the illusion that some day they will stop these bureaucratic happenings.

But in Greece, or elsewhere, where persons are facing death every day by being in the guerrilla movement or even by distributing handbills, they want to know why a person was removed.

This is the answer the KKE leaders cannot give to the army or to their membership. Markos' deviation seems to rest on the following: He is still against the slogan of "Independent Macedonia" and against the KKE carrying on any activity that may stop supplies coming in from Tito's Yugoslavia.

Although this may seem as two points it is really only one. If the KKE pursues the slogan of "Independent Macedonia," which means giving the Greek section of Macedonia to Bulgaria, then Tito will immediately realize that Moscow controlled Bulgaria's next step will be to claim the other section of Macedonia that is now part of Yugoslavia.

Whether Markos is thinking only in terms of military material or whether he is against the slogan of "Independent Macedonia" on political grounds it is difficult to say. But that is not important information for anyone.

What is important is that the members of the "democratic" army are against the slogan of "Independent Macedonia" or any dismemberment of Greece. They joined this army because they wanted a government of their own choosing, freedom

and civil liberties, and against foreign domination and intervention. And one can rest assured, that the soldiers as well as members of the KKE, no matter what their background, feel that "an independent Macedonia" means intervention by Bulgaria.

## STALIN'S AGENTS EYE MACEDONIA

All of this is the opposite of the new line of the KKE. The KKE now realizes that the Royalist Government in Athens, no matter how corrupt and rotten it is, will be able to continue the struggle. The United States will make sure that Athens keeps fighting. The millions upon millions of dollars being poured in by the United States in money and material will mean the continuous whittling away of the guerrilla movement. But, as important, is the fact that the KKE views Russia's peace maneuvers with some apprehension.

The KKE has lost all hope of taking over in Greece for some time to come. They feel that the only thing they may be able to salvage is Macedonia. So,

they are going to press for victories in that region, hoping that eventually at some future peace conference, no one would permit the Macedonian question to delay more important issues. Thus, the Stalinists hope they will gain this foothold by default.

The problems now facing the Stalinists are many. They must conquer all of Greek Macedonia. Their maneuvers must not be too obvious or else the soldiers will desert. For, who would remain and fight if he is told that he is not fighting to return to his home a free man, but that he is fighting for an "Independent Macedonia." Politically advanced and politically backward soldiers will rebel at this, even if for entirely different reasons.

This is why the "disciplinarian" and GPU man, John Ioannides, is now a charge of the army and the government. The new task does not call for a front man like Markos. The Stalinists know that this is the last straw and that is why one of their leaders has been put in. Ioannides will try to control the army with strong arm methods. But they will fail.

The poor mistaken workers and peasants in this army followed the Stalinists, for they had nowhere else to go in their search for an organized resistance to the Athens regime. But now, even if all issues are still not clear, they will depart. Some will surrender, others will go along with their morale completely broken. What Churchill's cannons and Truman's planes could not do—the Stalinists have accomplished.

## FOUR POINTS ON THE KKE AGENDA

The agenda and the decisions of the meeting of the Central Committee of the KKE are the most revealing documents ever published by any organization. Not so much in what they say, but in the way they try to hide various facts.

It was a four-point agenda starting off with a long speech by the general secretary on conditions in Greece and the main aims of the Stalinist army during 1949. He went into detail on what towns and areas must be taken, etc. This may seem foolish, telling the enemy where you are going to strike and who will be there to fight. A maneuver? Yes, but not to fool the Royalist government, but to fool the "democratic" army into thinking that the KKE is planning overall actions in every part of Greece, and thus hide the fact that Macedonia remains the only goal.

The second point on the agenda was on the "Right wing opportunist deviations" and this is where Markos and others were pulled apart. In the report of the meeting distributed to party henchmen throughout the country, the KKE leaders claimed that the deviationists believed that progress could be made and that the foreign aid was necessary before any army should engage only in small guerrilla skirmishes. But that is camouflage.

Third point of the meeting was the reason why a new Political Committee was necessary, and the fourth point was the election of the new committee. Among those dropped from the Political Committee are Chryssa Hatzivasiliou, a leader of the Athens organization, who was considered too soft for the tasks ahead, and Porphyrogenis, a lawyer who served as Minister of Labor in the Papandreou cabinet. Another member, P. Rousos, husband of Chryssa, and one who had helped form the Papandreou coalition at Lebanon, was reduced to an alternate on the Political Committee.

# Schapiro Talk Jams Forum

(Continued from page 1)

oping on the part of the artists themselves that more fruitful results could be achieved by applying their art to practical projects (architectural design, etc.), as well as to the emigration of leading artists due to the lack of materials and opportunities in the midst of civil war, famine and economic dislocation. These tendencies merged into the ensuing Stalinist period of growing power for the bureaucracy and increasing pressure upon artists to succumb to the needs of the Stalinist state.

## WIDE RANGE

This, however, was only one section of the evening's talk, which ranged over a wide historical field, taking up at greater or lesser length the effects on art of Nazism in Germany and its campaign against "Bolshevism in art" and "Wehrsabotage," a few side glances at conditions under Mussolini, the French Revolution and after, the Catholic Church and—in answer to a question from the floor—of the WPA in the United States in the '30s. In connection with his discussion of painting under Hitler-

ism, Professor Schapiro also included a section on forerunners of the fascist spirit in the field of art—glorifying male aggressiveness, the Fuehrer image, marching men in serried ranks, etc.

Approximately the last third of the lecture was based upon the showing of slides of representative paintings under Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini—often paired to underline the points.

