

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

# LABOR ACTION

APRIL 11, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

## Congress Stalls On Taft-Hartley

By SUSAN GREEN

The working people are going to get as resounding a slap in the face from Congress on labor legislation as they took on rent control.

The coalition between reactionary Republicans and Southern Democrats rules the Congressional roost. President Truman is reported to have abandoned his "get tough" policy towards Congress and to have adopted a mood of "compromise." The result is not hard to guess. There will be enacted what is known as a "strong" labor bill—in plain English, an anti-labor bill.

Though the Thomas-Lesinski measure calling for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law and for the restoration of the Wagner Act—of course with a few labor-restricting amendments—was approved by both the Senate and House Labor Committees, the predictions are that this bill, more favorable to labor, will not be passed by either house.

The strategy of the reactionary

coalition in the House of Representatives will be to control procedure. When the Lesinski bill is put before the House, its opponents will move to substitute the Wood bill.

### DEMOCRATIC TAFT-HARTLEY

The Wood bill is the child of a Southern Democrat, John S. Wood of Georgia—anti-labor though he is, still a member of the House Labor Committee. The Wood bill contains virtually all the provisions of the T-H Law, and in some respects is even more offensive than that most offensive anti-labor legislation.

If the Wood bill is the one to be considered by the House, the representatives who feel beholden to labor to some extent would have the exhausting and time-consuming task of taking up each of the more than twenty-five sections of the bill, bit by bit, to try to amend them in order to tone down its anti-labor content.

The Washington reporter for the New York Times had this to say: "If the coalition plans are successful, the House's product will be a bill strongly resembling the T-H Law but carrying a Democrat's name."

In the Senate the strategy of the ruling coalition, when the Thomas bill reaches the floor, will be to offer so many modifying amendments as to add up to another T-H Law. Officials of the AFL meeting in Washington expressed gloom over the outcome. Their one hope is in the dozen (or less) still doubtful senators.

According to the AFL, out of the 96 senators, 38 to 43 favor repeal of the T-H Law while 42 to 46 oppose it. The AFL will concentrate on these doubtful senators, who will be visited by spokesmen of the unions on a national, state and local level, though they are not at all optimistic about the result of their efforts.

### POLLSTERS HERE AGAIN

In the meantime the capitalist class is also doing its bit to influence congressmen. As if polls have not been sufficiently discredited by the votes of the electorate last November—votes giving an overwhelming mandate for the repeal of the T-H Law—such powerful outfits as General Electric, Revere Copper & Brass Co., and Look magazine are busy "polling public sentiment" on labor legislation—for the benefit of congressmen.

Such Simple-Simon, biased and leading questions as these are asked: "Should labor law protect employees against unfair practices by union and management?" or "Should the union shop, under which a person is forced to join a union a short time after his employment, be unlawful?"

The citizen not knowing that it is a distortion to put union and management on the same basis in relation to employees, will naturally tend to give the answer the poll-takers want. Similarly, a question like the one above about the union shop will lead persons who don't understand that a union shop is voted for by the majority of workers, to say he opposes any kind of "force." In this way is "public sentiment" evaluated.

On the other hand, the manipulators of "public sentiment" have made it their business not to give publicity to a juicy bit of information about the origin of the T-H Law. A Washington attorney, name of Morgan, recently stated that he was the author of the T-H Law—he, and not Senator Taft and Representative Hartley, who were elected by the people to make the laws.

Mr. Morgan stated that he was employed by the Republican National Committee, which as we all know, is not the law-making body of the land, and that after the bill became law Mr. Morgan was paid \$7,500 by the same Republican National Committee. Thus are the laws made under the system of capitalist democracy.

### DEMOCRATS STALLING

The obvious purpose in both houses is to delay consideration of labor legislation as long as possible. Though the House was ready for the Lesinski bill, the matter of procedure was referred to the Rules Committee, where the worthy representatives killed considerable time. Now, it is reported, the issue will be decided.

(Continued on page 4)

# ATLANTIC TREATY MARKS NEW HIGH IN COLD WAR!

World Balance of Power!



## Three Myths: Fact and Fiction on the Treaty

In the barrage of propaganda that has been industriously laid down around the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, three notes are being constantly hit—in press editorials, ceremonial speeches, official "White Papers," and even in newspaper news columns—

### Three myths.

"I can take care of my enemies but the lord protect me from my friends..." The frank warmongers, the gentry who want to drop the atom bomb on Moscow tomorrow (or the day after at the latest), carry their own antidote along with their propaganda. Anyone who wants to applaud the Atlantic Pact frankly as a war alliance in preparation for the Third World War and in defense of America's "manifest destiny" to control the world will have no more use for these myths than we. But the "friends" of peace are not selling the Atlantic Pact on the basis of this kind of sales-talk.

The build-up is the now-popular denunciation of Russian totalitarianism. We do a substantial amount of such denunciation ourselves and will continue to do more, as socialists who fervently believe in the inseparability of democracy and a workers' world. We have as much hatred for the Russian Stalinist despotism now as we had during those honeymoon days of the war when the twelve statesmen who have autographed the pact were shushing socialists who dared to "criticize" "our noble Russian ally." But, for us, anti-Stalinism is part of the fight for a socialist democracy, and not a device for sprinkling rose-water on the aims of Western imperialism.

So we turn our attention to the three myths of the Atlantic Pact. These are: (1) The pact is a "union of the free nations." (2) The pact is purely "defensive." (3) The pact is simply the time-honored American institution of "checks and balances" applied to international politics.

### (1) "Free Nations"?

Why has the UN failed as a security system? asks Anne O'Hare McCormick, New York Times columnist. Because cooperation is not possible "between free nations and dictatorships." The Atlantic Pact is therefore necessary as the instrument of the "free nations," unalloyed by any admixture of dictatorship.

"Spain, for instance, belongs to the Atlantic community. Its exclusion is not only an anomaly but a weakness in the chain. It must be temporary; yet while a dictator makes arbitrary policy in which the people have no voice, Spain does not belong to the union of the free."

Swallowing this takes a firm stomach in view of the fairly well-known fact that the U. S. government would like nothing better than to sneak Franco into the happy family of nations if public opinion would allow this move. But if Franco Spain is left out in the cold for noble ideological reasons, somebody will have to explain what Salazar's Portugal is doing among the "democratic" and "free" twelve. The latter dictator does not bow to Franco when it comes to making "arbitrary policy in which the people have no voice."

In this holy union of the free is a nation still engaged in suppressing another people against the supposed will of the United Nations itself—the Netherlands. Dutch soldiers were busy grabbing Indonesia even as their representative was signing the Atlantic Pact. If there is any formal difference between Dutch grabs and Russian grabs, it is that the United Nations itself is formally on record as ordering the former to cease and desist, unheeded, while it never did so in the Russian case.

Indeed, this propaganda claim for the Atlantic Pact was put to a test only in the last few days. Senator Brewster offered an amendment to the ECA bill before Congress providing that ECA

(Continued on page 3)

By EMANUEL GARRETT GELTMAN

The Duchy of Luxemburg declared that it would consider an attack on the United States as an attack upon itself. The United States reciprocated and declared that it would similarly consider an attack on Luxemburg as an attack upon itself. In all, twelve nations (including, in addition to the above

## Anti-Semitism Growing In Stalin Government

By AL FINDLEY

Slowly there has seeped out a mass of evidence to prove the existence of strong anti-Semitic tendencies behind the Iron Curtain in Russia. The evidence shows that the Stalinist bureaucracy is practicing discrimination against the Jews and slowly but surely eliminating them from public life. The question that puzzles most observers is what this policy means. Is the government accommodating itself to prejudices and adopting a shortsighted method of minimizing anti-Semitism by hushing it up and keeping Jews out of the public eye? Or does this signify a conscious and direct adoption of anti-Semitism as a governmental policy?

The events of the past few months clearly indicate that the creeping discrimination and anti-Semitism that began in the late 1930s has now become governmental policy.

The fact that this program is only in its inception and that little is permitted to be known should not blind us to the real danger. For the first time, Stalinism has emerged as an anti-Semitic force that places a question-mark on the survival of the Jews of Russia. Unbelief of the facts and a wait-and-see attitude may doom Russian Jewry.

An incredulous world finds it hard to believe that the Stalinists, who make such a furor about the lack of race hatred and the illegalization of anti-Semitism in Russia should now embark on a conscious and centrally-directed anti-Semitism. As late as 1944, the world and even some socialists refused to believe that the avowedly anti-Semitic Nazis were actually engaged in an exterminationist program against the Jews.

### TREND REVERSED

Once in a decade is enough. The error of waiting must not be repeated. Especially since it is NOW, when Stalinist anti-Semitism is only in its beginnings, that a vigorous protest and publicity on the part of Jewish

organizations and the labor movement can be most effective and perhaps prevent a full-blown development of Stalinist anti-Semitism.

Czarist Russia, and especially the western provinces of the czarist empire, were infested with anti-Semitism. The Russian Revolution outlawed anti-Semitism and combated it in every form. With the exception of the NEP period, anti-Semitism steadily declined and reached its low point in 1935-36.

The consolidation of Stalinist totalitarianism reversed this trend. A "new" anti-Semitism arose, reflecting the tendencies by various bureaucratic groups to eliminate the Jews from influential positions and to reduce the proportion of Jews in occupations reserved for the elite. No mass movement from below, this "cold war" was effective and also contributed to the spreading of anti-Jewish feelings in the masses.

The great purges that accompanied the consolidation of the Stalinist counter-revolution had as their main targets old-guard Bolsheviks, among the most distinguished of whom were Jews—Trotsky, Kameñev, Zinoviev, Radek. For a short period during the purges, anti-Semitism broke into the open. Stalin was not above using anti-Semitism as a weapon. But this was only a flash in the pan. Post-purge anti-Semitism was not open, but to the extent that personnel data on the Stalinist elite can be found, the cold and silent squeezing out of Jews stands out as a definite trend.

In 1940, in the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR from Western Ukraine, White Russia and Poland, an area inhabited by millions of Jews, not a single Jew was elected. In occupied territories, according to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (February 25, 1940), there was "not a single Jew in an important position." "Jews in Eastern Galicia are accepted only in SMALL NUMBERS in the military school system, and as state

(Continued on page 4)

two, Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and Belgium) affixed their signatures to the North Atlantic Pact.

