# Loyalty Hearings

tributions to it.

The sessions of the Loyalty Board,

which met in New York under the

chairmanship of Oliver C. Short of

the Department of Commerce, heard

the testimony by the department em-

ployee and by several of his friends

and co-workers in the department

In addition, Attorney Migdal was

permitted to present defense wit-

nesses who were especially qualified

to testify as to the character and po-

sition of the Workers Party. These

were Max Shachtman, national chair-

man of the Workers Party, and Pro-

fessor C. Wright Mills, member of

the faculty of Columbia University

in the Department of Sociology, and

well-known authority on the labor

movement of the United States. The

text of the questions directed to

Shachtman by Migdal and members

of the board, along with his answers.

are printed elsewhere in this issue of

Not only Mr. Migdal, but the offi-

cers of the Workers Party, are highly

gratified by the outcome of the Loy-

alty Board hearings and consider that

its decision may well prove to be a

new point of departure in the efforts

of the Workers Party to have its

name removed from the "subversive

list" published by Attorney-General

be informed of all new developments

AN EDITORIAL

be justly settled."

started.

its chief gravedigger.

its price for salvation.

and join an AFL union.

Spellman?

against the Catholic Church as employer?

name of God, AD MAIOREM GLORIAM DEI?

Readers of LABOR ACTION will

The Issue Is Not Buried

.. Please God, before too many more days have passed, all the dead

will be buried and all the other issues of this unjustified, immoral strike

Cardinal Spellman, head of the Catholic Church in America and also

Thus spake Francis ("I-am-proud-to-be-called-a-strikebreaker")

The strike of the Calvary Cemetery gravediggers has been settled

indeed, but the issues will NOT be buried. The workers received an

eight and a third per cent raise-which may or may not satisfy them

at the moment-but this was only the issue over which the strike

Do workers, particularly Catholic workers, have the right to strike

Does the Catholic Church have the right to break strikes in the

Does an employer, whether he bases himself on the Taft-Hartley

Act or on the catechism, have the right to refuse to deal with his men

on the ground that he doesn't like the political views which he ascribes

Anyone who raises these questions-or rather, understands that

Spellman has raised these questions-has got to make clear that there

is no question here of the Catholic Church as a religious-propaganda

organization. In this respect it is no better and no worse, and has no

fewer rights and no more rights, than the Baptists or Bahai, or than

both the orientalist and western wings of the Rosicrucians. Socialists

are FOR the free right of religious worship, whatever their opinions

may be about religion. But the Catholic Church above all others is

more than a religious-propaganda organization; it is an institution of

temporal power, here on this vale of tears. It is one thing when the

Catholic Church claims to have a corner on tickets through the Pearly

Gates, and it is another thing when the church makes scabbery part of

coerce the men, most of whom are Catholic communicants, not with the

threat of worldly jails like Messrs. Taft and Hartley, but with the

threat of divine wrath, communicated through his own holy personage.

The Holy Ghost, however, was apparently somewhat unclear in con-

veying to its chosen vessel the grounds for its displeasure with Local

293. He started out by saying: "The issue in this morally unjust strike

is that it leaves all these people unburied." But AFTER the storm of

protest, especially from Catholic workers, and while all these people

were still just as much unburied, Spellman ducked out by seizing upon

the fact that the gravediggers local voted to disaffiliate from the CIO

coerced into breaking "from its Communist-parent union" (the Food

and Tobacco Workers), and he was ready to talk turkey and settle.

Didn't Spellman know before that the leaders of the local were not only

anti-CP but were indeed members of the very, very anti-Communist

Association of Catholic Trade Unionists? And if he did know, what was

of the workers' picket signs. They meant: there is no justice in the Cath-

olic hierarchy. We said as much in denouncing-yes, denouncing-the

frameup trial of Spellman's fellow cardinal in Hungary, Mindszenty.

The Hungarian affair was a typical product of Stalinist totalitarianism,

but the victim was no lamb of Jesus fighting on the side of the angels.

The ideology and very structure of the Catholic hierarchy is totalitarian

to the core (we refer our readers to the debate between Max Shachtman

and Father Rice on "Marxism vs. Catholicism" in the January New In-

ternational). Catholicism as an institution of worldly power adapts it-

self with its usual skill to the democratic prejudices of American work-

ers, but its soul leers out even in this country as soon as its vicar dropped

ists? As we noted last week, the ACTU has reacted to the strikebreaker

role of Spellman with admirable denunciation and even bitterness. But

should not the members of the ACTU-without prejudice in this con-

nection to their religious convictions—re-examine the question of the

propriety of organizing themselves in a separate communion within

the labor movement under the imprimitur of a hierarchy which has

What does this mean for the Association of Catholic Trade Union-

his holy water and seized the shovel.

thus shown its colors?

"heartening" about their disaffiliation? The fact that it was dictated by

"There is no justice in Hungary and no justice in Calvary" read one

"It is heartening to learn," he announced, that the workers had been

Spellman denounced the strike as immoral-that is, he attempted to

to the heads of the international union to which they belong?

LABOR ACTION.

who testified in his behalf.

A Loyalty Board decision had occasionally made financial conwhich may have far-reaching importance in the case of the listing of the Workers Party and similar organizations in the "subversive list" issued by Attorney-General Tom Clark, has just been announced by Lester C. Migdal, attorney for an avowed sympathizer of the Workers Party in a hearing before the Loyalty Board of the United States Department of Commerce.

Mr. Migdal, formerly with the War Crimes Division of the American military authorities in Germany, was enlisted in the defense of the Workers Party sympathizer by the Workers Defense League and was assisted in the case by the American Civil Liberties Union. His announcement reports that the Loyalty Board has finally decided that the Workers Party sympathizer, whose name has not been made available to the press, is confirmed in the position he has held in the Department of Commerce for a year and a half in view of the board's finding that there were no reasonable grounds for the charge of disloyalty first levelled against the department employee in question. The department has therefore closed the

What makes the board finding especially significant, according to the information supplied by Mr. Migdal, is that the defendant in the case openly acknowledged from the beginning that, while he was not a member of the Workers Party, he was one of its sympathizers and that he had not only distributed some of its literature from time to time but

# Wire-Tap Circus Comes to Town-O'Dwyer Is Riled

By WYATT LEE

With grimly serious espionage and treason cases holding the limelight in half a dozen countries throughout the world, a comic melodrama, with characters and dialogue straight from a radio thriller, is creating a passing furor in New York City.

For a moment, at least, attention is diverted from the parrot-like confessions of clergymen in the Russian satellites, from the disturbing implications of the Gubitchev-Coplon case and from the trial of the U.S. Communist Party leaders.

These ominous events, inextricably bound up with the struggle for world domination and foreshadowing a conflict that will inevitably engulf the onlookers, can be laid aside as we joyously follow "The Case of the Wire-Tappers."

The cast includes a host of "private eyes," a mysterious king of racketeers, a really first-rate clownwealthy, posturing Clendenin J. Ryan -and His Honor the Mayor, William O'Dwyer. The plot background, civic corruption, is as American as apple pie and the action hews closely to any 25-cent detective story.

# PLOT THICKENS

Briefly, in jacket-blurb style, the story began a few weeks ago when Clendenin Ryan, young wealthy socialite as the phrase goes, announced that he, with the aid of half a million dollars, was going to drive O'Dwyer and Tammany Hall from the sacred confines of City Hall.

His first pronunciamento caused little more than a polite yawn. Next he prepared a list of questions for O'Dwyer, purporting intimate collusion between the Mayor and Frank Costello, alleged head of a national slot machine ring who is perennially "exposed" as a power in New York politics. Ryan nailed the document to City Hall door, a dramatic act that brought headlines but betrayed him for what he is-a fattish, publicityhungry young man with a handsome wardrobe and a genius for corny dia-

The plot got into high gear over the weekend when O'Dwyer charged (Continued on page 2)

# WP Sympathizer Southern Dem Filibuster Wins-Wins Decision in Truman Vacationing in Florida

# Mine Shutdown Warns Of Strike on Contract

By GERRY McDERMOTT

WEST VIRGINIA, Mar. 13-The twoweek shutdown in the coal fields is a down payment on a new contract. It is the first installment of an almost certain strike on June 30, when the old contract runs out. The miners are expected to seek a six-hour day at that time.

This is the real story behind the strike which took most of the nation by surprise, a strike that the capitalist newspapers have labeled "the Boyd strike." The reason given for the strike is that it is a protest against the appointment of Dr. James W. Boyd as head of the United States Bureau of Mines. Lewis has also announced that the strike is a memorial period for the 54,100 miners killed and injured during 1948. Such a strike is within the terms of the con-

The underlying cause of the strike, however, is to improve the bargaining position of the UMW for the contract struggle in June. The effectiveness of the coal strike depends on the supply of coal above ground. The more coal stockpiled, the harder it is for the miners to win. At present, there is a record three months' supthe last six years.