Labor Action Forum wishes to extend its regrets to those who were unable to hear Professor Schapiro. The next in the series of forums, taking place Sunday, March 6, will hear a discussion of "Asia in Revolt" by a panel of three highly qualified speakers. They are: Jack Brad, whose articles in LABOR ACTION on the recent events in China have been widely regarded as among the most illuminating accounts of the situation there to have appeared anywhere, Henry Judd, who writes the "World Politics" column weekly in LABOR ACTION, and A. Kimbay, a specialist in economics and writer for The New Internationalist and LABOR ACTION, who has lived in China for many years. Time: 8:00 p.m., at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14th Street.

# WORLD POLITICS

## Thorez and Togliatti

In statements made by them this past week both Maurice Thorez, head of the French Communist Party which still has about 1,500,000 members, and Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Stalinist movement with about 2,000,000 members, have both deliberately provoked the possibility of arrest of themselves, their parties' respective top leaders and, finally the outlawing of their organizations. The question naturally is: what lies behind this careful provocation on their part; why was it made at this particular moment; how does it fit into the well thought-out tactics and strategy of Moscow? For there should be no mistake about that. These statements, although uttered in French and Italian, were written in Moscow or wherever the Cominform now has its central bureau.

But, first, let us be clear as to what these two Stalinist gentlemen had to say. The phony "peace" offensive undertaken some weeks back by the decrepit Marcel Cachin, the Stalinist Senator from Brittany, has now dried up and this antique has been put back on the shelf. The reaction of America to that offer was its concretization of the terms of the impending North Atlantic military alliance. Against this background, Thorez had his say, to the effect that if Russia should be obliged to invade France (in a war with America, of course) the French Stalinists would openly side with the Russian armies. In his rhetorical way, Thorez stated that in the event of war "... could the workers of France have any other attitude toward the Soviet Army than has been that of the people of Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia?" A cynic might, of course, willfully interpret this to "mean" that the French would do their damndest to throw out the Russians, but everyone knows what Thorez had in mind.

From the viewpoint of the French government this, of course, is a reasonable statement. A strong, unified French government (not the shaky thing that passes for a government now) might have clapped Thorez in jail at once. Instead, the reactions so far have been rather timid—a resolution condemning Thorez passed by the National Assembly, without depriving him of his Assembly immunity from arrest; some raids on secondary Stalinist headquarters; a few arrests of fifth rate Stalinists, etc. It is possible, however, that the government is contemplating a more violent reaction at a later date. So it is, the general situation of stalemate probably means that the matter will rest and tend to die out unless the Stalinists pursue their provocative course.

## TOGLIATTI GOES A STEP FURTHER

In Italy, Stalinist Togliatti made much the same declaration. After pooping the whole idea of the Russians coming as far as Italy, Togliatti, with deliberate hypocrisy, nullified his own insistence that it was all a "hypothetical" matter by an even more specific and clearer statement than that of Thorez. (Catch an Italian Stalinist leader being outdone by a French Stalinist!) "... the Italian people would have the evident duty to aid in the most efficient way the Soviet Army in order to give the aggressor (that's America, of course) the lesson he deserves." That is, Togliatti proposes active and positive assistance to the Russian troops, whereas Thorez only talks about welcoming them (as did, allegedly, the Polish, Rumanian, etc., people). Uncle Joe will surely make a note of this in his index file of rewards and punishments.

Just what the even weaker Italian government will do with Togliatti is still more doubtful, unless, again, the Italian Stalinists pursue their provocations with other statements and actions. This, of course, would create a major crisis involving much broader issues than those at stake now and would change the whole picture. But this still seems unlikely.

So much for the facts in this evidently new "tactic" of western European Stalinism. What's behind the whole performance?

One aspect is obvious enough. The North Atlantic security pact is coming shortly, the differences are about to be worked out, and the tendency for the strengthening of western Europe—a capitalist, militarist basis—continues to progress. This is therefore Stalinism's open declaration of war on the coming military alliance of Western Europe and all have understood it as such. It is both a warning and a threat, aimed at weakening the effects of the Pact and issued with perhaps a vague

hope of even forestalling it. Thorez and Togliatti are both saying to their respective bourgeois governments—if you go to war against Russia, under American leadership, you will face "civil war" at home.

So much is clear, but the question still remains: why should western European Stalinism, a movement which has become distinctly weakened, less popular and much more actively opposed within the past year, risk its immediate future and actually court a further decline and loss of membership by such obviously provocative declarations? From their immediate viewpoint, both Italian and French Stalinism can only lose considerable ground now, particularly since they are incapable at this moment of taking power, or even seriously threatening to. This cannot be answered by merely saying that both parties are aware that the existing governments in France and Italy are too weak to suppress them, no matter what they say. This consideration naturally enters in the picture, but neither government is so weak as to be unable to annoy, disrupt and hamper public Stalinist performances and activities. Stalinism is in for rough times in both countries.

## NO INDEPENDENT ROAD TO POWER

The question must be answered more tentatively and from various aspects. It has long been clear that western European Stalinism has little likelihood of coming to power now, today, independently, under its own force and steam. We believe that a new thought must be added to this now: namely, not only is this pretty much excluded, but Stalin (that is, the Russian ruling group) consciously and deliberately does not want this to happen! He desires Stalinism in power in France and Italy, to be sure, but only over a certain road. That road is not the independent political action of the French and Italian parties, but rather over the road of the Third World War; i. e., invasions of his Russian troops who will then host a dependent national Stalinist movement into the saddle. Stalinism to power over the Polish, Rumanian, Hungarian road—yes; but not to power via the road of Yugoslavia or China. The images of Tito and Mao-Tse-tung are probably haunting Stalin today equally as much as the visions of Truman and Churchill.