The time: 4:51 p.m. on April 4, 1949. The place: the Departmental Auditorium on Capitol Hill in Washington, where the first numbers in the World War II draft were drawn. The master of ceremonies: Secretary of State Dean Acheson, of the United States.

The signators and visiting politicians joined in affirming that the pact was the mightiest blow against aggression and for peace struck in the history of the world. President Truman, topping the ceremonies with an address to the delegates, flatly avowed that had the treaty existed in 1914 and 1939, both wars would have been averted.

Off on a side, the Marine Band included George Gershwin's "It Ain't Necessarily So," in its serenading of the solemn occasion.

The pact now goes to the Senate and to the legislatures of the six other nations who helped to frame the text (Britain, Canada, France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg) for discussion and ratification, after which the terms of the treaty become effective. There will undoubtedly be considerable discussion, and there will undoubtedly be ratification.

### WAR BLOCS GEAR

Rarely has an event been attended by more solemnity, and with good reason. Rarely, too, have speeches, seemed quite so hollow as those made, in alphabetical order, by the foreign ministers of the participating nations.

From Acheson to Count Sforza of Italy, from Truman to Spaak of Belgium, the statesmen strained to attach the meaning of peace to their act. The labored sentences carried little conviction. But the reality, which poked its way through them, carried an infinite amount of conviction—the reality of a war bloc gearing itself for world decision.

(Continued on page 4)

Still Grinning!



SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

## New Class Bloc Seen as Stalin Aim in Germany

NEW YORK—"Russian Policy in Germany" was the theme of the Labor Action Forum held last Sunday, latest in the successful series of forums being held at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14th Street. The speaker was Guenter Reimann, noted author of a number of books dealing with Germany.

Reimann's extremely interesting thesis provoked the bulk of the discussion. He argued that the Stalinists neither wanted nor were capable of the achievement of a unified Stalinized Germany; they rather wanted a sort of "People's Front" with the conservative and industrialist elements, out of fear of Titoism in East Germany and in order to ensure a Germany which was at least anti-American if not directly pro-Russian.

His analogy was with South China, which, he asserted, the Stalinists do not want to occupy but where they aim for this type of government also. He mentioned a meeting of industrialists aiming at unification and rapprochement with Russia.

During his lecture, the speaker was able to draw abundantly upon the information accumulated while visiting Germany last fall, including on-the-spot reporting and indicative anecdotes. (An example of the latter: A resident of Hamburg, where over 50 per cent of the houses were destroyed during the war and whose merchant shipping was criminally destroyed after the war, asks another resident how long he thought it would take to reconstruct Hamburg. "Thirty-five years," is the answer. "Thirty years of occupation and five years of rebuilding.")

While devoting most of his time to an interpretation of Stalinist policy, Reimann also pointed out the bankruptcy of Western policy in Germany because "it has no political or economic foundation," predicted a split in the Social-Democracy because "it has no ideological basis," and informed the audience that the Stalinist "Socialist Unity Party," the Stalinist party of East Germany, is discredited, as is its leader Ulbricht.

## N.Y. Cabby Strike Called by UMW

District 50 Taxi Union Faces Difficult Organizing Battle

By WILLIAM BARTON

At the time of writing, the New York City taxicab strike has entered its fifth day, with reports remaining very unclear and likely developments uncertain. The union, the Taxi Workers Organizing Committee, a unit of the United Mine Workers District 50, claims that the strike is 90 per cent effective.

However, there are serious signs of weakness already apparent in the union's organization. The extent to which the drivers are acting in sympathy with the union or are actually organized is not yet clear. The next few days may tell the story.

The Police Department has declared that about a quarter of the normal number of cabs were running at 6 p.m. Monday. All observers agree that the number of taxis on the streets, particularly in sections away from midtown Manhattan, is much less than usual, but that the number is daily increasing.

The strike began when the owners of the taxi "fleets," which operate a little more than half of the city's cabs, refused to negotiate with the union until it was certified by a Labor Relations Board election. The union charged that the cabowners were stalling and added to the demand for recognition a series of proposals for wage raises of \$9 to \$11 a day, premium pay for overtime, and welfare and pension funds. Until the fleet operators agree to meet with the union, these will not be an issue in the strike. Latest reports have both sides considering a new plan for an election submitted by Mayor O'Dwyer.

New York taxi drivers, regarded by out-of-towners as a group of crafty schemers always out to detour the unalert passenger to "make a buck," actually live a very precarious, uncertain existence. Unionization has been started several times; militant strikes have been frequent. The strike of early 1934 inspired playwright Clifford Odets to write his famous "Waiting for Lefty." But no union has yet been able to establish a stable foothold. One of the leading difficulties has been the fact that almost half the drivers own their own cabs.

The United Mine Workers sought to fill the breach and increase the membership of its independent union by establishing an organizing committee under the jurisdiction of its catch-all District 50. There is a potential membership of 5,000 in the New York taxi industry. With the power, prestige and experience of the Mine Workers to bank on, a fast organizing campaign has been attempted, much of it under the personal direction of Denny Lewis, brother of John L.

Just what strength the union now has, no observer seems to know. The strike was almost completely solid in the first couple of days. It started with the agreement by one of the organizations of driver-owners, the United Taxi Owners Guild, to keep their cabs in their garages during the strike. However, a larger organization of independent drivers, the League of Mutual Taxi Owners, has been striving to have its members run their cabs from the beginning of the strike.

Police protection has been given many cabs along selected main thoroughfares. Fifty-seven people have been arrested, mostly for "verbal threats" against cabs. Officials of the operating fleets have advertised the great additional amount of money to be made by working during the strike. The union has charged that rumors have been consciously spread that strikers would lose their hack licenses, and that police inspectors were intimidating non-working owner-drivers.

Mass picketing began Monday at one large taxi terminal and is likely to spread. Plans are under way for more intensified strike activity by a larger section of the union membership.

### BOGEYMAN TROTTED OUT

A possible foretaste of a surprising little used type of anti-strike propaganda was revealed by a resolution submitted to the City Council to "obtain evidence of the connection of John L. Lewis or any of his henchmen with any act of sabotage or violence." The resolution was referred to committee without discussion. The taxi owners may use their convenient bogeyman. But it is not likely to get anywhere with most New Yorkers. They know too many cab drivers and their histories.

If Lewis succeeds in establishing a going taxi union in the city, it will be only slightly a result of the effectiveness of his organization. Sooner or later they will be successfully organized. If the Mine Workers can help them accomplish it through this strike, more power to them.



# Two More UE Workers on 'Risk' List

## No Charges or Evidence as Navy Orders Transfer of Unionists

PHILADELPHIA, April 12—During this past week the Department of Defense, in collaboration with private industry, has been busy tacking "poor security risk" labels on labor unionists in this area.

Two more active members of Local 107, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, CIO, at the Westinghouse South Philadelphia Works, have been added to the "risk" list already composed of Frank Carner and Herb Lewin. Once again there has been no statement of charges or

U. S. Navy's statement, the new "risk" cases will be given work in other sections but not in the aviation gas turbine division where they were previously employed.

Only the militant action by the local union in the previous cases prevented Westinghouse from following the industry pattern of firing all "risk" cases. In general it seems likely that the companies and the Department of Defense are working together very closely with the aim of weakening the unions' structure and prestige as much as possible. This assumption is substantiated by the fact that the company usually knows about the "denial of consent" issuance several weeks before the individual is informed of his changed status.

The Lewin-Carner cases have never been resolved in a manner satisfactory to the individuals, the unions, and other groups concerned. The individuals, although working in the South Philadelphia plant, still carry the "poor security risk" label. The Industrial Employment Review Board has never rendered a decision on the Lewin appeal hearing, which was held on November 4, 1948. The decision on Carner's appeal was unsatisfactory, since it upheld the original action taken by the U. S. navy, denied the request for reimbursement of lost pay and reiterated the "denial of consent" of access to classified work.

### Fifth Freedom!

Some subversive copy-desk fifth columnist on the New York Times got in a lick at the capitalist system which will bear some investigation. Under a recent headline, "New Haven Lays Off 1150," there appeared the following subhead:

"Repair Shop Workers Freed, Effective Wednesday."

Freedom from a job—the right to be unemployed—and no unpatriotic agitator is going to take this blessed liberty away from workers in the land of the free, not if "free enterprise" has anything to say about it.

evidence submitted. There are also rumors that in several other plants workers have been fired when labeled by Defense Department agents.

The two new risk cases at Local 107 are to be transferred to non-classified jobs in the South Philadelphia Works, in accordance with an agreement made by the Westinghouse Corporation last July in order to bring to an end the sitdown strike by Local 107, held in protest against the labeling and suspension of Carner and Lewin.

### SITDOWN STOPPED FIRING

Indications are that, although the corporation has violated one phase of the agreement by failing to notify the union prior to the issuance of the

ceedings, I have just as consistently been answered in the negative. I would like at the very least to have the name of the individual who can give me a different answer."

To our knowledge Carey has as yet received no answer to his letter.

In the recent cases at Local 107 the union expects to file requests for an appeal hearing even though the very nature of these hearings stacks the cards heavily against the individual and the unions. The appeal board is the Industrial Employment

### Child Labor

Here's what you can find in a recent routine report of the Wage-Hour Division of the U. S. Department of Labor, if you look for it:

Children under 12 are working in a starch factory 12 hours a day, from 6 in the morning to 6 at night. Youngsters in a cement plant are putting in a 13-hour day. In canning and packing plants, sawmills and planing mills, laundries and dry cleaning plants, 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the labor is under age.

Good way to keep them out of mischief, isn't it?

Review Board composed entirely of military personnel. The hearings are closed, there are no transcripts of the hearings, there are no witnesses, no cross examinations, and even the attorney is prevented from taking notes from the hearing room.

Although the hearings of the Loyalty Review Boards are (to say the least) far from being models of democratic procedure, they are many times more satisfactory than these hearings conducted by the Department of Defense for those workers in private industry who dare to challenge the "poor security risk" labeling—a labeling which in most instances deprives them of their jobs and effectively blacklists them from all of industry.