Therefore, a strike now for several weeks will make for a shorter strike and better chance of winning when June 30 comes. The present action also serves as a warning to the operators that the union is still solid. Further, the current stoppage is the first kick-off by labor against the fakery of Truman's fast - crumbling "Fair

employment.

However, the appointment of Boyd is also an issue in itself, as is mine safety. The two are really linked together. Although the Bureau of Mines is charged with inspecting mines for hazards, it is shocking to realize that despite countless disasters lover the years, the Bureau still does not have authority to enforce its findings. An unfriendly head of the Bureau will not help to correct this. Levis is opposing Boyd's appointment to head the Bureau because Boyd has had no experience with coal mining. Boyd's nomination by Truman is now before the Senate for confirmation.

Although the coal operators have been predicting a strike for the past six weeks because of the large stockpile, they are acting very righteous and shocked and are throwing the usual filth at the miners. Among the first to do so was George H. Love, head of giant Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal Company. Lewis, according to this profit-hungry magnate, "wants to take over the appointment of impor-

(Continued on page 2)

ply above ground, largest stockpile in

### CRUCIAL TEST

Contract time this year will be a crucial test for the union. The coal industry has felt a creeping depression now for many months. Unemployment and short work weeks are the rule. All indications are that the miners will ask for a six-hour day in the new contract. This is the only answer to the growing threat of un-

tant government officials."

Coming from a man who speaks for the Mellon and Hanna fortunes, that is quite a joke, but not a very funny one. Haven't the capitalists "taken over the appointment of important government officials" ever since anyone in this country can remember? What's wrong with the miners choosing the man who is supposed to be responsible for their safety? LABOR ACTION is all for

the 80th (Republican-controlled) and preceding Congresses as a two-party coalition of filibusterers successfully paralyzed Senate action and specifically blocked measures intended to promote civil rights legislation.

The 81st (Democrat-controlled) Congress proved itself this week a worthy successor of

With a sizable group of Republican legislators assisting the Southern Democrats in maintaining their filibuster, even after the administration had offered surrender, the filibuster ended in complete victory for the lynch-law senators. The filibusterers "yielded" joyfully under the terms of an agreement worked out with the Republicans and introduced by Senator Knowland (R., Calif.) which provided: (1) that closure could be invoked only by two thirds of the ENTIRE Senate membership (the original administration measure had provided for closure by majority of those present) and (2) that CLOSURE COULD NOT BE INVOKED AT ALL ON ANY AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE RULES GOVERNING DEBATE. In practice this formula means that a gang of filibusterers can talk to death any move to change the rules—which, in further practice, means blocking any effective move to enact legislation threatened by filibuster.

The administration had earlier made surrender moves which were rebuffed by the Southern-Republican coalition. Acting through Senator Lucas, the administration had defended its action on scuttling consideration of the civil rights program row by the press of other urgent mat-

# Chicago Jim Crow Housing Saved by "Liberal" Mayor

CHICAGO-Once more big city ma- anti-ordinance representatives, Kenchine politics, operating under the banner of a "liberalized" Democratic Party, has shocked the illusions of tens of thousands of its labor, Negro and progressive - minded supporters here. Out of this churning may well come a greater appreciation of the facts of life in capitalist politics.

The Chicago City Council on March 2 defeated, by a vote of 31-13, the ordinance proposed by Alderman Carey to bar racial and religious discrimination in publicly-aided housing projects. The man who saved the day for the private building industry, banks, real estate and insurance companies in this instance was none other than the sterling hope of Chicago liberals. Democratic Mayor Martin Kennelly.

At the eleventh hour this mouthpiece of private enterprise, himself a wealthy man and director of a huge meat packing trust, elected in 1947 as the symbol of good government against the corrupt Kelly machine, descended in person on the City Council to stem the tide in favor of Carey's modest proposal to outlaw Jim Crow in new housing. That tide had been swelled by the testimony before the council's housing committee of literally scores of organizations and individuals determined to put into practice right now in Chicago the civil rights program of Kennelly's President Truman.

ISSUES AT STAKE Advancing the same arguments given before the committee hearings by the nelly gave his customary sanctimonious twist to a slashing attack on the ordinance. "We have heard a lot about moral issues in the debate over this ordinance," he declaimed. "Well, good faith is a moral issue, too. I intend to keep faith with the people of Chicago," But what he was really saying here was-keep faith with the capitalist interests.

At stake in this debate was the same type of issue as in the legislation ADOPTED in New York City five years ago: shall the \$30 million bond issue already approved by the voters in the city's slum clearance and redevelopment program be made a vehicle for DEMOCRATIC SOCIAL CHANGE? Under this program, city and state funds will be used to acquire slum property and resell it at reduced prices to private developers

The proposed ordinance would forbid any discrimination because of race or religion in the renting of flats built by these private owners on land acquired from the Chicago Land Clearance Commission.

Carey, liberal Republican alderman from the slum-ridden Third Ward of the South Side's "Black Belt," and his numerous supporters on this grave popular issue had contended that by clearing the slums without this ordinance, the city would actually be promoting at public expense the subsidization of private capital's

(Continued on page 4)

ters—for example, rent control (on which the administration also suffered a smashing defeat in the House with adoption of an amendment providing for local option).

While the administration was clearly pressed to the wall, it CAN-NOT be said that it took effective measures to break the filibuster. Civil rights need not have gone out the window for rent control!

What right had the head of the administration, President Harry S. Truman, to be vacationing in Florida with crucial issues before the Congress? Why was he not LEADING the fight for the program he presumably espoused?

It may be said that there was little he could do, given Senate rules. That is not true! A week or so ago he threatened to take to the road to speak to the people. Fine. Why was he not on the air daily through the filibuster fight calling on the people to demand an end to the filibuster? Why didn't he get into his railroad car and go directly to the people?

The answer? Truman, no more than Democrat Ellender, who held the floor over 12 hours, or Republican Knowland, who found the "formula," is not particularly anxious to encourage the intervention of a people's demonstration or protest. All capitalist politicians shy away from that most horrible (for them) prospect.

The two capitalist parties have again proved themselves obstacles to progress, the Democratic Party no less than the Republican Party. The record to date of the 81st-Trumanvictory-Congress is something for the labor movement WHICH ELECTED IT, to ponder over seriously. The record speaks its own conclusions.

(See article on page 4)

# **Compromises Cripple Rent Control Bill**

"If you destroy rent control in March you'll have strikes in May," warned Representative Wright Patman, Democrat of Texas, in the House debate on renewal of rent control.

Representative Abraham J. Multer, Democrat

The House on March 15 further crippled rent control by voting local option. See next week's LABOR ACTION.

of New York, spoke along similar lines: "This country will be plunged into chaes the like of which has never been seen if controls are lifted."

Chester Bowles, now governor of Connecticut and formerly OPA chief, was alarmed at the sentiment he found in Washington to let rent controls lapse, a sentiment largely created by the threemillion-dollar real estate and landlord lobby. "Should this come to pass," said Bowles, "we would have riots all over the United States in a very short time. I don't think you can possibly exaggerate what might happen."

These politicians are not overstating the feeling of the people for the continuance of rent control in a form which will really protect them. There are maybe 14,000,000 families who will be affected if the rent control bill is allowed to lapse on March 31 or soon thereafter, or if such a measure as may be passed will not give them actual protection. It would be well for tenants to be prepared to defend their right to have a home at a rent which is not highway robbery. Housing Expeditor Tighe Woods predicts that rents would rise fifty to sixty per cent were control ended. The choice would be to pay or to be evicted.

Judging by the way things are going, with the filibuster in the Senate holding up all legislation and with the House whittling down the Adminis-

tration bill till it looks like a toothpick, the people ought to be on their toes, ready to make themselves heard on rent control, in effective and organized action.

Last week the Administration Democrats in the House, by the skin of their teeth, prevented the passage of the Republican measure to drop all rent control within ninety days from March 31. This Republican bill also had plenty of Democratic support. For example, E. E. Cox, Democrat from Georgia, was all for continuing controls for ninety days "and then have the whole thing thrown out the window."

The final decision comes in the House this week. With the close vote of 178 to 163 defeating the Republican measure, the Administration Democrats are very shaky against the strength of the opposing coalition. The latter is expected to make a final try to defeat the Administration bill, even though, in its present form, it repre-

sents a number of crippling compromises. Yielding to the pressure of the real estate and landlord lobby and of such "enlightened" legislators as Representative Jackson, Republican from Calfornia-who, amid outbursts of applause from the floor and from the lobby-crowded gallery, declared that rent control is the "high road of State Socialism"—the Administration Democrats in the House are cheating the tenants of the nation.