In this sense, the declarations of Thorez and Togliatti are also declarations of loyalty—that is, subservience—to Stalinism, Russian style. They are both declaring, to Stalin, their willingness to continue their present decline in influence and membership, to flirt with the danger of a renewed underground existence, etc., because they both accept the Stalin strategy of coming to power only during the course of a new world war. Stalin has demanded proof of loyalty and subservience. Partial proof has been the new-concluded violent purge that went on in both these parties. This is final proof that the leadership has abandoned any temptations of an independent road to power, outside of and against the will of Moscow. Will Stalin demand further proofs? That depends upon other factors. If he believes that war with America is coming closer, that it may come within the next four or five years, he most certainly will—including such provocative actions as would surely result in the suppression of his parties.

Such seems to be the meaning of these new tactical declarations. As to the charge of "treason" directed against the Stalinist leaders, they are most surely guilty if we clarify what we mean by "treason." Yes, Togliatti and Thorez are treasonable agents of Russian imperialism, if by that we mean treasonable to the Italian and French people in general, and the working class in particular. In essence, they have declared their open intention of imposing Stalinist totalitarianistic dictatorships upon these people at their earliest opportunity. And that is treason in the real sense of the word; treason to a socialist future and humanity in general. No socialist can be so naive therefore, if they should be arrested and prosecuted, to consider this a "civil liberties" issue and to fight in their behalf; anyone than any socialist could side with his own government's charges of "treason" since de Gasperi and Queille have an entirely different interpretation of this word than we do. Thorez and Togliatti are guilty, guilty in the judgment of socialism. We look forward to their appearance before a court of the people, charged with their crimes against humanity.

Henry JUDD

# Push Russification of Eastern Europe

By JACK BRAD

Three years after the end of the war, the countries of Eastern Europe are taking on a common appearance under the forced program of Stalinism. In this relatively short period of time nations of as different a culture and history as Czechoslovakia and Hungary are being forced into a common mold, and an equalized level is gradually being established in which differences are eliminated and homogeneous subservience to the new master imperialism comes to dominate everywhere.

The end of the war saw all East Europe occupied by the Russian Army (except Yugoslavia). Under this occupation the Russians established the "new people's democracies" as Coalition regimes of remnant capitalist elements, peasant parties, social democracies and church parties. However, all of these parties were successively penetrated by Stalinists. Whatever their origin or tradition their leaderships were split by a Stalinist core which took over power, or the old leadership was replaced by more direct attack.

At this early stage the Stalinists even recreated some of the traditional national parties in order to offset the possibility of independent development. Thus, in Poland, for example, the Stalinists actively participated in the reconstruction of the Socialist Party under Cyrankiewicz. In Czechoslovakia Fierlinger played a similar role. Peasant parties were likewise fabricated for the same purpose and by the same means.

## OPEN AND BLOODY STALINIST RULE

This period of coalition throughout East Europe proved uniformly short-lived. For coalition soon became subordination to Russian control. At this stage, which is now in the process of completion, the facade of coalition was abandoned for more direct Communist Party rule. The penetrated and betrayed parties were gradually obliterated. The "People's Fronts" are giving way to monolithic rule in naked fashion.

Social-Democratic parties were destroyed internally, split by Stalinist agents and betrayed by corruption and spinelessness. In Poland, Hungary and elsewhere the Social Democratic Parties were forced to "unite" with the Communist Parties. The process of unity was one of expanding political and police terror. Purges lopped off op-

ponents at the top. Accusations of treason, exile and imprisonment were used against leaders who resisted. Even the ranks could not be trusted. The terror was extended to the smallest unit.

Political screening boards reviewed every member's history and family background. His neighbors, his fellow workers, his foreman, his janitor were questioned on his attitudes. Dossiers were established for tens of thousands; the secret police extended itself over every section of the population. The merged party was a purged party. Nevertheless this did not end the sifting process. For at the next stage of development collaboration and even subordination were no longer enough. So the once "purified" parties are being purged again and again. Socialist parties and trade unions were the first elements brought under Stalinist control, for this group represented the greatest danger to the regime.

The workers are the focal point of the Stalinist economic program. Everywhere the CP has introduced piecework, speedup, the longer working day and longer workweek. Stakhanovist slogans and the pressure to produce under constant threat of accusation of sabotage have become the normal factory regime. The unions are transformed from agencies for the protection of the workers into arms of the state for enforcement of production norms. Political, economic and cultural organizations of the city proletariat have been integrated into the uniform monolithism that is emerging.

The parties of the remnant bourgeoisie were next brought under attack. These fell with little pressure. Only in Czechoslovakia was there a capitalist class of any strength, but under the Benes-Stalin pact it had already surrendered key political posts. The fate of Benes and Masaryk indicated the feebleness of the bourgeois opposition. It also explains the inability of the U. S. State Department to develop a policy inside these countries. The other urban groups which the Stalinists have brought under their control were the students and university faculties. These have been completely re-oriented into training grounds for the new class of bureaucrats.

The most numerous social class is the peasantry. All East Europe is a largely peasant area. To coordinate the countryside into its structure Stalinism first began the destruction of the peasant parties. The fall of Mickolajczak and the killing of Petkov were the symbols of this drive. Similar events took place in the rest of East Europe. Today peasant parties do not exist except as village adjuncts of the state apparatus and its rulers. Village cooperatives have become instruments for economic control of agricultural production.

The current destruction of independent churches, as exemplified by the Mindszenty affair and the case of the Bulgarian Protestant priest, is the culmination of the process of destroying the last bastions of peasant opposition or potential opposition. The specific charged crimes in each instance are relatively unimportant and incidental to the primary Stalinist objective of eliminating the last vestige of possible antagonisms and its transformation into national churches to serve as agencies among the peasantry for propagation of Stalinism. For Stalinism is not so much anticlerical as anti-those-churches it has not yet taken over. In fact, the Russian Orthodox Church has

been utilized to spread Pan-Slavism and Russianism.