### THEY WON'T TALK

Regarding these cases, James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, stated in a letter of Dec. 28 to John H. Ohly, special assistant to James Forrestal:

"Specifically, I have consistently asked if there was available any information to the effect that

- (1) These men are agents of a foreign power.
  - (2) They are agents of a potential enemy power.
  - (3) They are even to be considered potential agents of a potential enemy power.
- "Thus far, in the course of the pro-

### OHIO LABOR NOTES

## Ohio Union Sues to Halt Firing of Older Workers

By JOE CLARK

In Cleveland an injunction has been sought in Common Pleas Court to restrain the Electric Vacuum Cleaner Company (a division of General Electric) from discharging women employees over 60 and male employees over 65 years old.

The applicant is Howard Metzbaum, who is representing District 54 of the International Association of Machinists. He says this is the first time a union has filed application to restrain an employer from firing employees because of age. He says the frings would be a violation of the seniority provisions of the company's collective bargaining contract. Twenty-six employees have been notified they will be retired "on pension" in the next few months.

If the pensions were adequate to furnish a reasonable standard of living, there would probably be little objection from the employees. But there's the rub.

The company pension plan went into effect late in 1946. Those who participated made payments only until they reached retiring age. Others were over age when it began. As a result of this set-up the pensions they receive will range from nothing at all (how does one receive nothing?) all to \$5 or \$6 a month. Some of them have seniority up to 30 years.

Patrick Barrett, 65, has been a machine operator at the plant for 29 years. The company wants him to retire on May 6. But he doesn't think he can support his wife and himself on the \$5 a month he will get. David Steels, 67, has been a separator man for the company for 16 years. He will get less than \$1 a month. Fred Reiss, a boiler operator at the plant for 22 years, must retire in May with no pension at all.

The strike at the Fawick Airflex Corporation plant in Brooklyn, a

Cleveland suburb, flared into violent struggle on March 28. This is the third time this has happened since the strike was called on March 7. But the strikers had no chance at all. They were completely routed by police tear gas. The police chief stated in explanation: "The men going to work are AFL members and not scabs. They have a right to work and it is my duty to maintain law and order."

### AFL MEMBERS SCAB

The strike was called by Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers (CIO) in an attempt to get a 30 cents an hour raise. The fact that the leaders had not filed the non-Communist affidavits gave the company a good chance to break off relations with them, which it did.

The AFL, with police protection, is sending its members into the plant; it appears that the whole thing will soon be over and another defeat marked up for the UE. Groups of workers are being escorted to work each day by police and the strikers are being pushed further and further away from the plant.

The work of breaking the strike has been given quite a boost as a result of the arrest of 18 strikers who, on March 29, were found guilty in Common Pleas Court of violating the injunction of Judge Arthur H. Day against picketing at the plant.

The 18 included Marie J. Reed, the union business agent (a big-shot Stalinist who recently toured Hungary and other Iron Curtain countries and returned with loud praises for the Stalinist system.) All 18 were given the maximum sentence: ten days in county jail and \$500 fine; but in the cases of 12 of the 18 the fines were reduced or suspended conditional on their "good behavior."

# Revolution a "Secret" Affair, Says Budenz

By WYATT LEE

After several days' testimony under the guiding questions of U. S. Attorney John F. X. McGohey and his special assistant, Frank Gordon, Louis F. Budenz, former Daily Worker editor turned Catholic professor, was cross-examined by defense attorneys for the eleven Communists standing trial on conspiracy charges.

As reported last week, Budenz appears to be the principal witness for the government, with his account of the reconstitution of the American Communist Party in 1945 forming the basis of the conspiracy charge. Since 1945, McGohey maintains, the defendants, all members of the CP National Committee, have conspired to "advocate and teach the violent overthrow" of the U. S. government, thus violating the Smith Act passed by Congress in 1940.

Put as briefly as possible, Budenz holds that the CP brand of Marxism-Leninism advocates the overthrow of the government; that the CP secretly teaches this Marxism-Leninism to some of its members; and that the American Politburo (to which belong the defendants) hold itself in readiness to signal the outbreak of the "American revolution" upon orders from Moscow.

This is the substance of the lengthy and involved testimony, brought out in the main by the question of Special Assistant Frank Gordon, who evidently has "boned up" on the Foundations of Leninism, by J. Stalin, for the purposes of this trial.

### "SECRET" EDUCATION

This teaching and advocating, Budenz brought out, is a devious process that only the initiated can understand. It is conducted through an "Aesopian" language that says one thing and means another. For example, the highly patriotic preamble of the CP constitution is completely negated, according to Budenz, by the words "Marxism-Leninism" which also appear in the text.

Similarly, the polite brand of social science peddled at the open CP schools—the Jefferson School in New York, for example—is not the secret Marxism-Leninism taught in the "closed" schools. These "training" schools meet in private homes, or small offices, or deep in the woods during a summer vacation! Budenz testified! One met in a doctor's ante-room! And what was Budenz's conspiratorial course? "Communist journalism!"

We won't go on with further revelations of this vast "conspiracy," which Budenz and the prosecutors take so seriously. It is the product of a warped mind, warped by ten years of Stalinist politics.

Budenz is not alone in believing that a revolutionary party consists of saying one thing and believing another, of practicing and preaching the basest working-class betrayals, yet basing secretly on the shibboleth "Marxism-Leninism" as a justification.

Any socialist who has argued with a Stalinist follower has heard that complacent reply: "But we really believe in the socialist revolution. It is just that the working class is not ready..." Such deception is only self-deceiving; for years "Marxism-Leninism" have been hollow words on the lips of Stalinists, hollow words to be filled with the content of the then current political line.

We will see, as this trial progresses, the interpretation that the words will

undergo in the hands of the defense and the defendants. Certainly we can be assured that they will not be put in true historical perspective nor given an iota of the essence of the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

### GETS OWN MEDICINE

At this writing, Budenz is still under cross-examination by the defense. Judge Harold R. Medina turned down some seventy defense motions to reject Budenz's testimony and to refuse admission of all documents referred to by the ex-editor except the CP constitution. Eugene Dennis, the CP national secretary who is conducting his own defense, arose during Budenz's testimony to recite the standard Daily Worker valedictory for ex-employees, calling the witness a "Judas, renegade, betrayer, Benedict Arnold," etc.

The cross-examination started by getting on the record the fact that Budenz had been living with his present wife for some years before he was able to marry her legally. Budenz accepted this digging into his personal life with equanimity. As an ex-teacher of "Communist journalism" he knows through practice and precept this method of Stalinist slander—including his own practice. He was getting some of his own medicine.

Strangely enough, the defense did not pursue character assassination very long. With Richard Gladstein, West Coast lawyer long associated with the CP-controlled sections of the trade-union movement, doing most of the questioning, Budenz was taken over his activities as a leading CP journalist.

Gladstein sought, with considerable success, to prove that Budenz had never "advocated" or "taught" the overthrow of the government. Here the witness and the attorney were in accord; they both meant that Budenz had never spoken in favor of revolutionary socialism.

Budenz, trying to help the government case along, insisted that some of the things he wrote did, in a secret way, advocate socialism. Only, he insisted, the initiated could understand him, but it was there.

### ADVOCATED SOCIALISM—ONCE

After going through the files of The Worker and the Midwest Record, another CP paper Budenz edited, Gladstein pulled out a copy of Labor Age, the organ of the American Workers Party, to which Budenz belonged prior to joining the CP in 1935. Here was an article which forthrightly stated that American capitalism should be overthrown and a socialist society set up in its place. Triumphantly, Gladstein drew the admission from Budenz that he was the author.

"Isn't it true that back in 1931 you personally believed in the overthrow of your government by force and violence?" Gladstein pressed.

"I wouldn't be surprised," Budenz replied. "The Mustelites were committed to that idea."

The defense had played its high card. Budenz, who had never written an overt, recognizable word in favor of socialism in ten years as a Stalinist, admitted that he once believed in the replacement of capitalism by socialism... before he learned the gospel of "Marxism-Leninism!"

Just what Gladstein was trying to prove to the jury is not quite clear. What he did prove was that, to the defense and the CP defendants, advocating socialism is just as heinous a crime as it is to the prosecution.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

## Obscene? Judge Says No

To the Editor:

A breath of fresh air blew out of Philadelphia recently. Judge Curtis Bok, in a lengthy and exhaustive opinion, ruled that nine books which had been seized by the Commonwealth (Pennsylvania) were not obscene, and the booksellers involved were therefore sustained. "I have read the books with thoughtful care and find that they are not obscene as alleged," Judge Bok states in his preliminary comments.

He further states, and this is significant: "It is my purpose to show that it has no inherent meaning (the word obscene and all its synonyms), that different meanings given to it at different times are not constant, either historically or legally, and that it is not constitutionally indictable unless it takes the form of sexual impurity, i.e., 'dirt for dirt's sake...'"

The books under ban were the *Studs Lonigan* trilogy, by James T. Farrell, and *A World I Never Made*, by the same author; *Sanctuary*, and *The Wild Palms* by William Faulkner; *God's Little Acre* by Erskine Caldwell; *End As a Man* by Calder Willingham; and *Never Love a Stranger* by Harold Robbins. Judge Bok cites numerous court cases involving litigation both here in America and in Europe to substantiate his opinion. On reading his citations one cannot help but be struck by the fact that the authors whose works ran afoul of the law are without exception those of greatest stature.

Citing an English case in 1868 dealing with a pamphlet entitled *The Confessional Unmasked*, which contained a diatribe against the Catholic Church, Lord Chief Justice Cockburn in his opinion stated: "I think the test of obscenity is this, whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall." Judge Bok notes in reference to this opinion, "Strictly applied, this rule renders any book unsafe, since a moron could pervert, to some sexual fantasy to which his mind is open, the listings in a seed catalog."

Judge Bok continues: "Not even the Bible would be exempt... it is enough to cite the story of Lot and his daughters... Portions of Shakespeare would also be offensive, and of Chaucer, to say nothing of Aristotle, Juvenal, Ovid, Swift, Defoe, Fielding, Smollet, Rousseau, Maupassant, Voltaire, Balzac, Baudelaire, Rabelais, Swinburne, Shelley, Byron, Boccaccio, Hardy, Shaw, Whitman, and a host more."