In the first place, instead of the original provision to extend control for two years, the bill now contains a time-limit of only fifteen months. Besides this major concession, the Administration Democrats agreed to abandon altogether the ceilings on rents in one hundred rural and small city areas. This won over some Democrats who didn't want rent control in their own districts but had no objection to controls in other places. But the concession that is the cream of the crop is to include a clause assuring landlords "A REASONABLE RETURN ON THE REASONABLE VALUE OF THEIR

One report said that "Both Democrats and Republicans agreed that was one provision that

undermined some of the opposition to the bill." And why not? While the Administration bill provides for the end of the fifteen per cent so-called voluntary rent increases that have been forced upon so many tenants, the compromise provision for "a reasonable return on the reasonable value of their property" could well result in MORE than fifteen per cent rent increases. Landlords are clever

In all respects the bill falls far short of what the President led tenants to expect. While there is a provision against mass evictions and one by which the government can sue landlords for "triple damages" for rent overcharges, this involved process is no substitute for a direct provision requiring fines and jail sentences for ceiling violators. These latter powers the bill does not have. Also, there is no clause in the bill to overcome the shameful, thriving black market in rentals, where a tenant must pay a large bonus to the landlord or buy a lot of useless sticks of furniture at unheard of prices.

Therefore, even if the compromised Administration bill passes in the House and in the Senate, it has so many loopholes that the unions, tenant and consumer organizations, and all such groups, will have to be ready for defensive action against the landlords. But because of the filibuster in the Senate, no rent control bill at all may be passed. The mass of tenants affected should be in a position to take organized offensive action to get a protective law on the books.

A full review of the latest Cogressional actions, by Susan Green, will appear next week. Also: an editorial on the significance of the Loyalty Board decision reported on this page: R. Fahan on "Sidney Hook and the Catholic Church"; the special report on unemployment announced on page 2 of this

# NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

# Seek to End Los Angeles CIO Split

By MARY BELL

LOS ANGELES - The split between "right" and "left" wings which took place in the Communist - dominated Los Angeles CIO Council a year ago in February over the issues of the Marshall Plan and the national elections, when the "right wing" walked out of the Council, is now in the process of being mended through the intervention of the national CIO. Allan Haywood, representative of the CIO Executive Board, arrived at an agreement last week with representatives of both sides.

An administrative committee composed of Wm. Lawrence of the Los Angeles Council, Albert T. Lunceford of the Los Angeles Committee for National CIO and Richard Leonard of the national CIO has been set up to effect a unification. This committee will be in charge until a new, united council can be elected, with the proviso that each officer is bound to support national CIO policy.

At the time of the split, the Stalinist-dominated CIO Council passed a motion not to endorse a presidential candidate, since they were supporting Henry Wallace in the face of the national CIO's endorsement of Truman. The "right wing" was in a minority at that time and, being unable to get the Council to adopt the national CIO policy, they withdrew. DISMAYED BY MOVE

Each group conducted its separate election campaigns and has maintained its separate existence for more than a year, with resulting weakness and confusion among the ranks of the labor movement. However, the original anti-Stalinist minority has gained adherents during this period from auto, rubber, steel and other locals until even its opponents concede it a majority at the present time. The Longshoremen's Union, in San Pedro, represented heretofore in the Los Angeles Council, two weeks ago resolved to withhold its per capita from the Council and not to receive the Stalinist-line Labor Herald, organ of the

Since the issues which provoked the split have receded, the Stalinist wing of the Council has been calling for unity. The anti-Stalinist wing has been more reluctant. For in addition to the political issues dividing the two groups, the non-Stalinists had long been subjected to the undemocratic, log-rolling, filibustering, partyline tactics with which the labor movement is so familiar.

# **Shorter Life Experts** Make Little Progress

"Very little progress appears to have been made in adapting artillery to air-borne work; and the overhead armored self-propelled gun, which won overwhelming support after the war, from the majority of the army's combat commanders, is still, moreover, a subject of dispute."-N. Y. Times, January 23, 1949.

to be accomplished comes with surprise, dismay and shock to many of the orthodox CIO leaders. There are several reasons for their reaction. They had anticipated and pressed for a lifting of the charter of the nonconforming Council by Murray's representative, Haywood, as was done in other places where a council split is definitely not a left wing. The Statook place. There is a definite feeling that Murray let them down, especially since the initiative for the original walk-out was not locally inspired and was undertaken to assist the general national campaign against

The orthodox CIOers do not look forward to happiness to the projected unity. While they have turned their former minority into a majority during the split period, they lack a clearcut distinctive program which the Stalinist party-liners have. They continue to tail politically the Democratic Party. The pseudo-left, while subservient to the Kremlin, is to that extent independent of the native capitalist parties and has a radical appearance. The "right wing" had a

the Stalinists. The "right wing" ex-

pected to be better rewarded.

The manner in which the unity is tough time before. It didn't win a majority in the united council. It may again lose its majority unless it develops its own independent program.

It should be pointed out that what unites the anti-Stalinist group is its anti-Stalinism. It is not a real right wing, despite the popular application of this term, just as the Stalinist group linists represent the totalitarian arm of the Russian ruling class within the labor movement. The anti-Stalinist group are the traditional American labor leaders, running from conservative to left wing. LABOR ACTION continues to support the latter against the former, although it cannot defend the unwise strategy used against the Stalinists.

The Stalinists will be defeated in the Los Angeles Council, as elsewhere, by a superior program which represents the interests of the rank and file, speaks clearly what it wants and where it is going and not by an organizational maneuver that has now come full circle, leaving the struggle just about where it was before. The weakness of their opponents is the strength of the Stalinists.

In Our Next Issue:

# A Survey of Unemployment Situation in United States

Reports from:

Illinois Missouri California Maryland

> New York Ohio **New Jersey** West Virginia

A FULL PAGE OF LA - ORDER YOUR COPY NOW

# Stalinists Win in UAW Fisher Body Local 45

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND - Reversing the trend here and nationally the pro-Stalinist administration of Fisher Body Local 45, UAW-CIO, won a smashing victory in the local union elections just

After the most vigorous campaign in the history of the local, resulting in an election turnout of well over two thirds of the union membership, the administration made a clean sweep, taking every position contested by a general two-to-one mar-

With the Stalinists losing out in such strongholds as UE and MMSW, a large part of the Cleveland labor inovement was watching this election. Local 45 has long been the loudest sounding board for the CP both in the Cleveland CIO and in the UAW nationally. Admitting that the present administration was well entrenched in the local, it was felt that the present trend sweeping the Stalinists out of union power would prove fatal to the Beckman-Fenster-DeVito combination. Up to the days of voting, it looked like a much closer race than it turned out to be.

# VIGOROUS OPPOSITION

The Stalinists have been opposed in past elections, but little fight had been put up outside of passing out slates of "good" men. Usually there was little interest and the vote was small. One or two of the opposition would sometimes get elected to office, but they would fail to continue the fight through the year.

This time the Reuther forces took

international representative, John Troeter, member of the local, spent considerable time organizing a caucus to fight the Stalinists. Basically the group's program was "for CIO and UAW policy," as against following the twists of the party liners.

The campaign started off pretty much on a red-baiting basis. However, this sort of attack soon diminished, with more attention paid to the down-to-earth trade union issues on which the administration was vulnerable, such as the faction attitude of the local leadership which resulted in no cooperation with the international union, failure to reach a seniority agreement, failure to effect a local wage settlement factoring in the last two general increases in the piece-workers' rates, lack of local bylaws, disregard of regular dates for membership meetings, extremely factional use of the union newspaper, almost complete lack of union committees, financial irregularities, no committeeman elections in three years,

# WHY THEY WON

With all this ammunition at hand. some explanation is needed to account for the election results. First of all. the present administration has at its disposal all the union apparatus and knows very well how best to take advantage of it. The local paper, The Eye-Opener, was used very thoroughly as a factional weapon, both in playing up the names of the leadership men all during the year, and in presenting the material of the administration in this campaign. The

an active part in the campaign. An main strategy of the pro-Stalinists in a normal election year. However, was to identify their men as the union, with the opposition as being antiunion, directed by outside forces. Some of the Stalinist statements even went out over the signature of the shop committee.

The plant has a very high percentage of Negroes and foreign born. The Stalinists exploited these elements fully, whispering that the opposition was against Negroes and other minorities, despite the fact that the opposition slate ran Negroes, Jews, foreign born, etc., for office, and welcomed all elements into the caucus. In typical CP fashion, slander and personal abuse were lavishly spread around the shop concerning the opposition.