## INTEGRATED INTO RUSSIAN ECONOMY

East Europe is not developing into a buffer zone or transitional area but is being forced, by a common leveling pattern, into the closest organic relationship between these countries and between each of them and Russia. The common pattern is the tying of each economy to the next arid of the whole to the Russian. Trade pacts, military alliances and the Cominform are the varied instruments of the coordination pattern.

Through "mixed companies" and radical alteration of trade direction toward Russia these economies are becoming not only Stalinized in the general sense, but Russified in the specific. The new stage in East Europe is toward Russification. The Tito schism has accelerated this trend, which is intended as a preventive to national separation.

Whether these countries become formally absorbed by Russia as the Baltic states were, only time will tell, but the tendency is toward such an extension of Russia into Europe. This seems to be the course of empire. In the process of absorption a leveling of cultural and economic life is essential because a higher standard in conquered areas than in the seat of empire is inadmissible. So the standard of living of East Europe is being driven down. The Russians extort from these countries huge quantities in order to raise the standards at home.

This tendency toward organic absorption, or as at present, coordination between Russia and its European satellites is motivated by strategic policies of the cold war and preparation of the next imperialist war. But not this alone. There are many pressures toward such a policy. What is emerging is the character of the new Russian empire under Stalinism.

1947

# BOUND VOLUME

The New International

\$4.00 each

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

Limited quantity at this price—

First Come—First Served

Order from:

WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

# Israel-Egypt Armistice—

(Continued from page 1)

fact that Stalinism is totalitarian, anti-equalitarian and anti-democratic in its home territory, is bad enough. But what is of more immediate concern to a people that is just winning its war of independence, is that Russia has reduced all the countries it "influences" to satellites, deprives them of national independence and freedom, stifles their industrial development (Yugoslavia), drains their natural resources (Rumania and Manchuria) and liquidates the Fierlingers and Quislings that helped bring them to power.

The antidote to both these dangers lies on the same road. Israeli labor must take the lead in creating an independent socialist movement in the Arab countries and for a people's unification of the Near East.

## PROBLEM FOR ISRAEL

Another danger faces Israel, not an immediate danger, but a danger nevertheless: that the defeat of the Arab states may cause some of the younger Arab nationalists to turn toward Stalinism and totalitarianism. The miserable social conditions, the utter weakness of the present nationalists and their current disillusionment make such a development a possibility on the part of sections of the intelligentsia in particular—unless a democratic revolutionary socialist alternative is offered.

Unfortunately, some Jewish circles and especially the Mapam (which claims to be a democratic revolutionary party) look forward to such a development. That they ignore the

fact that Stalinism is totalitarian, anti-equalitarian and anti-democratic in its home territory, is bad enough. But what is of more immediate concern to a people that is just winning its war of independence, is that Russia has reduced all the countries it "influences" to satellites, deprives them of national independence and freedom, stifles their industrial development (Yugoslavia), drains their natural resources (Rumania and Manchuria) and liquidates the Fierlingers and Quislings that helped bring them to power.

The antidote to both these dangers lies on the same road. Israeli labor must take the lead in creating an independent socialist movement in the Arab countries and for a people's unification of the Near East.

## POINTS IN A PROGRAM

While LABOR ACTION cannot substitute itself for the Jewish and Arab labor movement, whose job it is to work out a concrete program, LABOR ACTION can and does offer a few suggestions that can be the beginning of such a program:

1. Economic union of Israel and Arab Palestine and/or Transjordan.

2. Return of Arab refugees.

3. United Arab-Jewish trade unions and political parties in Israel.

4. Direct contact with the Arab labor movement outside of Palestine.

# Mapai Wins in Histadruth

Elections to the convention of the Jewish trade unions in Israel, the Histadruth, were held on February 13. 180,000 workers cast their ballots. Five parties competed for delegates: Mapai (Labor Party-Social-Democratic); Mapam (United Workers-pro-Stalinist); Oved Hatzioni (Liberal); Oved Hadati (religious bloc in Histadruth and independent of the Misrah and Aguda); and the Communist Party.

The counting of the ballots in the civilian areas is completed but the army vote remains to be counted. While no final and complete figures are yet available, the returns so far show a complete victory for Mapai.

The Mapai received 60 per cent of the vote, compared to its previous 52 per cent. The Mapam received almost 30 per cent, compared to its previous 38 per cent. The other three groups divided the remaining 10 per cent among themselves. No breakdown of this 10 per cent is yet available, but unofficial reports indicate a sizable loss for the Stalinists.

The rout of the Mapam within the Histadruth completes the defeat suffered by that party in the Israeli elections. The main reason for this defeat is the pro-Stalinist position of the Mapam. The series of defeats suffered by the Mapam should be the signal for a re-orientation of that party. The Mapam militants interested in the growth of a left-wing party must take steps to return their party to a democratic revolutionary socialist program.

**LABOR ACTION**  
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism  
Published Weekly by the  
Labor Action Publishing Co.  
114 W. 14th St., New York City 11, N. Y.  
General Offices: 4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel: IRonsides 6-5117  
Vol. 13, No. 10 March 7, 1949  
Emanuel Garrett Gelfman,  
Editor  
Editorial Board: Jack Brad, Hal  
Droper, Henry Judd, Business  
Manager; Joseph Roan  
Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.  
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)  
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24,  
1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,  
under the Act of March 3, 1879

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

# What Future for American Socialism?

By R. FAHAN

The low vote received by Norman Thomas in the last election, the general decline of the Socialist Party over the past decade, the beckoning temptations of jobs and prestige in both the union movement and the governmental apparatus that have led so many leaders of the SP to abandon "socialism in our time," the overall political demoralization that has beset the political left in America—these, together with other factors, indicate that the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, pale, fragile ghost that it is, is not long for this world.