Compiling an arbitrary list of his own which includes Koestler's *Arrival and Departure*, Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* and *Arch of Triumph*, O'Neill's *Anna Christie* and *Hairy Ape*, Dos Passos' *U. S. A.*,

Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Maugham's *Of Human Bondage*, and Wright's *Black Boy*, among others, Judge Bok defies society to explain why none of these has ever been banned, as they all contain sexual material.

"It is no answer to say that if my point about the books just listed be sound, then by analogy the law against murder is useless because all murderers are not caught. The inherent evil of murder is apparent, but by what apparent, inherent standard of evil is obscenity to be judged, from book to book? It is my purpose to provide such a standard, but it will reduce to a minimum the operation of any norm of indefinite interpretation." [My emphasis.]

It would be impossible to begin to generalize on Judge Bok's lengthy opinion; it runs to more than three newspaper pages. Suffice it to say that it will most certainly be referred to as a guidepost in future opinions and briefs such as will no doubt ensue. As the judge states, it is practically impossible to prevent a moron from reading into a book something the author did not put there, or which in that person's mind he has been able to distort for his own edification.

Only by a general rise in the mentality level of the reading public will it be possible to attain a point where all literature is read and understood in the meaning and context in which the author has written. Until that time society must feel compelled to attempt to prescribe and proscribe what is and what is not fit for public consumption.

Norman JOHNSTONE

Our thanks to correspondent Johnstone for bringing the above to our attention. We gather that by his last sentence Johnstone means to say that our present society will tend toward such regimentation; it is not, of course, intended to express approval.—Ed.

## Western Union Slogan—A Critical View

To the Editor:

With much interest I have studied all the obtainable materials of the Workers Party and arrived at the result that there are only little differences between my views and yours. As regards these differences, I wish to make some remarks.

Unfortunately I didn't get up to now the LABOR ACTION issue which contained the resolution of the Workers Party's Political Committee on the slogan "For an Independent Western Union." However, the publication of an article taken from The Socialist Leader, the reprinting of Leon Trotsky's article written in 1923 and several passages in Max Shachtman's letters to European comrades (WP Bulletin, No. 6) permit me an approximate judgment about this subject. I reject the slogan of an Independent

Western Union for several reasons, the most important of which I wish to lay open in the following:

Firstly: the question whether an Independent Western Union is realizable at all. I think a Western Union is not only possible but also in fact about to be created. It is, to be sure, neither an Independent Union nor a progressive solution, but merely an appendage to U. S. imperialism in its preparations for World War III and, more immediately, a means for shifting off its own inner difficulties to the shoulders of the European working class (as Trotsky explained already in his criticism of the Comintern's program 1928).

If revolutionary socialists want to counterpose to this reactionary aim their own progressive solution, their proposal must be clearly distinguished from the imperialist slogan not only in content (that is self-evident), but also in words. It's necessary to take into account the psychological effect of a given slogan on the masses. From this viewpoint it is not sufficient to add the little word "independent" to the reactionary "Western Union" (that is being created by Churchill, Montgomery, etc.) for transforming it into a progressive one. Our revolutionary slogans should not appear only as corrections to the imperialist slogans.

Secondly, it must be asked if such a slogan is attractive for the masses, if it can serve as a means for their mobilization, if it strengthens their combativity. I doubt if the slogan "For an Independent Western Union" has these qualities. It must be generally noted that the Western European working class at the present time is not very susceptible to long-term projects. This is due to the low level of the class struggle... The revolutionary education of the masses today more than ever must begin from the bottom."

If this is so—and if anything Comrade H. overstates it—then we fall to see how the conclusion is to be drawn that therefore only directly socialist slogans can be properly put forward on the question of European unity. Comrade H. is justifiably concerned about not raising illusions in the minds of the masses concerning the reform of imperialism; so are we. But the way to expose the imperialist nature of the Churchill et al. schemes for Western Union is not merely to demand socialism (i.e., a directly Socialist United States of Europe). A transition is necessary, precisely for the reason Comrade H. indicates. The WP resolution puts forward a plan (a "slogan") for an Independent Western Union filled with an anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist content (see text of resolution for the details). It states specifically that such a REALLY independent union cannot be achieved by the present governments in our opinion, but it is for the working class to find this out in the course of fighting for it, not for us to insist that they must accept our word on it in advance. Such an Independent Western Union we counterpose to the various reactionary and/or utopian proposals now circulating on the subject. Such an approach, we are convinced, can be most fruitful precisely in order to prepare the masses of workers for the goal of a Socialist United States of Europe (or West Europe) and the two should not be set against each other.—Ed.

From this viewpoint I reject the method proposed by the ILP politician R. Sherman (see LABOR ACTION, December 27, 1948): to call on the British Labor government to issue a declaration of independence from both war blocs. It seems to me very dangerous to allow any doubts on the fact that the Labor government is acting not as a socialist force but as a prolonged arm of British and, as a result of the latter's dependence on U. S. policy, of U. S. imperialism. No revolutionary socialist can believe that a fundamental change in British and European policy is possible except as a result of a fundamental change in the power relations between the classes, i.e., by a revival of the revolutionary working-class movement.

I therefore don't see any reason

for either pushing into the foreground the discussion on the question of Western Union or abandoning our old slogan "For a Socialist United States of Europe" in favor of a less popular slogan and one so little distinguished from the reactionary slogan, namely, "Independent Western Union."

Comradely,  
H. (U. S. Zone, Germany)

We regret that Comrade H. has not had an opportunity to read the resolution itself—that is, the Workers Party resolution on the slogan for an Independent Western Union—because we think that its text would help to clear up some of the questions he raises on the basis of having seen only the documents he refers to. Another document would also be of interest in this regard, namely, a reply to a number of questions on this same subject, adopted by the Political Committee of the Workers Party and printed in the WP Bulletin No. 9.

Briefly, we think the main point in the conclusion that Comrade H. seems to draw from his remark that "the Western European working class at the present time is not very susceptible to long-term projects. This is due to the low level of the class struggle... The revolutionary education of the masses today more than ever must begin from the bottom."

Comrade H. overstates it—then we fall to see how the conclusion is to be drawn that therefore only directly socialist slogans can be properly put forward on the question of European unity. Comrade H. is justifiably concerned about not raising illusions in the minds of the masses concerning the reform of imperialism; so are we. But the way to expose the imperialist nature of the Churchill et al. schemes for Western Union is not merely to demand socialism (i.e., a directly Socialist United States of Europe). A transition is necessary, precisely for the reason Comrade H. indicates. The WP resolution puts forward a plan (a "slogan") for an Independent Western Union filled with an anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist content (see text of resolution for the details). It states specifically that such a REALLY independent union cannot be achieved by the present governments in our opinion, but it is for the working class to find this out in the course of fighting for it, not for us to insist that they must accept our word on it in advance. Such an Independent Western Union we counterpose to the various reactionary and/or utopian proposals now circulating on the subject. Such an approach, we are convinced, can be most fruitful precisely in order to prepare the masses of workers for the goal of a Socialist United States of Europe (or West Europe) and the two should not be set against each other.—Ed.

## Second Thought By R. Fahan

To the Editor:

Two issues ago in LABOR ACTION I had an article on Sidney Hook and his statements about the Catholic Church. Were I to write about that matter again, I would refrain from two errors of interpretation and taste which I made. I did not make clear that what Hook was writing about was the problem of political relationships to the church, and thus might have given the impression that he proposed some sort of intellectual alliance with Catholicism. That is not true. Secondly, I wrote with unnecessary nastiness of tone, a manner of writing that is always to be deplored. Precisely because I think the political point of the article was essentially valid do I regret these two lapses.

R. FAHAN

## Four New York Lecture-Discussion Meetings For the Benefit of Politics

### "Packages Abroad"

Friday, April 15  
BERTRAM D. WOLFE  
Author of "Three Who Made a Revolution"

JOSEF STALIN, THE MAN AND HIS PLACE IN HISTORY

Friday, April 29  
KARL AUGUST WITTFOGEL  
Director Chinese History Project, Columbia University

THE HISTORICAL MEANING OF CHINESE COMMUNISM

Thursday, May 12  
ARTHUR M. SCHIESINGER, JR.  
Author of "The Age of Jackson"

TRUMAN—HEIR OR EPIGONE OF THE NEW DEAL?

Thursday, May 19  
DWIGHT MACDONALD  
Editor of "Politics"

GOODBYE TO UTOPIA

Rand School Auditorium  
7 East 15th Street  
At 8:30,  
Admission 75¢

## NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

April 17—ALFRED KAZIN and IRVING HOWE  
Two Novelists: Melville and Hawthorne  
SUNDAY, 8 p.m., at 114 West 14th St., N. Y. C. 50 Cents (SYL: 25 Cents)

## NEW YORK—MAY FIRST

# May Day Meeting

An Announcement of Unusual Importance to Everyone in the Labor and Socialist Movement Will Be the Theme of This Meeting

Speakers: MAX SHACHTMAN, EMANUEL GARRETT, NATHAN GOULD

SUNDAY EVENING  
MAY 1—7:30 P. M.  
CORNISH ARMS HOTEL  
23rd St. and 8th Ave.



# Editorials

(Continued from page 1)

money be withdrawn from any country which contravenes the orders of the UN. It was, he explained, directed most specifically against the Dutch aggression in Indonesia. The ECA, we are being told, is the economic counterpart of the Atlantic Pact, and it is.

**But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected the Brewster proposal. The reason given for its rejection was that "it was not germane to a foreign-aid bill."**

**This is perfectly true from the point of view of American imperialism's approach to the problem of building its own fences; "peace-loving policies," "union of free nations," etc.—these phrases are germane only to the propaganda barrage around the pact, but not to the pact itself.**

Another signatory to the pact, and not a minor one, is a country which has been fighting in two parts of the world to shoot down a people struggling for freedom: this is France, with its two wars in Viet Nam and Madagascar. Another is Italy, and here Columnist McCormick reaches a new high in imperialist naïveté:

"Especially in dealing with the [former] Italian colonies there is a dramatic opportunity for a solution in keeping with the vision of free cooperation they are opposing to the Soviet idea of a closed compound of subjugated peoples." And what is this vision of freedom—perhaps freedom for these colonies? The idea does not even occur to our columnist! What she is referring to is: the necessity for giving these colonies back to Italy! Because of "Italy's surplus population" and because "Italians are first-rate colonists"—both amply proved, no doubt, by the last colonial venture of Italy, the rape of Ethiopia.