The Stalinists had just about all the known capable union leaders on their side. Opposition elements, over an extensive period of time, have been driven from union activity by the usual methods of slander and character assassination. This left no well known activists to head the fight. Beckman ran for his twelfth successive term for president. Kennedy, DeVito, Foster, Fenster, Chaka were identified in the minds of the membership as THE UNION. Fryar, Phelps, Williams, Clark, Marrett were relatively unknown, and none of them had demonstrated any leadership abilities recently. Troeter was known, but it was fairly easy to discredit him as "an outside force" trying to do a job on the local leadership.

# OUTLOOK FOR FUTURE

The vote polled by the anti-Stalinists would have been enough to win tions.

the Stalinists really worked hard in the shop rounding up the vote, and even held campaign meetings in the Negro communities, miles away from the plant. Furthermore, the administration had good contact with the women workers in the trim shop, where the opposition had very little force. The campaign waged by both sides was effective, as demonstrated by the voting, which was largely by straight slates. All independents running placed behind the caucus candidates.

The main job for the members in Local 45 is to replace the present leadership, which is mainly composed of out and out Stalinists, fellow travelers and opportunists who may disagree with the CP, but refuse to open their mouths. Looking over the forces in the local, one sees little chance of putting in office real militants now. However, it is possible that under a more democratic and less factional regime the militant elements could be built up to a position of influence in the union.

be better prepared for the 1950 elec-

### It is with this understanding that it was proper to support the pro-CIO forces against the Stalinists. Also, on most of the specific union issues

raised, excepting the argument against the third party, the anti-Stalinists deserved support. It is necessary now to keep the opposition alive, again, to face the Stalinists on issue after issue throughout the year, to build up a reputation as union builders and union fighters, and thus to

in guerrilla warfare, he should not

hide such information. To my best

knowledge, he is simply an officer

in the regular REPUBLICAN ARMY.

Magnus is taken from the report he

detested so much. My interest in Tan-

malaka could not have been so ut-

terly platonic if it made his program

available (for the first time in the

I think the Republicans will fight

through to independence. The prob-

lem for socialists is what kind of

independence and at what cost to

Indonesia's future. This is where Mag-

nus' sights are still on Trotsky's 1927

However, there are other matters

which deserve more attention than

the above relatively secondary ones:

1. how to explain the complete elim-

ination of the Marxist movement in

Asia and how to rebuild it: 2, how to

explain the rise of mass social de-

mocracy and define our attitude to-

ward it; 3. how to advance a program

of socialist unity for Southeast Asia

as a step toward union and an inde-

pendent third camp. These matters

deserve discussion. They are new

problems, unexpected, not contained

in traditional analysis. Even disputes

Finally, my articles do not consti-

tute any kind of "decision making."

level. He is manifestly wrong.

We have a difference in emphasis.

West) in whatever sketchy form.

The four-point program listed by

### had no trouble finding the mastermind in this business, but merely picked up the acknowledged expert, Kenneth Ryan, who received his

Wire-Tap Circus—

training in tapping wires as a city detective. Along with this Ryan, another "private eye," a former Treasury agent named Edward M. Jones, was brought in.

that Ryan was attempting to tap tele-

phone wires in City Hall. The police

Both men talked freely, with Jones claiming that he hired Kenneth Ryan after a lawyer associated with Clendenin Ryan gave Jones the assignment to tap the wires. Evidently fearing that the pace was slowing, wiretapper Ryan left the City Hall in approved thriller style, through a washroom window.

Still following the radio script, the private detective appeared two days later before the Grand Jury, accompanied by a famous criminal lawyer, and voluntarily surrendered. O'Dwyer proved that he is a detective story reader by saying to reporters, "I knew he would be back."

Meanwhile, Clendenin Ryan left his country place in New Jersey for an enjoyable round of interviews. marred slightly perhaps by the muttered comment of a cop who said, "Your father should've left you brains instead of money." When he retired to his town house, Ryan assured reporters that he felt "stronger, younger and healthier" than ever and that he planned to take his wife out for a round of dancing.

### TAPPING THE LINES

At this writing the Grand Jury has taken over, with Kenneth Ryan indicted and Edward M. Jones held as a material witness and a full-dress probe into wire-tapping in prospect.

This latter phase is of most importance to us, far more than the perennial corruption of the city government and the mock heroics of the righteous crusader, Clendenin Ryan.

Eavesdropping on private conversations via the telephone has become an integral part of investigation even though the Supreme Court has held it to be contrary to the Bill of Rights. Proof that evidence has been obtained through wiretapping is enough to cause a mistrial in federal courts. In New York State, wiretapping is legal provided court permission has been obtained in advance.

Nevertheless, the practice has be-

# Minimum Wages For Farm Labor?

WASHINGTON (NFLU)-The House Labor Committee is about ready to report on the new Fair Labor Standards Act. The National Farm Labor Union and the American Federation of Labor have been putting up a strong fight for the inclusion of workers employed on the 102,136 largescale industrialized farms in the nation. As originally proposed by the AFL, the minimum wage bill would include employees of farms hiring 4 or more workers during a calendar quarter year under minimum wages, no overtime provisions. It was rewritten by the committee to include only employees of those farms having 5,000 man-days in the preceding year. It was estimated that it would cover only 2,000 extra large farms.

The farm lobby representing big business in agriculture succeeded in bringing enough pressure to bear on individual members of the Labor Committee to knock out even this crumb of crust for the agricultural workers.

Meanwhile, the National Farm Labor Union, the American Federation of Labor and other interested organizations are continuing the fight to include agricultural workers under the minimum wage provisions of the

# Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

13-12

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. **RENEW NOW** 

branch of law enforcement and has carried over into private investigations. Kenneth Ryan, credited with inventing the most ingenious devices in this "peeping Tom" business, was enabled to set himself up as an expert and to invest thousands of dol-

lars in equipment. Whole staffs of technicians were kept busy during the war by various departments in Washington to spy on one another and presumably the activity still persists. No government official feels safe enough to discuss "delicate" matters over the 'phone.

### INVASION OF PRIVACY

We aren't too greatly concerned over the squabbling of various governmental bureaucrats who record telephone conversations to be used as blackmail in the future, or in efforts of one gang of politicians to "get the goods" on another.

As another infringement on the democratic rights ostensibly existing in the U. S., wire-tapping is to be condemned and opposed. Perhaps the present fracas will serve to throw a welcome light on the subject.

In any event, the practice is one more manifestation of the growing invasion of privacy, held in such reverence by the capitalist class, that accompanies the repression of civil liberties now under way. The dividing ine between the openly totalitarian state and the "democratic" state becomes every day more blurred and obscure.

# Mines—

(Continued from page 1)

hat, and for miners and other workers picking "important government officials" from the President on down. KROLL'S TEARS

Mr. Love, who hates the miners, also made a nasty crack about the memorial feature of the strike. The strike, he says, is "just an ordinary strike with a little black ribbon on it." That is from the head of a corporation which makes millions selling coal with an awful lot of workers' blood on it. The year 1948 saw 1,105 men die in the pits and 54,100 suffer injury. The percentage killed or inured is one miner in eight each year. Little black ribbon," indeed!

That is the sort of thing workers expect from a coal operator. They have no right, however, to expect the kind of talk that they are getting from Jack Rroll, national director of the CIO Political Action Committee. Brother Kroll is practically in tears over the mine strike. He is afraid it will stop repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act! This is a deadly kind of reason-

If unions must give up their right to defend themselves in order to get repeal, then maybe we had better keep the Act! Besides, what is Kroll orried about? Aren't Congress and the White House simply lousy with "friends of labor" that Kroll worked so hard to elect a few months ago? Or is it that Congress and the White House are just simply lousy-period?

Lewis deserves criticism, not for calling a strike which is, in effect, against the government, but for putting the union in a position where a strike is necessary. Why should workers vote for political parties which won't even protect a worker's life, let alone his standard of living? We don't know, but Mr. Lewis must.

Just after the election, the United Mine Workers Journal, in defending its support of Democratic and Republican candidates, instead of labor candidates, said that "when someone tries to string you to the effect that the membership of the UMWA does not vote for its best interests as regards senators and congressmen, the individual member of the union can refute such a ridiculous charge with these simple facts."

The "simple facts" referred to are the contention that "friends of labor" had been elected. If these are the "simple facts," why must the miners strike for their safety? The UMW Journal continues: "The election is conclusive proof that the American people are still wedded to the twoparty system. It should convince the most exacting of the futility of attempting to establish a third party, or a labor party, as a means of attaining the political objective which the common folks want."

The reason Lewis himself gives for this strike is the best answer there is to this foolishness.