Geared intellectually and emotionally for electoral activity alone, lacking any sustaining programmatic strength and completely disoriented by recent history, the SP is now in the process of debating how best to bury itself.

No socialist in his right mind can view this fact with mere glee. Were it the consequence of a turn to the left by American socialists, were it the prelude to a new, lively political formation such as the RDR in France, the disappearance of the SP would be cause for satisfaction. As it is, its present dilemma (once one leaves aside factional considerations) must be seen as part of the GENERAL decay of the socialist movement in America.

Today, the SP is debating several variant proposals: shall it surrender its traditional electoral role? shall it continue as a party? shall it merge with the Social Democrats? But more important, it is debating what its POLITICAL view should be: shall it become, even more than it has thus far been, a mere "critical" defender of Western capitalism?

One issue that is agitating the SP is the question of what attitude to take toward the Atlantic Pact: unconditional or "critical" support? Norman Thomas is reportedly on the "left" in this dispute! To such depths has American socialism sunk.

## PROPOSES SUICIDE

In an interesting article in the January, 1949, Modern Review, Daniel Bell discusses the future of the SP in America. Bell is a young Social Democrat with a touch of academic sheen and sophistication; he is intelligent and realistic—oh, terribly, terribly realistic. His proposal, in effect, is that the SP officially and frankly commit suicide, so that its people and supporters can engage, without impediment, in old-party politics.

The amusing thing about Bell's article is the vocabulary with which he dresses up his none too remarkable proposal. The SP, he says, has always fluctuated between being a POLITICAL and an ETHICAL movement. Listen to Bell's distinction:

Society, he says, "is an organized system for the distribution of tangible rewards and privileges. Within that frame, ethics deals with the ought of distribution, involving a theory of justice. Politics is the concrete manner of distribution involving a power struggle between organized groups to determine the allocation of privilege... If there is a genuine commitment to politics, as a means of implementing the ethical ideal, then one must accept the hazards of evil that are implicit and shunt utopianism. Politics then becomes the acceptance of the relevant alternative."

Here is something queer indeed. A Social Democrat defines ethics as being the equivalent of a revolutionary approach to politics—though we had thought that for the Social Democrats ethics was a perennial monopoly and that it was the revolutionists who were unethical. Politics, however, means being realistic, accepting the "relevant alternative"—that is, accepting the capitalist status quo. In other words, says Bell to his friends in the Socialist Party, stop being socialists! Be reformers, be ADAers, be left-wingers in the Democratic Party—but don't try to build for independent class politics or independent Marxist thought.

Bell is frank enough: "compromise after compromise is necessary." He sneeringly points to the record of the SP "left wing" which had passed "revolutionary" resolutions in the late '30s and a few years later was plumping for Roosevelt. He is for "independent labor action" but not for an independent labor party. Socialists, he thinks, should work in the Democratic Party primaries, acting as "intellectual catalysts" (read: intellectual stooges) of the labor leaders. (Bell thus has the honor of codifying in theory what has been taking place in fact: the shameful history of such once "revolutionary" figures as Gus Tyler, Jay Lovestone and Will Herberg in becoming the "think men" of labor bureaucrats.)

But Bell is not content with mere pragmatic motivation; he has a theory, too. First, the trade union movement today is committed, not to overthrowing capitalist society (hear! hear!), but to assuring itself a better place within it. Second, as a consequence of recent economic policies in capitalist countries—deficit spending, managed economy, labor-capital partnership—it is unlikely that violent depressions will break out. Hence, the problem for socialists is one of increasing labor's share of the "take" and not worrying about eventual goals.

A few words are in order on these

notions. First, the theory. One wonders: what world is Daniel Bell living in? Has he ever heard of such matters as war economy, the preparation of America for war, and the economic consequences of that preparation?

Implicit in Bell's article is the assumption that the present uneasy "prosperity" will continue in America indefinitely, that somehow capitalism will succeed in stabilizing itself. It follows on an economic theory, or rather notion, that by virtue of tight governmental regulation of economy and the creation of what C. Wright Mills aptly calls the "garrison economy" in preparation for an active war, capitalism will be able to avoid cyclical depressions. This is a theory about which one may be properly skeptical, but even if one decides to accept it, that hardly means that any sort of genuine stabilization will follow. (Bell speaks of the workers having a "settled" feeling. What feeling of the workers is settled, except their fear of unemployment?) For what the theory implies is that war and war economy have become so natural, so unavoidable under capitalism that there is no "room" for the classical short-run cyclical capitalist development. In other words, the worst aspects of capitalism will completely replace its "normal" line of fluctuation.

Let us grant that. But then what follows? Is it possible for such a war economy indefinitely to grant the labor reforms which Bell believes are the only consequential matters for the labor and socialist movement? Will there not, must there not arise a fundamental clash between the war machine and the reform tendencies of the garrison state, even though these reforms (mostly, by the way, quite hypothetical, in the bush rather than in the hand) be politically necessary for the militarized state in order to keep labor docile. Such questions do not concern Bell—which shows that he is writing not about America as it IS but America as it is imagined in the editorial offices of the New Leader.

And even if, as he implies, there will not be an immediate large-scale depression with millions thrown out of work, will there not also be an increasing "hidden" economic hunger? Can the price of war wastage be indefinitely postponed? Who will pay? Will not the workers, even if working regularly, find that they are being squeezed increasingly? And will this not lead to an intensification of the class struggle? (The class struggle, Daniel Bell, is something one can observe in practice, in life; it is not a myth concocted by "ETHICAL" socialists.)