McCormick, of course, and her Times are only illustrative of the current propaganda smokescreen. But somebody is a liar, we find, when we compare this line with the official statement of the State Department. In the March 19 White Paper of the U. S. cold-warriors, we find the following declaration:

"The security of the United States would again be seriously endangered if the entire European continent were once more to come under the domination of a power or an association of powers antagonistic to the United States."

For a couple of centuries Britain, too, based her foreign policy on the principle that no power could be allowed to dominate Europe except herself, and it had nothing to do with ideology. No imperialist rival can be permitted by the United States to be more powerful on the continent—any power that tries to do so is by definition "antagonistic" and "unfriendly."

**If Portugal were to make this attempt (if we can imagine this) we should shortly be reading about the inherent incompatibility between the Salazar dictatorship and the ideals of American democracy. If Holland were to be in a position to make this attempt, the speeches would ring out on the theme of the manifest impossibility of coming to an agreement with a nation which violates all human rights and steps on Indonesians.**

As Bevin said in his speech in Washington: "It [the Atlantic Pact] says to the totalitarians: 'You have your system. We have to share the world. You have your system but don't have it with the idea that you can upset other people's way of life and prevent them living the way they want to.' That is what it says to 'the totalitarians,' but it does not say that to the Portuguese and the Dutch and the French among others; to these it merely says: 'We have to share the world—among ourselves.'"

## (2) "Defensive Pact"?

Russian propaganda too has been laying down its barrage around the pact. Its lying protestations of its own lily-white intentions and pure peace-loving motives can be dismissed at the moment. The pot is calling the kettle black, as usual. But in the course of this pot-and-kettle act, this same Russian propaganda has seized hold of a handle provided for it by the Atlantic powers, and the latter have remained tongue-tied about it.

The simple question is this: If the pact is really only what it declares itself to be, a security pact for common defense against any aggressor of any kind, then why is Russia excluded—even from the point of view of the signers?

Very well: let us agree, for the sake of argument, that Russia is a potential aggressor; let us agree, for the sake of argument, with the rest of the speech-making language used on that point. That, let us say, is the opinion of Washington and the other signatories (including the current colonialist aggressors among them). But what is gained even from their point of view in excluding Russia so demonstratively in advance? Would not the pact operate just as effectively if Russia were among the signers?

It is obviously a naive question, since it is based on the assumption that the pact is simply what it purports to be, a pledge of common defense against any aggressor.

**The fact is, however, that the pact is not primarily designed to ensure peace or even based on the expectation that this is possible. It is designed to organize "our" side in the next war, to organize it in advance, harden the lines, arm the prospective belligerents of the union of certified-to-be-free nations, and get everything ready for the day the shooting starts. And that is why Russia cannot be permitted to sign its hypocritical signature to a hypocritical treaty in as hypocritical a manner as the rest of the worthy dozen.**

# WORLD POLITICS

## A New German Crisis

For eight months 65 men representing political parties of Western Germany, with a majority of conservative Christian-Democrats in charge, have been writing a constitution for their half of this split nation. This body is peculiar and unique in the history of constitution-making bodies. Its like has never before been seen.

It is not even called a Constitutional Assembly, but merely "Parliamentary Council." No one knows what parliament it is a council of, since such a parliament does not exist. This arbitrarily selected group has attempted to fashion a constitution at the bidding of the three occupation powers of Western Germany.

Last week, their efforts broke down in a deadly stalemate which well represents the general political and social stalemate now gripping all of Western Germany. The truth of the matter is, the occupational authorities simply do not know what to do, which path to take, where next to turn. This conflict exists on many levels, some of which intertwine with each other, and therefore render the stalemate extremely complex.

For example, there is a sharp struggle within the "Parliamentary Council" of 65 between the Social-Democratic delegates and the reactionary Christian-Democrats.

There is a general struggle between the council as a whole which, at times, presents a united face, and the military government of Western Germany as a whole (which also on occasion presents a united front against the Germans).

There is a bitter struggle among the occupation authorities themselves, particularly between the Americans and the French.

Finally, there is the broad background of the whole German situation, which consists of two principal factors: (1) The substantial economic revival of Western Germany over the past year, which has brought German industry back as a factor in both European and world affairs. (2) The split of the nation between East and West with its accompanying vicious struggle so familiar to all of us.

### S-Ds WEAK-KNEED

A word on the "Parliamentary Council" still holding its sessions in the ancient Rhineland town of Bonn. The history of Germany is strewn with the bones of "Constituent Assemblies" which met at various moments, usually to thwart more radical reorganizations and solutions to Germany's historic problems of national unification and independence. Marx wrote some of his most fascinating political studies around, for example, the famous Frankfurt Assembly of 1848.

But even those gatherings were models of revolutionary will and forthrightness compared to the miserable clique of 65 politicians, hand-picked, who meet today with the per-

mission of the military government and wrestle impotently with their problems.

The Bonn assembly may still draft an actual interim constitution and impose it upon Western Germany but, again, it will quickly be proved that such constitutions in which the democratically inspired masses of people have no say will not endure for very long. The swiftly changing situation within Germany will rapidly liquidate whatever comes out of Bonn, particularly since it is written and stamped by the occupation authorities whose power, obviously, is waning throughout Germany as a whole.

In this assembly, Social-Democrats and Christian-Democrats (linked with the so-called small businessmen's party, the Liberal - Democrats) have fought many a battle. But the Social-Democrats always end by surrendering in principle, since their very willingness to participate in the council, to begin with, makes no other action possible for them. Their leader at Bonn, Professor Carlo Schmid, has made clear some of the essential differences:

(1) The occupation powers demand a "federalistic, decentralized" constitution and will permit a referendum on it to be held only if and when they find it "sufficiently federalistic." The Christian-Democrats, representing by and large the most conservative and reactionary elements in the country (landowners, professors, Catholic Church and all elements of traditional German provincialism), naturally lean to this system since they wish free reign to be given to all of Germany's centrifugal tendencies.

The Social-Democrats, however, oppose such strong federalistic conceptions and tend, for reasons we shall mention below, in exactly the opposite direction. This was bound to cause serious conflicts, a partial reflection of similar disputes among the Allies themselves.

(2) The occupation powers have prepared a common occupation statute for the whole area of the three Western zones. Although not in complete agreement as yet, they have decided to withhold a whole series "of most important powers from the future German government." This statute will delimit the constitution now being drafted, and "will reserve the right in certain cases to take the bulk of power back in their hands again." In other words, the new constitution—and when it comes into being—will have a permanent sword over its head.

Now, it is clear the contending parties in Germany have widely divergent opinions about this fact. The real left wing of the Social-Democracy desires not to accept such conditions and to withdraw from the Bonn Council, whereas the most conservative elements of the Christian Democrats, who lean entirely upon a perspective of a permanent occupation of their country, are prepared to

We do not have an iota of confidence in the peace-loving intentions of either of the war blocs—the Western no less than the Russian.

## (3) "Checks and Balances"?

The Atlantic Pact is put forward as a means of preserving peace, however. The idea is simple: scare Stalin. Let him know in advance that the United States will jump in at the start this time; Balance the Russian preparations with Western preparations, throw American dollars into the scales against Moscow's manpower and Moscow's satellite system. . . .

Balance the two war blocs and let the world hang in the balance. . . .

Editorials are being written on this theme as if it were a brand-new idea, recently developed by modern statesmanship. One would never suspect that this is precisely the old balance-of-power theory which has operated to screw the world up to the pitch of war for over a century!

Appeasement as a means of peace has been thoroughly discredited, because people still remember Chamberlain and his umbrella—and Munich. But who remembers the balance-of-power politics of the Holy Alliance, or the balance-of-power "peace strategy" of Sazarin and Viviani and Lord Grey before the First World War—and its catastrophe?

**Who remembers that the only effect of the balance of power has been to preserve a temporary unstable peace while each side tries to "scare" the other most effectively, counter armament with armament, bluff with bluff, mass power against power—always in order to preserve the "balance"—until the equilibrium topples over?**

Appeasement or balance of power—both only serve to channelize the raging imperialist rivalries, which cannot be put into a straitjacket or tamed by such schemes. The New York Times (April 3), in the most old-fashioned of old-fashioned editorial pronouncements, dramatically proclaims that "the heavy hand of destiny [is] knocking at American doors." "Destiny"—heavily festooned with dollar bills—beckons Washington to the receivership of a bankrupt world. Destiny tells the Washington gang that it is to dominate and control the world's markets and economy, just as it tells the gang in the Kremlin that they are the wave of the future.

The destiny of a world at peace is in the hands of neither Washington nor Moscow. Europe can escape being crushed and pulverized between the two only by building toward a socialist democracy. It is on the socialist struggle that our hopes are pinned for everything civilized and decent—for life, not death. The Atlantic Pact is only another step toward the abyss.

go along with anything, provided a certain provincial autonomy is guaranteed to them.

### CENTRALIZATION?

(3) Various other issues, such as the creation of state schools of a denominational character with an extensive clerical influence (proposed by the Christian-Democratic Party, of course), as well as what concrete shape and form the various legislative bodies of the new Bundestag and Bundesrat shall take, have provoked further disputes.

(4) Perhaps the most vital (and surely the most violent) dispute of all has been over the issue of taxes and finances. In brief, the conservatives want such matters to be controlled by the local states (Laender) and to make the federal government dependent upon their good will, whereas the Social-Democrats "want to equip the Bund with independent taxes and its own finance administration so that it would not feel itself to be at the mercy of the Laender." This is a basic issue, and reminds one of the early struggles of "States-Righters" vs. "Federalists" in the American government.