### PROS AND CONS: A Discussion Corner forces in Indonesia. The weakness of marks is to prepare for the eventual barricade. Our differences on the no one knows. If Magnus knows what social policy Tanmalaka is pursuing

# Which Policy On Indonesia?

The Workers Party has not yet taken a position on the perspective and strategical and tactical orientation presented by Comrade Jack Brad on the situation in Indonesia in his letter in the February 14 issue of LABOR ACTION. Nevertheless Brad has seen fit, in his capacity as a writer for LABOR ACTION, to apply this policy in practice. I wish to protest this type of decision-making from above and to posit an entirely different orientation for the party.

In a newsy interview entitled "How Indonesian Republic Fights On," the express purpose of which is to whitewash the Republican leadership, Brad has, in fact, carried out his perspective of "loyalty" and unconditional support. His mild and innocuous criticism of the Republican policies and his breezy offhand remarks about Tanmalaka indicate only too clearly the position he is approaching. Here in America things are muddy and indistinct. Let us shift our view to Indonesia where the events are occurring and attempt to indicate a correct revolutionary perspective. If I am mistaken about the meaning of Brad's remarks I shall be only too happy to admit it, but let us see.

# CRITICAL SUPPORT?

In India, Burma and Ceylon, independence has been attained under the leadership of the colonial bourgeoisie. Does this mean that revolutionaries should give uncritical or "unconditional" political support to the Republican forces of Indonesia or their "social democratic" wing? NO! A generalization about the weakness of British and French colonialism and the effect of World War II and the Japanese occupation cannot be substituted for a concrete analysis of the relationship of class and national

present-day imperialism or colonialism does not thereby indicate an automatic change in the character or the strength of the colonial bourgeoisie. and furthermore the specific content of various colonial struggles differs sharply. This is especially true in Indonesia, where the history of the actual struggle has shown specifically and in detail that the Republican leadership is incapable of freeing this country from Dutch imperialism.

The Indonesian independence movement has suffered a severe defeat, and a discussion of future possibilities and concrete plans must begin with a recognition of the EXTENT of this defeat and its primary causes.

The defeat stems not from the difference in military strength of the Dutch and nationalist forces (although this is a contributory factor), but is primarily the result of the entire previous character of the Republican struggle-its aims, methods and social character. The Republic lost a political and social battle, not a military one. When the heat was on, the LEADERSHIP oozed defeatism and compromise and social conservatism. while Tanmalaka showed vision, uncompromising optimism, and a cor-

rect theoretical approach. The information on Tanmalaka is spotty and incomplete, but every bit of data received indicates, more and more, that he has maintained throughout the years a completely correct and irreconcilably proletarian position. He has fought the Dutch consistently and effectively and is doing so today under his own banner, and yet he has maintained an unmoving POLITICAL opposition to the policies and aims of the Republican leadership, under whose "democratic"

rule he spent two years in prison. If this policy is what Brad means by "loyalty" to the struggle, let him say so in so many words, for I fear that the REAL purpose of Brad's reabandonment of Tanmalaka and his policies The difference between my ap-

proach and Brad's can be reduced to a single sentence: He is for unconditional support to the Republican leadership and I am for unconditional support to Tanmalaka. He is preparing to ask Tanmalaka and his party to submit themselves completely to the narrow, anti-working class policies of the Republican military leaders while I would urge him to remain independently fighting the Dutch in cooperation with the Republican leadership, but with his own program and policies.

As reported in Brad's February 21 interview, Tanmalaka's program is as follows: 1 - Against the Lingajatti and Renville policies-and no compromise with the Dutch; 2-No negotiations while the Dutch retain a single soldier on Indonesian soil; 3-A radical social policy; 4-For a workerpeasant alliance to achieve power in the Republic. This program is absolutely correct and I support it and urge the party to support it.

I shall attempt to concretize these views in an article which I will submit to the Workers Party Bulletin which should take care of the deficiencies of this extremely schematic letter, but, in short, my position is as follows: 1-Defense of the Republic against Dutch imperialism; 2-MATERIAL aid to all Indonesian armies; 3-Uncompromising political opposition to the Republican leadership; and 4-Unconditional support to Tanmalaka and his program.

Robert MAGNUS

# The Problems of Marxism in Asia

I must refuse Magnus' offer to take to opposite sides of the traditional

stated questions are of emphasis, not kind. No one is getting ready to drop Tanmalaka and go over to the reprehensible (!) Indonesian bourgeoisie. On Tanmalaka, it is difficult to give acceptable guarantees since Magnus seems to think my coverage of the great Indonesian revolutionist to be in some unstated way inadequate, incomplete or somehow at fault. It is strange that he does not criticize my attitude toward Tanmalaka specifically.

The Republican leadership is supine, given to utmost compromise; will make the most destructive deals with Holland: will on occasion arrest socialist revolutionists: will be unable, like its counterparts elsewhere in Asia, to solve a single one of the desperate problems - such as social relations in agriculture, balanced and planned industrialization - without driving down living standards and keeping Indonesia out of either imperialist orbit.

These statements are not elicited for the first time by Magnus' letters but are present, however indistinct and poorly, in all my articles. I cannot disagree with Magnus on this. Renville and Lingajatti are proofeven if not a single theoretical basis existed. ( I must insist, though, that Indonesia requires special examination for its specific class character. It is much too simple and vulgar to talk about the "bourgeoisie.") Since this seems to be the crux of the matter. the dispute should end here.

# MATTER OF EMPHASIS

tic about Tanmalaka than I have been, but I have done my best to make his opinions known, "Unconditional support" is further than anyone needs to go at this distance, but I do think we would find ourselves in Tanmalaka's camp. What he is doing now,

Perhaps Magnus is more enthusias-

sponsibility.

on them might be fruitful.

I expressly stated that my approach was personal and not necessarily that held by the WP. If anyone is to write on Indonesia he must write from some viewpoint. My viewpoint has been discussed and generally approved by the editorial board of LABOR AC-TION, though, in the nature of analytical reporting. I have had to include certain views on my own re-

Jack BRAD.

# HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL ☐ Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents ☐ One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

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

# COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY BY WP CHAIRMAN IN LOYALTY BOARD HEARING

# Is Socialism 'Subversive'? Shachtman Testifies for Workers Party

MAX SHACHTMAN was called as a witness, was duly sworn, and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Chairman Short:
Q. Will you state your full name to the reporter?
A. Max Shachtman.
By Mr. Migdal:

Q. Mr. Shachtman, will you identify yourself, please, for the Board? A. I am National Chairman of the Workers Party.

Q. Do you know T.? A. I met him this morning. Q. Had you ever seen him before? A. No. Q. Had you ever heard his name before?

Q. Do you know the members of the Workers Party? A. Yes. By and large, I am acquainted with them personally.

Q. How does it happen, Mr. Shachtman, that you know the members of your Party personally? A. We are a very small organization, and in my capacity as National Chairman I travel about the country from branch to branch of our Party, and I meet the members of the organization, and am

therefore familiar with them.

Q. Did you, at my request, make a check to determine whether Mr. T. was a member of your Party, or was carried on your rolls in any way?

A. I inquired of our New York Organizer, who is even more intimately familiar with the members of this City than I am, and he knows of no T.

Q. Now, may I ask you some additional ques-

tions: Do you know J. or N. D.? A. No.
Q. Are they members of the Workers Party?
A. I don't know them.

Q. Do you believe if they were members of the Workers Party that you would know them? A. Yes, unless they are members in some small community I haven't visited recently.

Q. If I tell you they are residents of the City of Buffalo, New York, would that help you in any way? A. Yes. I know all the members of our organization in Buffalo; at least, I have known them up to quite recently and unless they joined in the last three or four months, I am quite sure I would know who they are.

Q. And you do not know who they are? A. No. Q. Do you know W.? A. How?

Q. W.? A. From where? Q. Buffalo, New York. A. No. I am not fa-

williar with that name at all.

Q. Is he a member of the Workers Party?

A. As far as I know, no. Q. Do you know S., of Buffalo? A. Yes, I know him.

Q. Is he a member of the Workers Party? A. No. To the best of my knowledge, he is a very close sympathizer of our party, but not a member. I know him quite well, as a matter of fact.

Q. You are certain he is not a member of your Party? A. Quite certain, in his case—perfectly sure.

Q. Did you ask him to join? A. I, personally,

Q. Has he had opportunities to join? A. Oh, yes. Everyone has an opportunity to join.
Q. And has he taken that opportunity? A. No. So far as I know, no.

# **Not a Secret Organization**

Q. Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your Party generally: I would like to know whether your Party has a position with regard to the Soviet Union? A. Yes, formally adopted by resolution at the last National Convention.

Q. Speaking generally, would you say that your Party is pro-Soviet Union or anti-Soviet Union? A. I think the answer to the question would be more enlightening if you asked about our attitude toward the present regime. We have nothing against any country.