## THE SIMPLE TRUTH

Bell is correct about one thing: that the labor unions are being forced to commit themselves increasingly to politics and that, in the present situation, they are being increasingly integrated into the capitalist state apparatus. But from labor's point of view, or at least from ANY sort of socialist point of view, that is a great DANGER. For the more the labor leadership is drawn into the garrison state, the more it becomes the junior partner (assigned to the task of running errands at election time) of the capitalist class, the less desirous and able is it to fight for labor's rights. The "statification" of the labor leadership is proceeding quickly, but that is a hindrance to the workers, not an aid.

Bell's political advice... He should have listened in at the political action session of the recent UAW conference in Milwaukee, where delegate

after delegate (not socialists, not members of the WP or any other party) got up to tell the same story. The story goes something like this: "We worked our heads off for the Democratic Party when no one thought it had a chance. We provided the manpower, the drive, and a lot of money. We elected their leaders. As soon as the Democrats win, all the old-time party hacks, smelling jobs, came rushing back and gradually began to crowd us out. In effect, we revived their party—FOR THEM."

In those simple words is the truth about the proposal to work in the Democratic Party. Bell himself, being a realist, remarks that when the socialists before the First World War entered the Democratic Party, "they won a party but lost their socialism." That doesn't seem to bother him, and if one were malicious one might say he doesn't have too much socialism to lose. But now, in 1949, what can be lost in the Democratic Party is not merely socialism, but simply labor militancy. What are the glorious consequences of "labor's great victory" at election time? What has been won? What will be won? Is any labor leader sanguine about Congress? Isn't there a reason for Philip Murray's recent attack on the Truman administration for bogging the "fight" against the Taft-Hartley bill? Is the great consequence of working in the Democratic Party the program advanced in Congress by leaders of both parties to build some 700,000 homes... by 1955?

Of all these things, Bell has little to say. Nor does he have anything to say, incidentally, about the dangerous trend to squeeze civil liberties that is evident throughout the country.

For in truth Bell is not talking about America as it is, and as it is BECOMING. (Were we not fearful of being accused of being amoral Bolsheviks, we would say he is not talking dialectically.) He sees no war economy, no problem for workers in that economy, no futility in tying up with the Democratic Party, no pattern of repeated betrayal of labor by Democratic Party leaders (including the liberal ones). Though he calls himself a socialist, he makes no effort to place America in the general pattern of capitalist development, to see it in decline and in a death struggle for existence. Instead he envisages an endless vista of social peace in which labor will snuggle into the state a bit more happily, get itself a few more reforms... indeed, the mind of a reformist is a cozy apartment.

It is very possible that a majority of the Socialist Party leaders will take kindly to Bell's article. For them his article may well represent "realistic" thinking. And it is more than likely that his proposal will, in one form or another, become the policy of the SP. If so, that means that there

will be left on the socialist scene only two groups—both tiny, both insignificant numerically and in terms of influence. Those groups will be the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party (Cannonites).

And this raises an important problem which we would draw to the attention of whichever members of the SP or its youth affiliate still think as class-conscious socialists. On the one hand, the SP is to surrender its ghost, either by depoliticalization or by merging with the Social Democratic Federation. On the other hand, the SWP becomes increasingly the wretched shadow of Stalinism. Is there not a need for a socialist group which will continue to speak for independent socialism, against a fatal dependence on either Washington or Moscow?

## THE MAGNETS PULL

The Bell course, with which a majority of SP leaders will probably agree, means to become a pale left wing of the ADA—that is, to stop being socialists and become liberals. It means supporting a series of liberal candidates and thereby moving closer and closer to the atom bomb war. On the other hand, the SWP is unable to break itself off from Stalinism—e.g., its preposterous, fatal, in-

credibly stupid line on China (that the Stalinists are insufficiently decisive in their fight against the Chinese bourgeoisie).

The magnets pull. The magnets of America and Russia pull apart the socialist movement. But are there not still socialists who see the tragic consequences of allying oneself with either side? Are there not socialists who see that supporting either Stalinism or capitalism is a form of political and moral suicide?

To those who see this, we would say the following: whatever criticisms you may have of the Workers Party, it remains the only alive, democratic center of socialist rebellion in the United States, the only party free of encumbrances with either of the two major power blocs. To those who want—not to become oppositionist liberals supporting the capitalist status quo or harried shadows of Stalinism—but to persist in the struggle for independent class action and the rebuilding of an independent socialist movement, come with us toward the WP.

The magnets pull. But who will have courage and wisdom enough to resist them, to realize that resistance means merely the life of socialism itself?

# Hearings Probe World's Slave Labor—

(Continued from page 1)  
torian and author of The Age of Jackson; and a group of WDL activists such as Rev. Albert K. Herling, director of research for the Commission; Rev. Donald Harrington and Frank McCulloch. Other Commission members are: Morris L. Cooke, Mrs. Ethel S. Epstein, Dr. Frank P. Graham, A. Philip Randolph, Max Sherover and Dr. Ralph Gilbert Ross, secretary of the Commission.  
Thomas L. Parsonnet, corporation counsel for Newark, N. J., acted as general counsel for the Commission and conducted the examination of witnesses. He was assisted by Ernest Fleischman and Carl Rachlin.