The Social-Democrats have refused to alter their stand for the centralization of financial powers in the new government, and have thus provoked the immediate crisis. The military government authorities have entered the struggle and, headed primarily by the French, demand a Social-Democratic capitulation. On this issue, the S-D Party stands alone against a combination of the Allied occupation authorities, and all other Western German political movements, including the extremist-separatist (pro-monarchist) Bavarian Party.

Actually, this struggle represents a more deep-going split. The German capitalist class is no longer able to function, politically and socially, as an organized class, with a clear-cut political party of its own and a definite policy. It is too weak and shattered for that. If the German bourgeoisie proved fit subject for all of Marx's irony and venom in 1848, today he would waste little time dealing with it. It is wrong to believe that the Christian-Democratic Party is simply the party of the German bourgeoisie. It is not a homogeneous movement, but rather a catch-all for all types of elements: ex-Nazis, politicians, reactionary professors, separatists, monarchists, landowners, etc.

In a certain sense, the Social-Democrats have taken over the role of the German bourgeoisie. It is they who struggle—in their own way—for a state with central powers and authority. "One should not demand our agreement to do something which does not even create the precondition for a state," declared Professor Schmid, their Bonn spokesman. Their program is for creation of a national state (in Western Germany), and a central government with power to nationalize industry, and attract Eastern Germany to itself by its superior economic power. This theme of the German Social-Democracy acting as a kind of neo-capitalist force requires, of course, greater study than a brief article permits.

Now they are openly threatened by the Western military governors, who hint at a liquidation of the Bonn Council and use of an alternative method. It remains to be seen whether the Social-Democrats will stick to their principle this time. If they do, they stand little chance of losing, since the Western Powers can offer no possible alternative at this stage.

### OTHER ISSUES

We can but briefly mention some of the other broad issues at dispute. Among themselves, the Western Powers disagree over the contents of their proposed occupation statute, as well as just how to organize their proposed "Trizonia." French imperialism, which in effect has made its zone simply a colonial area attached to France, is the chief obstacle to agreement in this sphere. The French want to de-emphasize any centralist trends, retain taxing and financial powers over their zone and maintain a veto power over "any changes in the basic laws governing a future Germany."

As for the issue of East versus West, a new development in this struggle has been the propagandistic approach of certain pro-Russian "neutrals" in the direction of various German politicians and businessmen, not to mention some Ruhr industrialists, with a nebulous scheme for "uniting" Germany as a neutral nation lying in the heart of Europe. A tempting proposal, which may interest many individuals and groups at a later stage, provided no Western German government can be established.

Now, what has all this meant to the masses of German people? On the one hand, the value of the Social-Democratic Party as the proper center today for revolutionary socialists in the fight for a real German state, independent of all occupational forces, is reinforced. The Social-Democracy, no matter how hard its conservative and old leaders resist, simply has become the rallying center for all such progressive forces.

On the other hand, there has undoubtedly been a great revival of all reactionary circles among the Germans. Each of the tendencies we have

## Kravchenko Trial

### THE CASE OF HEINZ NEUMANN, EX-CP FUEHRER IN GERMANY

[The following article adds more details with regard to the disclosures that have been made at the Paris trial, initiated by Victor Kravchenko against the Stalinist Lettres Françaises on grounds of slander. It is translated from the March 5 issue of La Batalla, the newspaper of the Spanish Marxist group POUM (Workers Party of Marxist Unity) and was written by Martin Lain. One of Kravchenko's leading witnesses against the Stalinists was Gertrude Neumann, the wife of a former top leader of the German Stalinists, Heinz Neumann. The piece by Comrade Lain concerns itself with the case of this latter figure.—Ed.]

Without the slightest doubt, the most impressive of all the testimony that has been given in the Kravchenko-Letres Françaises trial in Paris has been that of Gertrude Neumann. The Stalinists have attempted, obscenely and cynically, to cover up their deeds with an improvised cascade of lies and slanders. Vain task! Suddenly L'Humanité discovered that Gertrude Neumann is a "Gestapo agent," that her husband, Heinz Neumann, put himself at the disposal of "fascist and Trotskyist elements," and acted as a "type of German Doriot." [Doriot was a French Stalinist who turned fascist—Ed.]

And even more. We quote: "In Spain Neumann formed part of the Brandler movement. Brandler, also a Trotskyist, attempted to provoke an insurrection in the rear guard of the Spanish Republican army." [Brandler, never a Trotskyist, was a right-wing oppositionist in the Stalinist movement—Ed.]

This must have shocked the old Communist militants. For many years the world Stalinist press made Neumann a "beloved and idolized leader." After the former German Communist deputy fell into definite disgrace, the most rigorous silence surrounded his name. Neumann, in the custody of the NKVD, fell into oblivion as did so many others. The Stalinist press did not bother to attack him. Why? The spectacular appearance of his wife has forced Stalin's police to invent the fable of the "German Doriot" . . . a Doriot little known until today and whose appearance evidently was long delayed.

### WHO WAS HEINZ NEUMANN?

But let us leave the miserable tales of the NKVD and turn to the facts, which are important to establish fully and clearly: the true personality of Heinz Neumann.

In the years preceding the triumph of Hitlerism, Heinz Neumann was one of the most popular figures in the German Communist Party. He was a member of the Central Committee and of the Political Committee. He was a member of the Communist minority in the Reichstag. He frequently intervened, in the name of the German party, in the drawing up of the resolutions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

In the CC and the Political Committee of the German Communist Party, Neumann's opinions often carried more weight than those of Thaelmann and Pieck. Neumann was feared not solely because of his authoritarian and intransigent character but also—and mainly—because it was known that he was an intimate of Stalin, that he was a leader who had the confidence of the "genial chief." Neumann wanted the German CP to carry out a policy of open struggle against the Nazis. Moscow's intentions were otherwise. He was called to Moscow, where he had the honor of being severely admonished by Stalin himself.

In her recent testimony, Gertrude Neumann has related some of the high points of her husband's conversation with the "genial chief." The truth of her statements cannot be doubted. With his policy in Germany, Stalin helped Hitler take power. Later came the Russo-German Pact of 1939.

### NEUMANN IN SPAIN

At the end of 1932, Heinz Neumann was sent to Spain. The internal situation of the CP in our country was very delicate at this time. In the Kravchenko trial, Gertrude Neumann has stated that her husband had the job of editing Mundo Obrero. In effect, this is correct.

described above naturally tries to organize its own forces. The Separatists (as in Bavaria, for example, welcome ex-Nazis, monarchists and anyone willing to play their game. As Marx would say, "all the old crap" is stirred up again! The occupation authorities, particularly the French, lend their support to such tendencies, but the all-important thing is that today, for the first time, these movements are really free of Allied control and have a momentum and will of their own.

Germany, as perhaps no other nation ever has, repeats over and over again many of its outworn struggles, even if under new conditions. There is an intermingling of all historic German struggles in the new one going on today, side by side with the multitude of new issues created by the war, the occupation and the split of the country. All this adds to the complexity of the picture.

Henry JUDD

At this point, it might be well worth remembering that the Kremlin never believed in the capacities of its "beloved chiefs" in Spain. Some day it will be known in all extravagance of detail that the band of illiterates and fools who constituted the Central Committee and the Political Committee of the Spanish CP were no more than simple puppets manipulated from behind the scenes in Moscow.

Neumann was an adversary of ours in Spain, and one who took active part in the hated Stalinist campaigns against our movement. It would be useless to repeat, then, that Neumann had not the slightest connection with the Workers and Peasants' Bloc, nor with the Communist Left (Trotskyist organization of that period), nor with Brandler's party.

Brandler, one of the founders and principal leaders of the German CP, broke with Moscow in 1929 and formed an independent Communist organization, the KPO [Communist Party Opposition]. Brandler was never in Spain. Some members of his party fought in our military units against Franco, and shared with us the Stalinist prisons of the Negrin government.

Up to now the official Stalinist thesis has been that the expeditions of May had been organized by the POUM and the FAI [Anarchists]. Now L'Humanité, trying to profit by the Kravchenko trial, takes leave of all the laws of history and discovers after a delay of twelve years that the expeditions of May can be ascribed to . . . Brandler and Neumann.

It is no secret that the heroic expeditions of May 1937 had their origin in a Stalinist provocation. That Neumann would have taken part in the provocation cannot be conceded, for the simple reason that he was in Russia at the time, already a victim of the terrible purges begun in 1936 with the Moscow trials.

On the other hand, to mention Neumann in connection with Brandler, as does L'Humanité, is truly an absurdity. No one in the German labor movement is ignorant of the fact that, in the leadership of the German CP, Neumann was one of the most violent of the anti-Brandler and anti-Trotskyist elements.

### STALIN AND HITLER

Gertrude Neumann has told that she was turned over to the Gestapo by the NKVD via Brest-Litovsk, during the time when Stalin maintained excellent relations with Hitler.

Her case was not unique. However, since the Stalinists carry their audacity to the point of saying that Gertrude Neumann and the rest of the German Communists delivered to the Gestapo returned to Germany voluntarily, it might be well to say something in that respect.

The Spanish political refugees who were in the camp of Vernet d'Arriège in 1940-41 know—and it can now be revealed—that many German Communists returned to Germany against their will and by order of the German Stalinist party.

In the comradely days of the Russo-German Pact, when Stalin and Ribbentrop drank to Hitler's victories, the leadership of the German CP told its militants that there was no point in emigration, and that it was their duty to return to Germany.

A short time after this unusual directive, several of Hitler's commissions visited the camp of Vernet to propagandize for the return. Not a few German Communists agreed. The reticent ones underwent a veritable siege. One Communist militant who carried his curiosity far enough to ask one of the members of the commissions about Thaelmann's fate, was given this reply: "Your comrade Thaelmann is in prison, but he is well and lacks nothing."

The militants who had the imprudence to comply faithfully with the orders of their leaders ended up in Nazi concentration camps. We can presume that all did not succumb to the tortures of the SS. There must be some survivors in Germany who will some day appear as did Gertrude Neumann, and accuse Stalinism of some crimes which cannot be forgotten.

We have given our opinion of the Kravchenko trial. There is little to add. It remains for us to say that the real trial of Stalinism and all its crimes is yet to take place. Stalinism shall be brought to trial.