Q. Will you describe your attitude, then, toward the present regime of the Soviet Union? A. I would say it is irreconcilably hostile to it, and has been since the inception of our organization.

Q. Do you suppose that any member of your Party, or anyone in sympathy with the aims of your Party, would, under any circumstances, act with others in the interests of the Soviet Union? A. No. Utterly inconceivable. I might add that there is a mass of evidence to demonstrate this incontrovertibly that would occupy this Board for several days.

Q. Could anyone who has a sympathy for the Workers Party, or could any member of the Workers Party, have a loyalty to or above any country other than the United States of America? A. No. That is likewise inconceivable.

Q. Could any member of your party be interested in any way with destroying the constitutional form of Government of the United States? A. Well, will you be a little more specific about that?

Q. Well, what I mean is, is your Party prepared to use force or violence or subversive or secret and conspiratorial methods for the purpose of everthrowing the Constitution of the United States? A. It is a long question. In the first place, we are not a secret organization in any sense. We are a public political organization. Members of our organization conduct campaigns for public office. I have been on the ballot. Their position on the ballot has not been contested. Our propaganda, educational and general political activities are quite well known, especially in the labor movement where we function most actively—so far as the question of secrecy and conspiratorial methods are concerned.

I might add further that the meetings of our branches, which are the basic units of our organization, are always open to non-members. We hold public meetings at all times. Our press is public and has been accorded second class mailing rights by the Post Office Department.

Our membership press, that is, our bulletins, are publicly available. By press, I mean that press in which we discuss our own Party problems. Those are publicly available.

Q. Well, will you address yourself to the question of force and violence? A. The answer is no. Q. Will you elaborate on that? Does your Party have any policy with regard to the use of force and violence in achieving any change? A. I wouldn't say that our Party had adopted any formal document on the matter. I can give you the general consensus of our Party that is more or less codified and formalized in literature that our Party

Q. Will you do that? A. I could refer you—I regret I don't have a copy with me—to a little booklet that I wrote recently on the Program and Principles of our Party, and which is considered a standard presentation of our Party position, so to speak.

On that score, I would say that our Party holds the position that it is necessary to win the support of a majority of the population in order to carry through a radical, fundamental transformation of

the social order in the United States.

This radical, social transformation is for us the establishment of a socialist society. We are a Socialist proprietion.

Q. Is it your intention, as a Party, to nominate

We publish here the official transcript of the testimony given by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, before the Loyalty Board of the United States Department of Commerce, on January 14, 1949, in the case of an acknowledged sympathizer of the Workers Party who was under "disloyalty" charges as an employee of the department. The testimony is taken from the official records of the board, which have been made available to us through the courtesy of Lester C. Migdal, attorney for the department employee in the case. The only changes made in the transcript have been minor corrections of stenographic errors.—Editor.

candidates for election to public office? A. We have done so within the limits of our strength, or, I should really say, of our weakness. We are a very small organization, I state again. We have run candidates in New York. I have been a candidate of our Party on several occasions. We have had candidates in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, in Michigan, in

# The Meaning of "Subversive"

Q. Has your organization had a hearing for the purpose of determining whether your organization is subversive within the meaning of the Executive Order of the President and the Directives thereunder? A. No.

Q. Has your organization ever made an application to be delisted? A. Yes. In my capacity as National Chairman of our Party, and under the instructions of the Executive Committee of our Party, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Clark requesting that he grant a hearing to our representatives in order that they might submit the position of our Party and demonstrate the injustice, the iniquity of the Department of Justice having placed our name on the so-called subversive list.

Mr. Clark replied, saying in effect that he would be glad to listen to a representative of our Party at his office in Washington. I said Mr. Clark. It was an error. It was his assistant—Assistant to the Attorney General.

Q. Has a hearing yet been held on the question?
A. No. Upon discussing the matter, our Executive Committee decided, and the decision was made in consultation with the American Civil Liberties Union, to request the Attorney General, once he had agreed to listen to our representative, to inform us of exactly what charges had been directed against us, what evidence had been presented to him, and what evidence he had at his disposal to sustain these charges. We considered, of course, that it was impossible for us to appear before the Attorney General without so much as the remotest idea of what charges had been presented against us to justify placing us on the list, or what evidence had been adduced before the Attorney General to sustain any

The Office of the Attorney General thereupon replied saying that in accordance with the Executive Order which directed the Attorney General to compile such a list, his office was not authorized to inform us of what charges had been directed against us, our Party, or what evidence, if any, had been submitted to sustain these charges.

Under those circumstances, we were absolutely helpless. I, for example, as a representative of our Party, cannot appear before any body, or any Board, or any Governmental institution in order to refute charges, the nature of which I am utterly unaware of, to reply to evidence the nature of which I am utterly unaware of.

We are, therefore, holding the matter in abeyance until further consultation with the American Civil Liberties Union, which has interested itself in the case of the Workers Party, and which on previous occasions has already intervened with the office of the Attorney General in Washington in that connection.

Delay has been occasioned by the fact that the Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, Roger N. Baldwin, has, for some time now, been in Germany. Upon his return the matter will be pursued by our Party.

Q. Is your Party, or can your Party be described as Totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or any of them? A. I will take the last one first. It is not exactly clear to me what is meant by subversive. I know all sorts of invidious connotations have been given to it. If the question were a little more precise, I could answer more precisely.

Q. May I ask you to leave that for a minute? Take the first three. A. The first three are much

Q. Could your Party in any way be designated as Totalitarian, Fascist, or Communist? A. In no sense whatsoever. In no sense whatsoever. We are an anti-totalitarian organization, and have been since our inception.

So far as being a Fascist organization is concerned, our Party has not only been emphatic in its opposition to Fascism in all its forms, but has even organized public demonstrations against Fascist organizations in this country. If I may, I can call your attention to the fact that I personally led such a demonstration in the City of New York in 1938, against the German-American Bund which was holding what we considered a very provocative meeting in Madison Square Garden.

So far as being a Communist organization, if by that is meant an organization in sympathy with the present regime in Russia, or in sympathy with the Communist Party in this or any other country, anyone familiar with the activities or program of our Party would consider the question an offenseridiculous. Our organization was founded, as a matter of fact, on the basis of three leaders having been expelled from the Communist Party and the Communist International on October 27, 1928, Since then, if anything, the gulf between the two movements has widened unbridgeably. I think it would be enough to read almost any issue of a periodical published by the Communist Party in this country to see what it says about our organization, and there will be no doubt in anyone's mind as to what view it has of us. Or read any issue of our periodical to

see what view we have of the Communist Party.

Q. Now, will you define for me, in your own way, whatever you think the word "subversive" used in this connection means, and tell me then what your attitude is about the possibility of holding the

Workers Party as a subversive organization? A. I might say that in the sense in which it is currently used, the Workers Party is decidedly not a subversive organization.

The general connotation of the term "subversive," as I gather it, is some sort of a conspiratorial, or semi-conspiratorial organization which is plotting for a sort of coup d'etat, violent overthrow of the Government by a minority, or which is operating as an agent of some foreign reactionary institution. None of these current concepts of the term "subversive" in any degree applies to our Party.

Q. Has your Party ever adopted a policy of advocating, or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States? A. No. How could that be? A good deal of our activity is necessarily devoted to fighting for democratic and constitutional rights for minority groups, one of which is the Workers Party itself. Far from advocating or supporting the restriction of democracy, we devote ourselves to a considerable degree to a fight to extend them.

Q. What, for example, would be the attitude of the Workers Party to the recent change of Government and methods used therein in Czechoslovakia? A. We have attacked and denounced that in most vigorous language in the popular press and in our scientific press, at public meetings and inside our own organization, in Europe.

# Goal, Method of Socialism

Q. Would you say that the Workers Party could be described in any way as seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means?

A. No. Decidedly, we ask to alter the form of Government of the United States. We are Socialists. We are opposed to capitalism. We are for Socialism. There is absolutely no secret about that. As for employing force or violence to impose the

As for employing force or violence to impose the will of the minority upon the population, from our point of view that is preposterous. You could not possibly lead, leaving aside all other considerations, to our objective, a Socialist democracy.

Q. Would you say that the Workers Party, its members or anyone in sympathy with the Workers Part, could or would, under any circumstances, engage in sabotage, espionage, or attempts or preparations therefor, or knowingly associate with spies or saboteurs? A. No. I mean, there may be some sympathizer attracted to our Party on the basis of Lord alone knows what. He is, perhaps, an irresponsible person. I don't know of any such person, in any case. But anyone attracted to our Party, as a member or a sympathizer, on the basis of what the Party stands for or does—I don't know how that could be conceived of, no.

Q. I repeat to you substantially the same question with regard to members or sympathizers of your Party, the question being: Could they in any way engage in treason or sedition, or the advocacy thereof? A. No.