## DESCRIBE GENOCIDE

Testimony concerning Russia and its satellites was taken on the first and closing days of the hearings and, as to be expected, attracted the most attention. On hand for the opening day were newspaper photographers, press photographers and the biggest delegation of the working press. Also present throughout the hearings were technicians who recorded the entire proceedings for the State Department's "Voice of America" foreign broadcasts. One of the State Department men assured this writer that the recording would be "edited" before use. Aside from the limitations of broadcast time, we wonder how many references to peonage in South America and to the treatment of Negroes in our own South will remain in the final version.

Star witness of the opening session was Jerzy Glicksman, a member of the Polish Socialist Bund and a political prisoner of the Stalinists during the Hitler-Stalin pact. Most of Glicksman's testimony has already been published in his book, Tell the West, but his first-hand account of his experiences in a slave labor logging camp in East Poland was moving and dramatic. Half-brother to Victor Alter, the Socialist Bund leader executed by Stalin, Glicksman has dedicated himself to exposing the conditions of prisoners in Russia. His appearance before the Commission in the spacious meeting room of the Bar Association, with his words recorded by sound cameras, must be the high point in his campaign.

Two other Poles, Mrs. Sabina Dworecki and Wladyslaw Zachariasiewicz, and a Yugoslav, Osvinik, told the Commission of their experiences in Russian slave labor camps and described in ghastly detail the brutalities practiced there.

Two representatives of governments deposed by Russian conquest appeared before the Commission. General Nicolai Radescu, former Prime Minister of Rumania, had an attendant read a lengthy statement that charged the Russians with genocide as a result of mass forced migrations of Rumanians to Russian regions beyond the Urals. Radescu sees the replacement of 1,800,000 Rumanians in Besarabia and Bukovina by immigrants from Siberia as "the creation of an ethnic insulation barrier along the Soviet frontier from the Baltic to the Black Sea."

Kaarel R. Pusta, Sr. former Minister of Foreign Affairs for Estonia, a Baltic nation absorbed by Russia, also charged that the native populations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are being "exterminated" by mass deportations, forced labor and forced migrations. Projects of the Soviet Five-Year Plan require "great masses of cheap manpower," he said, "and as a result, mass arrests and mass deportations never cease." Submitted to the Commission were photostats of personal accounts of Estonians deported to Russia.

## HORSES TREATED BETTER

Russian witnesses appeared before the Commission at the final hearing held February 26 at the Hotel McAlpin. Vladimir Petrov, now an in-

structor at Yale University, spent six years in Russian prison camps and said that the toll of prisoners from overwork amounted to 15 per cent annually.

"It was much better to be a horse than a human," he said. "The horse only worked eight hours a day, got medical attention when it was sick and its groom was punished heavily if it suffered an accident. The human worked 15 hours a day, got no medical attention, and nothing happened to its guard if there was an accident."

More surprising was the testimony of Kyril Alexeev, an engineer who has stayed in the United States after being sent here on a Russian commercial mission. He declared that in 1944, when he left Russia, strikes took place throughout the country, even in Moscow. The strikes were invariably broken, he said, by gunfire if necessary. Prison laborers were used as strike-breakers, being rushed into plants to keep production going.

Alexeev's wife, Nina, was to have appeared to give an eye-witness account of a strike in the Urals involving 25,000 workers. Mrs. Alexeev was unable to attend the hearing and Parsonnet, counsel conducting the hearing, told the Commission that the strike was broken by machine-gunning the leaders.

Alexeev said that slave labor was not confined to prison camps remote from population centers, but that he had seen groups of political prisoners working for nothing on the same production lines where they had previously earned their living.

## FORCED LABOR IN THE U. S.

Testimony on forced labor in the United States dealt mainly with the Negro worker in the South. Most impressive witness was C. Leroy Hacker, a Methodist minister and former professor at Bethune-Cookman College, who had made a detailed, first-hand study of labor conditions in the turpentine camps of Alachua County, Fla.

Turpentine workers in that county, which was picked because a few wealthy farmers are in complete control, are kept in filthy compounds made up of one and two-room shacks. Whole families live in these places without the most elementary sanitary facilities. Other compounds, Hacker said, consist of barracks, in which the families are separated. Some compounds are fenced in with mesh wire, while others are surrounded by high board fences topped with barbed wire.

Armed guards are used to keep "the insiders in and outsiders out," Hacker said. Armed guards also escort the men to work and prevent attempts to escape. A worker who tries to escape will be chased by bloodhounds and, if caught, returned to his slavery.

These workers are recruited through false promises of high pay and good conditions or, if this is unavailing, men are arrested on vagrancy charges and sent by the authorities to work off their bail. Once

# Knitgoods Union Hits Cardinal's Frameup Trial, Franco Terror

NEW YORK, Feb. 28.—In a statement, signed by Sam Cohen, President, and Louis Nelson, Manager-Secretary, of the union, the Knitgoods Workers Union (ILGWU-AFL), today protested the Mindszenty Trial, and simultaneously denounced the terror in Franco Spain. The statement follows:

The whole world was shocked by the manipulated trial conducted by the Communist dominated government of Hungary against Cardinal Mindszenty. This trial was a farce, staged in the pattern of the Moscow trials against a background of secret police, concentration camps and all pervading fear.

The Knitgoods Workers' Union, Local 155, ILGWU-AFL protests this trial as it has protested against all denials of justice, whether in Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Spain or the United States. Justice and liberty are our common heritage and each man, whether high or low, is entitled to the protection of his rights.

We call on Cardinal Spellman and all those who have protested vigorously against this Mindszenty Trial to also join us in calling upon Franco to end his oppression of the Spanish people and to release the thousands of Spanish workers who are languishing in Franco's jails.