Stalin's tyranny will not be eternal. One day the victorious working class will open all the secret archives. One day the conditions under which were assassinated the comrades in arms of Lenin and Trotsky, the glorious leaders of the October Revolution, will be known. One day the Russian concentration camps will be opened and the survivors of all the "purges" and of all the crimes will fully reveal the magnitude of the immense Stalinist fraud.

Meanwhile it is the duty of the revolutionaries to denounce unceasingly all the crimes of Stalin's "court" and to struggle to lead the laboring masses away from the tragic influence of Stalinism. Silence and inaction only serve to help Stalinism and the reactionary forces of capitalism.

(Translated by R. S.)

## LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism

Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.

114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.

GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 14

April 11, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper  
Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates,  
Emanuel Garrett Goltman  
Business Manager: Joseph Roan

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.



# Anti-Semitism Growing in Russia —

(Continued from page 1)  
engineers." In the rest of Russia, analysis of personnel figures to the extent that they give clues shows a decided and unexplained drop in the percentage of Jews in the preferred positions and occupations in Stalinist Russia of this period.

These anti-Semitic tendencies were heightened as a result of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. In the period between the signing of the pact and the Nazi attack on Russia, all mention of Nazi atrocities against Jews was eliminated from the press. There were many reports of sympathetic discussion of Nazi race theories among leading Soviet groups (Jewish Morning Journal, March, 1940).

After the Nazi attack the situation changed. There was plenty of publicity given Nazi atrocities but rarely were Jews mentioned. Their numbers were always included as Russians, Ukrainians, etc. Russian nationalism and patriotism were given almost exclusive attention. With the exception of the Russian-Yiddish press, the Nazi atrocities against the Jews and the struggle against anti-Semitism were not given even a minor place—only a microscopic position. This same attitude of almost complete silence on the tragedy of the Jews continues in post-war official reports.

Nor was the situation different in regard to the Jewish contributions toward winning the war. Newspapers, war correspondents, fiction writers, etc., in language other than Jewish, systematically refrained from mentioning performances of Jews in the conduct of the war. So complete were the Jews removed from sight that there can be no doubt that there was a strict government directive on this subject to the Russian writers.

### EXCLUSION POLICY

After the war, the anti-Semitic pattern of exclusionism, begun in the late 1930s and reinforced by the war, continued and deepened everywhere, except in the Ukraine. An exception was made of the Ukraine in order to combat the active nationalist movement which used anti-Semitism as an anti-Russian weapon. When the Ukraine was retaken, at first Jewish officials were prevented from returning to their posts. Later this policy was abandoned. Under Lazar Kaganovich, many Jewish party officials, managers, etc., returned to the Ukraine. This was true, however, only in the higher ranks; little attempt was made to restore Jews to jobs where they came into contact with the rest of the population.

In the rest of Russia, the policy of exclusion was greatly increased. The

percentage of Jews elected to both houses of the Russian parliament dropped much below their relative standing in the population, even after taking into account the decimation of the Jews by the Nazis. This is in sharp contrast with the previous pattern, where Jews had a slightly higher representation than their relative proportion in the population.

In recent years, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has become almost completely "Judenrein" (as the Nazis put it). There have been continuous reports that NO Jews are accepted for training in foreign service. While a few Jews remain officially as vice-ministers, Litvinov, Lasovsky and Maisky, none of these are ever heard of in connection with important diplomatic receptions or events.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not the only place where Jews have been eliminated. The same holds true for the Ministry of Foreign Trade and to a lesser extent in the armed forces.

Russian nationalism has been made the dominating motif in post-war Stalinist Russia. This nationalism no longer pretends to be Soviet nationalism, but is more and more assuming the character of "Great Russian" nationalism. The sharpest form this nationalism has taken is the violent purge of the arts and sciences. The slogan is "Love the Fatherland—Hate Cosmopolitanism."

### ANTI-SEMITISM AT WORK

Most people are familiar with the comic claims of the Russians to have discovered everything from airplanes to Henry Wallace's hybrid corn. But what few people know is that this campaign is NOW being used PRIMARILY against Jewish writers, critics, etc., and used in such a way that there can be no doubt that this is a centrally directed governmental anti-Semitic program.

Of the 50 intellectuals publicly at-

tacked during the last two months, 49 are Jewish. Where the Jewish origin of the accused is obscured by an adopted Russian name, the original Jewish name is quoted by the Russian press in parentheses. Where extended references are made to a writer, his penname is used only once; the rest of the time his Jewish name is stressed. The only time this happened before was during the great purges, when Kamenev's and Zinoviev's Jewish names were stressed.

An article in the February 12 Literary Gazette refers to a "malignant putrid story written by homeless cosmopolitan Melnikoff (Mehlman)." Another article in the same issue twice mentions the "cynical impudent activities of B. Yakovlev (Holtzman)." In a subsequent issue a literary critic with the good Russian name of Kholodoff is revealed as "homeless cosmopolitan" Meyrovitch. In the February 19 Pravda Ukraina three noted literary critics, I. Stebun, Ya Burlachenko and L. Sanoff, are identified as "homeless cosmopolitans" Katzenelenbogen, Berdichevsky and Schmulson respectively.

The Jewish publishing house Emes has been closed and the only Yiddish language daily, Einigkeit, suspended. There exists today in Russia NOT A SINGLE Yiddish paper or publishing house for the two to three million Jews who live in Russia. A number of Jewish intellectuals have been arrested. Among them is believed to be Johann Altman, a literary critic, described in a recent issue of Soviet Art as a "double dealer, a man with the dark soul of a traitor, a servant of the imperialist West, a diversionist in art."

The homeless cosmopolitans are accused of the usual offenses: decadence, bourgeois materialism, and admiration for things foreign. But the bitterness, viciousness and spite of the

onslaught are unparalleled. According to playwright Safronoff, the homeless cosmopolitans have even "utilized the experience of the anti-Soviet underground."

N. I. Gussaroff, secretary of the Byelorussian Communist Party, in a speech February 17 declared: "Only one theater in the Byelorussian Republic—a Jewish one—puts on unpatriotic plays in which life in America is praised."

### CZARIST LANGUAGE

The anti-Semitic nature of these attacks is greatly enhanced when one takes into consideration the fact that Jews from all fields of creative endeavor are lumped together and treated as a collective unit; that the attackers are exclusively Great Russians, and no other nationalities like Ukrainians, Armenians, etc., are permitted to do the job; that the czarist government often justified repressive measures against Russian Jews by referring to them as cosmopolitans; that the terminology of the attackers—shopkeepers, merchants, landless, passportless—is the stereotype used by all European anti-Semites.

The evidence of Stalinist anti-Semitism is only beginning to be accumulated. The need of the Stalinists to pose as friends of minorities in order to gather some popular support will probably never permit an OPEN anti-Semitism, but they will continue to use such charges as cosmopolitanism, etc. Other pretenses may be more difficult to pierce. It is also not excluded that in their cynicism the Stalinists may exile the Jews to Siberia and proclaim to the world that they have solved the Jewish problem. The time to stop them is now!

[Sources used for the above article: Yiddische Kemper, March 17-18, 1949; Solomon N. Schwarz: Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; Newsweek, April 4, 1949.]

# From the Socialist Underground in Russia

Is there a democratic, revolutionary socialist underground developing in the totalitarian prison-land of Russia? It is because this question is of such vital interest to us and all real socialists that we bring the following letter to the attention of our readers.

This letter, from a former fighter in the anti-Stalinist, anti-Hitler underground of the Russian Ukraine, was received recently by the national secretary of the Socialist Youth League (SYL) after contact had been established with the author, who is at present in the American zone of Western Germany. (This is why "Gregory"—which, of course, is a pseudonym—refers to the youth organization, rather than to the Workers Party, in his letter.)

On Gregory's suggestion (he writes that he has studied English only for a year) we have taken only the liberty of polishing up the language to the minimum extent necessary for easier reading. A few references have also been deleted for security reasons. This letter was, of course, not written for publication as an article, but we hope to be able to secure more information for our columns on the immensely interesting and important movement to which its writer refers. Reports of Ukrainian underground activities have been circulating for some time now, and we shall be particularly interested in the political ideology of the movement as well as its history and activities.—Ed.

close friend had already been sentenced for five years to a concentration camp in Siberia.

### UKRAINE UNDERGROUND

You ask about slave labor in Russia. I think there has been much written on this subject. A friend of mine has himself written a book with extensive material on the subject, exact descriptions of the camps, even their official names and addresses. This book is not yet published because there is no possibility of printing it here in Germany. And I doubt if he would be able to publish it at some later date because he is now seriously ill with tuberculosis. Perhaps it will be my task to publish it.

But I have deviated from our subject. After the outbreak of the war and the occupation of the Ukraine by the Germans, I was connected with the Ukrainian resistance movement (the Ukrainian Insurrection Army) which fought under the slogan "Against Hitler and Stalin." I will mention in passing that this movement is still in existence now in the Soviet Ukraine. Its ideology is my ideology.

Then the Nazis caught me and my whole family (father, mother and brother) and brought us to the labor camps in Germany. Here we were working in war industry and agriculture till the end of the war. After the liberation we refused to return home and stayed in Germany as political refugees.

Since 1945 I have been a member of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party (URDP), which is a branch of the above-mentioned revolutionary underground existing in the Soviet Ukraine. The ideology of this party is an interesting one, and I hope in the future to acquaint you with it. I will write now only about its chief points.

We stand in the USSR for a revolutionary overthrow of that last class of exploiters which you have called the "bureaucratic collectivists" and which in the Soviet Ukraine is popularly called the "bolshevik magnates." Our aim is a real people's democracy, that is, the democratization of the whole social structure of our country. We stand against any kind of restoration of capitalism. By the democratization of the present social order we mean the establishment of real workers' control, that is, of a real democratic and classless society of socialism. In addition, we stand for an independent Ukrainian socialist republic, as well as for the independence of the other nations in the present USSR, because the present "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" is nothing but the old Russian Empire.