Q. Could they, under any circumstances,— A. (interrupting)—May I elaborate on one point in particular? Q. Surely.

A. Which, if I may say so, strikes me as particularly absurd. Take the matter of treason. Treason is, as I understand it, defined constitutionally, or by statute, I am not quite sure now, as collaboration with some foreign government against the interests of the United States—roughly. But we are not less hostile to any other government on the face of the earth than we are to the Government of the United States. It simply could not enter the mind of any of our members to collaborate with other governments. All the governments in the world, so far as we can see, are capitalistic governments, in most cases much more reactionary than the capitalistic government in the United States, or Stalin's government, for which we enterain a particularly vigorous and irreconcilable opposition. To collaborate with such governments for the purpose of opposing the Government of the United States is, from our political point of view, a complete absurdity.

I might add that if any member of our Party were mad enough so much as to contemplate such collaboration, though we are extremely lenient about differences of opinion in our Party, we would nevertheless promptly expel him from our ranks.

Q. Now, as to any intentional unauthorized disclosure to any persons under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty to the United States of documents or information of a confidential or non-pubic character obtained by the persons making the disclosure from the government of the United States, is it conceivable to you that any member of your Party, or anyone in sympathy with the ideals of your Party, would, under any circumstances make such an unauthorized disclosure? A. Absolutely out of the question. We are not an espionage organization. We are a political organization for the purpose of pursuing, certainly at the present time, almost exclusively educational aims.

time, almost exclusively educational aims.

Q. As to the question of performing or attempting to perform one's duties, or otherwise acting so as to serve the interests of another government in reference to the interests of the United States, would you say that any member of your Party, or anyone in sympathy with the ideals of your Party, could so act? A. Flatly, I say that would be impos-

Q. As to membership in, or affiliation with, or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination that could be described as Totalitarian, Fascist. Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means, will you say that any member of your Party, or any person in sympathy with the aims of your Party, could be described in that fashion? A. It is implicit in what I have said to the preceding questions, that that would be absolutely impossible.

# Democracy in the WP

MR. MIGDAL: I propose now to have Mr. Shachtman say something about the nature of the aims of the Party, and the kind of Party discipline exercised, so that I can then in that way lay some foundation for my feeling about what sympathetic association with one of the members would mean, and that will be the direction of my next questions.

By Mr. Migdal:
Q. Mr. Shachtman, does your Party require any special discipline of its members? A. We require the payment of dues. A prolonged lapse of that would mean that the offender is dropped from the rolls of the Party. But that is normal in any organ-

We require a certain minimum of activity from every member: attendance at meetings more or less regularly; distribution of our press; assisting in the convening of public meetings where we present our point of view.

Discipline outside of the organization is confined more or less to the following:

We require of every member that he shall so conduct himself in his political life as not to throw any discredit upon or do harm to the labor movement in general or his own Party, the Workers Party, in particular. Inside of the organization I doubt if you will find another political party or group in this country which not only admits but encourages as wide a range of differences of opinion as the Workers Party. That, too, could easily be documented.

I referred before to a bulletin that we issue primarily for the Party members, but which is generally available to the public. This is a discussion bulletin which takes up all sorts of problems of the Socialist movement. You would see controversial articles in there written by different members, and even leading members of our organization, which represent a considerable range of difference of opinion.

In no case, in the almost nine years of existence of our Party as an independent organization, has there been a single case of discipline being exercised against a member, or expulsion of a member from our Party because of differences of opinion he may have had with the officials of the Party.

As a matter of fact, I know of only one single case of expulsion for any ground from our Party. That was quite recently. We expelled a member of our Party for having failed to support the workers in a given plant who went out on strike. We consider that any member of our Party who does not go along with the decisions of the trade union to which he belongs cannot properly represent our Party among the workers. That is the only case I know of, of an expulsion in the almost nine years of the existence of our Party.

Q. Within your Party, do you have major differences of opinion with regard to such current issues as, for example, support of the Marshall Plan, the position of the United States with regard to functioning within the United Nations, the Palestine question, domestic legislation, and will you say something about all of them, please?

A. Except for the question of the functioning of the United States in the United Nations, which has not arisen as a dispute in our organization, all of the other questions you mentioned have been the subject of discussion, dispute, controversy in our Party, in which extreme differences of opinion have been presented, and, without saying tolerated—I shouldn't say tolerated—that sounds—well, it is inadequate—encouraged. I can give you two or three examples if you wish.

On the Marshall Plan, for example, there are many of our members who oppose it, and many of our members who are for giving it a form of conditional support, or partial support. Both points of view have been presented inside our Party, in the bulletin, and in our public press which—almost every issue has a section devoted to discussion.

Or, take the matter of Palestine: There are not less than three or four different points of view that exist in our Party. Some are for the support of the movement to make Palestine a Jewish State; others are for supporting the movement to make Palestine a bi-national State; still others are for supporting a movement which would give the native Arab population such political parity with the Jewish population as would, in effect, make it bi-national. but in which the Arabs would have a majority. That seems a wide range of difference of opinionat one extreme, those who would convert it into a Jewish state, and at the other extreme, those who would want Palestine converted into what would be an Arab state. I doubt if more extreme positions on such a question could exist. Neverth do exist. They are being currently discussed—as a matter of fact, particularly so in view of the fact that the Party is on the eve of a National Convention. Preceding the National Convention there is an especially intensive period of discussion of the

# Opposite of Stalinist Party

Q. Now, may I ask you to describe for me what you consider to be the chief difference between the Communist or the Totalitarian parties and your own Party? A. There are several, and they are fundamental. When I say fundamental, I mean they make any collaboration, any cooperation between us in almost any field a political impossibility.

The Communist Party, as is commonly known, is in the service of the present Russian regime. I can only repeat that we are intensely hostile to that regime. Those who used to be akin to us in Russia have either been executed or imprisoned, or are in concentration camps, or in slave labor camps. Under those circumstances, it would be very difficult for us to entertain the slightest sympathy with the present regime.

Q. May I interrupt, for I don't think you understand the question. I mean, in terms of party discipline and loyalties outside of the United States, can you describe any serious differences between yourselves and, say, the Communist Party? A. As far as relationships abroad are concerned, I can really repeat my position in a somewhat different way. We consider, and we have denounced the Communist Party as being nothing more than a tool of the Kremlin. We have no international affiliation ourselves, and certainly with regard to Russia, we have a hostile attitude that I described before.

As far as internal discipline is concerned, there is no party democracy in any Communist Party. There is no discussion in any Communist Party. Decisions are simply arrived at at the top, in the leadership. Those decisions are usually transmitted from Russia, and the ranks are simply required to carry out decisions arrived at without consulting them.

That is impossible in our Party. All decisions taken in our Party are preliminary discussed by the membership. They are decided by the membership. Our leading committee is an executive committee in the literal sense of the word. It executes decisions arrived at by the members.

Q. Now, if someone were in sympathy with the general ideals of the Party, would it be possible to describe the way in which that man would act under any special circumstances?

If I may explain my question just a little more, what I mean is this: If I were a member of the Communist Party—I think all of us in this room would agree, for instance, if it took a hostile attitude towards the United States, I would; or conversely, if it took a soft attitude toward the United States of America, then I would; or, if they took a specific position—if the Soviet Union took a specific position with regard to Palestine, then the members of the Communist Party in America and elsewhere in the world would take that kind of attitude.

So that, with regard to the Communist Party, it would perhaps be possible to say that you can determine the attitude of the members of that Party,

or their sympathizers, by knowing what the Soviet Union is doing at any given moment? A. I would agree with that, yes.

Q. Now, with regard to a sympathizer with your Party, could you define the way in which he felt about anthing from knowing that he was a sympathizer with the general ideals of your Party? A. In no way. Our position is not determined by nor dependent upon the position taken by any government, let alone the Russian government.

Q. Would it necessarily be so that a sympathizer with the ideals of your Party could be assumed to agree with any position of the Party taken by even the majority of its membership, as an automatic thing? A. No, of course not. I tried to point out there are differences of opinion inside our Party, and if that prevailed, then there must certainly be an even greater range of differences with the official positions of the Party among our sympathizers, that is, among those less intimately associated with the Party.

### Problem Before the Board

Q. Is there anything more you would like to say to the Loyalty Board convened here that you think would be of assistance to it in coming to a determination of this case? A. Well, perhaps I could summarize the problem as I see it, that is, the problem that confronts this Board.

Unless I am radically mistaken, what the Board is concerned with, and what the authorities who are responsible for setting up this, and what similar Boards are concerned with, at least primarily, is that government institutions shall not make possible or facilitate the work of those who in any way serve the Russian regime.

My impression is that that is a primary consideration.