The terror of Franco continues unabated. Only recently, twenty-two Spanish miners were thrown into a well, drenched with gasoline and dynamite. This tragedy at Pozu Fumeras does not stand alone. The Franco regime maintains itself through a reign of lawlessness under which no one is safe. During this month of February 1949, many democrats, trade unionists and socialists have been arrested and sentenced to long prison sentences. One of these arrested, Enrique Marcos Nadal, the holder of French and British decorations for brave deeds in the war against Hitler, was sentenced to death.

The fight for freedom is one throughout the world and cannot be separated or sub-divided. Such a struggle is a just one and deserves the support of all people. In the ringing words of Cardinal Spellman, "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God."

they are in the compound, low wages and high prices at the compound will plunge them into debt, giving the owner a legal pretext to keep them against their will.

Mr. Hacker told of the experience of his cousin, trapped in one of these slave camps, who escaped through the swamps though pursued by armed men and bloodhounds. Federal and state authorities were notified of this incident, but no action was taken.

## DEBT SLAVERY

Rowland Watts, national secretary of the WDL, corroborated Hacker's testimony on the basis of actual cases investigated by the WDL and discussed the legal status of forced labor in the U. S. The most prevalent form practiced in this country, he said, is debt slavery, in which the worker finds that his wages never meet the cost of food and other necessities supplied by the employer.

Watts told of the case of 60 longshoremen of Broward County, Fla., who were arrested for "vagrancy" on their day off and forced to work off fines and court costs in the bean fields. In another case, a young Alabama farm worker had been working on a farm for eight years, holding a 16-hour day seven days a week, without pay. An attempt to rescue him met with armed resistance.

Watts estimated that 20,000 families in six Southern states were held in a state of peonage, but that he had seen groups of political prisoners working for nothing on the same production lines where they had previously earned their living.

Other witnesses on the American scene were Edwin C. Mitchell, representing the National Farm Union; Dr. Von D. Mizell, Florida state chairman of the WDL; Mrs. Pauline Kibbe, Oil Workers Union representative, who told of slave labor practices employed against Mexican workers in the U. S.; and Roy Finch, a conscientious objector during the war.

## SOUTH AMERICAN PEONAGE

Victor Andrade, former Bolivian Minister of Labor and at present a lecturer at the New School, was the principal witness on Friday morning when peonage in South America was before the Commission. He told how feudal relations established by the ancient Incas were first utilized by the Spanish conquerors and still form the peonage pattern used today by large plantation and mine owners.

The Bolivian government in 1944, Andrade claimed, abolished this system and another called "Pongo," under which persons were obliged to serve their "lord" without pay. These obligatory services could also be hired out without consulting the persons involved, Andrade said. When the Villarroel government was overthrown in 1946, Andrade said, these forms of slavery were reinstated.

A summary of reports on peonage in the Latin American countries was presented by Herling, director of research for the Commission, and he said the conditions described by An-

drade were common to Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador.

## IMPRESSIVE REVIEW

Direct witnesses were not called when Africa, Asia, Australasia and the island countries of the South Pacific were before the Commission, but Herling delivered summary reports on each, dealing with material collected either from direct sources or recognized works published on the subject.

The mass of evidence presented during the three days of hearings was truly impressive and undoubtedly the most ambitious review of a neglected field ever attempted. The Commission and its staff worked under the handicaps common to unofficial bodies dealing with an unpopular subject.

According to Dr. Gideonse, the Commission still hopes the United Nations will deal with the question of slave labor on an official basis.

"We took great comfort," he said in his opening remarks, "from the fact that the U. S. delegate to the UN Economic and Social Council vigorously supported the second AFL request, made recently, for an official inquiry into forced labor and slave labor all over the world."

Admitting that the "obduracy" of the Soviet Union may well prevent a UN investigation, Dr. Gideonse went on to say that the Commission "remains the sole source of relief and public information to a frustrated humanity, an extraordinarily large part of which suffers the degradation and humiliation of slaves, peons and forced laborers."

A luncheon Saturday afternoon at the Hotel McAlpin concluded the sessions.

## New Yorkers!

You'll Meet Your Old Friends

From All Parts of the Country

And Make New Ones

at the

# DANCE

Organized by

Local New York of the Workers Party

Sat. Eve., March 26

Labor Action Hall

114 West 14th Street

## THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

by Leon Trotsky

\$3.50

Order Your Copy From LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, New York

## Debate in Los Angeles:

Will a Labor Party Advance the Interests of the Working Class?

"YES"

ALBERT GATES  
Workers Party

"NO"

F. G. EVANS  
World Socialist Party

Chairman: ANTHONY RAMUGLIA, Intl. Rep., TWUA-CIO  
VLADECK CENTER  
126 N. St. Louis St.  
Basement Hall  
SUNDAY, MARCH 13  
7:00 p.m. 35 Cents  
Unemployed Free

## New York Labor Action Forum:

### SUNDAY LECTURE SERIES

Winter-Spring 1949  
All lectures begin at 8:00 o'clock

- March 6  
SYMPOSIUM: JACK BRAD, HENRY JUDD, A. KIMBAY  
"Asia in Revolt."
- March 20  
HAROLD BROWN  
"The Meaning of Interpretation in Music."
- April 3  
GUENTER REIMANN  
"Russian Policies in Germany."
- April 17  
ALFRED KAZIN and IRVING HOWE  
"Two Novelists and Their Times: Melville and Hawthorne."
- April 24  
ISAAC ROSENFELD  
"War and the Novelist."
- May 1  
MAX SHACHTMAN  
"The Growing International Crisis."

TIME: Sunday Evenings at 8:00 o'clock  
PLACE: Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.  
Admission: 50¢ per Lecture — S.Y.L.: 25¢

**Subscribers — Attention!**  
Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.  
If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.  
**13-10**  
If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.  
**RENEW NOW**