I shall send you a pamphlet in English published by the URDP in order to acquaint you with its ideology. If you should be interested further I'll send you some other materials. Please tell me which languages you know besides English. I ask this because we do not have much literature in English. It is a difficult task for us to support our propaganda abroad financially because our movement here in exile has no financial resources. For example, the American military government has forbidden the publishing of our newspaper here in Germany.

As to your proposal to send me your literature, I am very glad to accept it. I read LABOR ACTION regularly and sometimes THE NEW INTERNATIONAL. Do not send me these two publications because I can obtain them here from my comrades. Other publications, especially those of the SYL, I would gladly like to read. Besides, I am interested in the pamphlets of L. Trotsky because I have few opportunities to read them. From my side I will send you our literature, and in this way there will be an exchange.

"NOT AN EXCEPTION"  
You ask about the conditions of life in Germany. If they could be described by mere words, I would say: they are bad. But not so bad as in the present-day USSR, for example. I am unemployed now. What is meant by unemployment in a ruined country you may imagine. There are now more than one million unemployed in present-day Germany. I live in a DP camp.

In general, dear comrade, I don't like to speak about my own conditions of life. In these same conditions live tens and hundreds of my comrades here in Germany, and in still worse conditions live thousands of my revolutionary comrades in the underground of the USSR. Therefore I am not an exception.

Your proposal to be not only my political correspondent but a friend too, I gladly accept. But please, it must not mean that you shall worry about me. I have already said that I am not an exception. You must understand it.

That's all, dear friend. I think that in following letters we shall say more. Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain,

Yours comradely

GREGORY

P.S.—Please excuse me; I don't know if you could read my handwriting. But I am not such a "capitalist" as to own a typewriter.

# N.Y. Feinberg Bill Gags Teachers — Dewey Signs It

NEW YORK—Academic freedom in New York's public-school system has become the latest democratic institution to bite the dust in the campaign against "Communist and subversive elements" inside the U. S.

Under the provisions of the Feinberg bill, signed by Governor Dewey this week, the Board of Regents has been directed to purge the schools of Communists, fellow travelers or anyone else who could be labeled subversive, with an open hint not to draw any fine distinctions during the weeding-out process. Thus New York's teachers, already underpaid and overworked, will now be muzzled so that they may better teach the young the superior ways of "American democracy."

Ominously passed with barely a muzzling word of protest from New York's powerful trade-union movement, the Feinberg bill is designed on the surface to oust only the faithful followers of Stalin from the teaching staffs. But like all measures of this stripe, the loose wording can, and undoubtedly will, be used to harass and hamstring every educator with courage enough to express independent and radical ideas.

No further proof of this is needed

than the bill's directive to the regents to draw up a list of "subversive organizations," membership in which will be sufficient cause for a teacher's dismissal. Such a list, to be patterned after the recent crude amalgam of the federal Department of Justice, is virtually guaranteed in advance to lump together the "east-wing" supporters of Stalin's abominations and genuine left-wing advocates of socialism.

Dewey's signing of the bill without any delay or reservations is revealing of the politician's ability to tack with the prevailing winds. During the past election campaign, Dewey, as one of the aspiring candidates for the Republican presidential nomination, opposed head-on the proposal of his rival, Harold Stassen, to outlaw the Communist Party. Dewey, then depending one of his few democratic ideas, correctly pointed out that such a step would necessarily lead to additional repressive measures and, ultimately, to the imposition of a rigid thought-control policing setup. But today, floating along with the rising tide of anti-Communist hysteria, Dewey has agreed to the freedom-destroying provisions of the Feinberg bill.

# Atlantic Pact —

(Continued from page 1)

Where such other famous agreements of recent times as the Atlantic Charter evoked general enthusiasm (except among such skeptics as we) in exact ratio with the hypocrisy of its promised Four Freedoms, this newest and most real of agreements appears to have evoked little enthusiasm among the masses of people who seem to sense its depressing import.

With the signing of the pact, the United States secured formal recognition from the signator nations that it alone is the sovereign imperialism into whose plans the others must fit their fates. Marking the final finish of U. S. isolationism, the pact formalized, in cold-war terms for the present, the new stage of U. S. imperialism in which all areas of the world become the responsibility of the master imperialism.

President Truman remarked that "we are like a group of householders living in the same locality"—the "same locality" stretching as it does from Frisco to Florence, being the world.

In fifteen typewritten pages, the Pact provides that:  
● Article 3. "The parties \* \* \* by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

● Article 4. "The parties will consult together whenever \* \* \* the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened."

● Article 5. "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them \* \* \* will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

### U. S. IS IMPERIALIST CENTER

Inasmuch as "the individual and collective capacity to resist" is militarily entirely dependent on the United States, inasmuch as the cen-

tral imperialist contest of our times is between the United States and Russia, the fate of the signator nations, and of others who are not here included only because they are outside of the "North Atlantic" region, is bound to be the design of U. S. imperialism.

At least, the U. S. imperialists hope it will be so. The people of these and other countries might decide otherwise, might decide not to serve either of the giant imperialisms. The pact is consequently framed as much against them as against Russian imperialism.

However vain and stilted were the speeches in their routine, for the record, efforts to encompass the pact in the framework of world peace, the serious excitement on a diplomatic level which attended the signing is a key to the true nature of the pact. The pact is no mere propaganda device, no piece of rhetoric concocted to snare the hearts and minds of men. It is serious business.

Never before in Washington history have so many high ranking dignitaries from other lands gathered in that city for a conference. It was fully in keeping with the situation that the United States should have been host. No pretense here that the United States was sending its envoys to another capital to sit as equals with the representative of Iceland.

Lost in the shuffle of attention given this significant and concrete imperialist achievement, the United Nations prepared for the opening of its Spring Assembly sessions two days after the signing. Secretary of State Acheson and a few other major diplomats intend to be on hand for the opening day, but the session is expected to have fewer major envoys than other previous UN sessions. The real business of the world, its western half anyway, had been taken care of in Washington.

Even as a sounding board for the cold war, the UN is losing importance. Russia, of course, will sail up to the pact at the UN. But its major assault on the pact will be demonstrated by its Stalinist henchmen on the streets of Paris and Rome, and through its own war bloc of satellite nations.

Thus, with the signing of the pact, the cold war has moved to new and more menacing levels.

# Congress Stalling —

(Continued from page 1)

layed until after the Easter vacation.

In the Senate no predictions at all are made as to when labor legislation will be taken up. The upshot of this playful delay is that the T-H Law continues in operation, militating against labor in its day-by-day struggle. But more especially will this disadvantage be felt when new contract negotiations between labor and management start this spring.

It is explained by Washington correspondents that the debacle of the Truman program is due to the fact that the Southern Democrats hold the balance of power in Congress. This die-hard, anti-labor, anti-Negro clique of reactionaries do number more than one fourth of the senators and almost one fourth of the representatives; they have had long seniority in many instances, and are therefore on leading committees.

However, President Truman knew the situation in his party when he made the promises he did to the electorate. Before the people he took responsibility for the Democratic

Party as a whole. Now he capitulates to the most reactionary wing in his party. Whatever his political reasons may be for his sellout, they have no meaning to the mass of people who need a better life and more security in life, and who voted for Truman to give them these things.

### SETTLE THE SCORE

The most fruitful question to be asked at this point is whether organized labor is doing what it can to make the people's mandate for the repeal of T-H felt. Is it sufficient for the CIO and AFL to have had witnesses to testify before the congressional Labor Committee and to have submitted briefs? Is it sufficient now for union officials to "work on" doubtful congressmen, quietly and in private?

It seems that what is required is a clear-cut reminder to the Democratic Party of its election promises—a reminder coming from the rank and file of the unions and from all working people. Mass demonstrations and protest meetings should carry more weight in the White House and in Congress than

do labor leaders quietly calling, hat in hand.

The rank and file of the unions also have a score to settle directly with their leaders. Why do these leaders continue to tie the political fortunes of the working people to the fate of the Democratic Party? Why do not these leaders start now to form an independent labor party which will be able to function in the 1950 election? This is a score that the rank and file will have to settle with its leadership.

### Employers Claim Split Personality

Classic example of the attitude of union-hating employers toward labor laws was provided by S. J. Fosdick of the National Retail Dry Goods Association.

Testifying before the Senate Labor Committee, Fosdick declared flatly that for purposes of the Taft-Hartley Law the retail industry was in interstate commerce, but for purposes of the Wage-Hour Act the industry was NOT in interstate commerce.

Even Senator Taft couldn't disguise his shock at the gall of an industry that demanded the benefit of the union-busting T-H Law but wanted to escape coverage of a law requiring a 40 cents an hour minimum wage.

You didn't read about that in your newspapers because the publishers were too busy writing editorials claiming that if labor was as reasonable as management, we'd have industrial peace in this country.—(From Midwest Labor World, March 23.)

### Incitement to Murder?

"The non-striker or strikebreaker, being a law-abiding citizen, always deserves police protection . . . [and] has a right to shoot to kill if he is attacked or threatened by a mob. . . . Not enough pickets were killed by law-abiding citizens during the . . . birth of the CIO. . . ."

"We have two salutary killings within the past year in which strikebreakers were acquitted of murder charges after shooting two pickets. . . ."

"Henceforth the good citizen under such attack . . . will have a right to pick a picket and shoot him in the head."

The above was written by the notorious anti-labor rat-columist Westbrook Pegler in one of his recent columns for the Hearst press. We invite any of our readers to try to imagine the uproar that would be created if such language were to be used by any labor paper with regard to scabbers and scabs.

Is Pegler inciting to murder or no?

### IN THE MARCH NEW INTERNATIONAL

Profile of Eisenhower by J. M. Fenwick

DON'T MISS IT!

**May Day Greetings**

to LABOR ACTION. We do not wish to announce our plans now—but we promise a sensational MAY DAY ISSUE—the best yet.

Send us your greeting—\$2.00 per columnar inch (for example: \$8.00 for a 2 inch, 2 column greeting). Include your own text. Copy must be received by April 18.

Mail to LABOR ACTION, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

**HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE**

**LABOR ACTION**  
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism  
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  NEW  RENEWAL  
 Six months (26 issues) at \$0.00  
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME..... (PLEASE PRINT)  
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....  
ADDRESS.....APT.....  
 Bill me  Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)