Mr. T., as I understand, is involved more or less on such a basis. If Mr. T is a sympathizer of our Party, then I am all the more anxious to see that he is not unjustly discriminated against, or discriminated against on unwarranted assumptions. If his offense is supposed to be his sympathy for our Party, I consider there are no grounds for any action to be taken against him.

Our Party was actually formed in the United States in April 1940—literally on the basis of its opposition to the support of Russia in the war, some months after the Stalin-Hitler pact had been signed.

The majority of the Party to which we belonged at that time, called the Socialist Workers Party, while hostile to the Stalin regime, nevertheless considered that Russia was some sort of workers state, and that it should be supported in the war, not because of the Stalin regime, to which, I repeat, they were hostile, but in spite of that regime. We represented a minority of that party. I belonged in that minority personally. We said that under no circumstances could we support Russia in the war, that we had, as socialists, nothing in common with the Russian regime.

You will certainly understand the gravity of the dispute and the seriousness with which we took it, if I say that it is on that issue that the Socialist Workers Party split in two.

The then minority constituted itself as an independent organization, the present Workers Party. That was in April 1940, a few months after the Second World War began.

It may be thought that once the Stalin-Hitler pact was broken, and Russia, by political and military expediency, found herself on the side of the United States, that the position of the Workers Party would change. In no way did that occur. We opposed the Russian regime before the war, during that period of the war when it was allied with the Western Powers, and since the war came to an end.

Q. May I ask you whether the members of the Workers Party served in the Armed Forces in the United States during the war? A. Of course. We are not pacifists. We have no conscientious objectors among our members.

Q. And you consider yourselves loyal American citizens who would participate in a war? A. Certainly. Any number of our members served in the Armed Forces, in our battlefronts as well, and with distinction. All of them, so far as I know, entered the Army as ordinary soldiers, as privates. When they were discharged, some of them ranked as high as Lieutenants, Captains. At no time that I know of, and I think I am familiar with virtually every case, was any question raised about the conduct of any of our members in the Armed Forces. Not once that I know of.

Mr. Migdal: Does the Board have any questions? Mr. Ryan: I have one or two.

# Defining a Trotskyist

EXAMINATION BY THE BOARD By Mr. Ryan:

Q. Mr. Shachtman, you have testified that the Workers Party has gone on record as opposing the present Russian regime. A. Yes.

Q. Have they gone on record favoring any for-

mer Russian regime? A. Yes. In the general sense, yes. We were supporters of the Russian Revolution of 1917, yes. We considered that a socialist revolution.

Q. The Trotsky Revolution? A. Well, what is commonly called the Lenin-Trotsky Revolution, yes. Q. Well, I would like to ask you this question:

Q. Well, I would like to ask you this question:
The Board has heard several definitions, and I
would like to have your expert definition of a Trotskyite. What is a Trotskyite? A. Well, now, I can
give you only my own opinion. If you read the Daily
Worker, an organ of the Communist Party, you
will read some rather violent definitions of what
a Trotskyite is.

Far from feeling any friendliness toward us, or toward any Trotskyite, we are described as fascists, vipers, wreckers, and other names which only the presence of our reporter prevents me from repeating.

In general, I can say this: Our support in a general way, that is, not the support of every single word and every single act of Trotsky—while we supported it in a general way, it was based upon two considerations:

One, that it was Trotsky primarily who began the fight against the bureaucratization of the Russian regime as early as 1923, and who thereby became the arch enemy, and finally the victim of the Stalin bureaucracy. Trotsky raised a demand and carried on fight for workers' democracy in Russia as against bureaucracy and against the totalitarian regime. We in the United States—I was a member of the Communist Party almost from its founding in this country —we in the United States were so far from Russia that we really knew very little of what was going on, although we had the impression we knew everything. It was only in 1928, five years after Trotsky began the struggle, that we began to get the details. We took a position in favor of that fight and against Stalin, and we were immediately expelled from the

(Continued on page 3)

### COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY BY WP CHAIRMAN IN LOYALTY BOARD HEARING

# Is Socialism "Subversive"? Shachtman Testifies for Workers Party—

(Continued from page 3)

Communist Party, although we had been founders and leader's of that party.

The second question-I am speaking of the main reasons-

Q. About what time was this?

A. October 27, 1928—a little better than 20 years ago. Three of us who were members of the Executive Committee, it was called at that time—yes, the Executive Committee of the Communist Party-were summarily expelled from that Party after a trial which lasted a few minutes, really. I think it is that time that dates our opposition to brief trials, you know—it developed almost into a prejudice on our part. We were expelled because we supported Trotsky in his fight for democracy, and because we supported him in his fight for internationalism and against the nationalist position taken by the Stalin

This nationalist position, which some of you may know, or should know, finally degenerated into the present imperialistic position of the Russian regime, the occupation of foreign countries, the subjugation of people, the suppression of all social and democratic institutions, especially of labor movements, and the like.

The hostility against us was from the beginning very strong. I can tell you that we suffered very heavily at the hands of the Stalinist leaders in the United States. The very first public meeting we attempted to hold, in November, 1928, to present our point of view as to why we had been expelled from the Communist Party, was in the Labor Temple in New York, at Second Avenue and 14th Street. I remember it very vividly. A big crowd of thugs and tough guys, organized by the Communist Party, was sent there to break up our meeting by physical violence. We defended ourselves as best we could. The meeting was broken up. It was only the second meeting that was successful, and because we had on the platform a representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, and, frankly, it was because we had prepared to defend ourselves from the Communist Party. More than one meeting, especially in those days, when we were even smaller than we are now, was broken up by the Communist Party, and I, myself, personally, physically, felt how they broke them up. Such attempts have not been made in recent years, because we are a little more experienced in defending our meetings, and, frankly, where attempts have been made, we have given as good as we have gotten. It has discouraged that

If the committee had unlimited patience, which I am sure it does not have and should not have—I will say I can give you a wealth of details to show the absolute abyss that exists between us and the Stalinites, in this country or any other country, and how completely inconceivable it would be for any of our members or sympathizers attracted to our movement on the basis of what we actually stand for to act as collaborators or agents of the Communist regime or the Stalin party—such things as espionage, or stealing documents-it simply is not possible.

Q. You mentioned your publication a moment

ago. What is the name of it? A. We have a weekly publication called "Labor Action." We have a monthly magazine, a more or less scientific magazine, called "The New International." And then we publish a mimeographed bulletin for discussion of the problems of our Party, or socialism in general, called "The Bulletin of the Workers Party." All three of those are the public press.

Q. I have one more question, and you have been very kind in answering my questions so far. A. I consider it not only a duty but a pleasure.

### Presidential Election Policy

Q. The Socialist Workers Party have what relation to the Socialists? A. Well, now, we are not the same as the Socialist Workers Party. That is the organization to which I referred before as the one

which split in 1940 over the Russian question. I can only reply for our own Party, the Workers Party, as to its relationship with the Socialist Party.

We have many differences with the Socialist Party, but I might point out that in the last election, the last Presidential election last November-this November past-we, ourselves, had no presidential candidate-that is, no one nominated by our own Party. We do not pretend to a strength we do not actually enjoy. I do not boast about this fact. I simply state it as a fact. We are a tiny organization primarily occupied with educational work. It is only on rare occasions, and in local situations, that we even put up candidates for election.

Having no candidate of our own, being opposed to the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. being opposed likewise to the Progressive Party. which we consider as being too intimately connected with the Communist Party to deserve the support of the Socialists or workers in general, we told our supporters in our press to support any one of the three existing small socialist organizations which did have presidential candidates. We asked them to chooseit was a matter of indifference to us—the candidate of the Socialist Party, Mr. Thomas, or Mr. Teichert

We, so to speak, endorsed all three, and offered our support of the choice of one of those. We had none of our own.

MR. RYAN: Thank you.

### **WP and Russian Question**

MR. MIGDAL: I would like to ask one more question, and I think we will be through. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Migdal:

Q. You have described the history of the Workers Party, and its being rooted in a feeling about Trotsky, and what Trotsky was doing within the Communist Party, and of the Soviet Union.

Now, I ask you whether someone-take someone at maturity in 1940 or 1941, and who is now, has been a sympathizer with your Party, would be a Trotskyite, or whether, from that sympathy with the aims and ideals of your Party, would you say he is or is not a Trotskvite?

consider myself a Trotskyite in the broad sense, supporting in general the socialist views that Leon Trotsky had.

It does not follow from that, it could not for me, it does not follow from any of our members, that we agree with Trotsky on every question, that we agree with him in small questions, or even in all large important questions.

I refer you to the fact that in the dispute in 1940 which led to the split in the Socialist Workers Party, the main dispute was carried on between myself, as representative and spokesman of the minority, and as spokesman for the majority, Leon Trotsky, who was at that time in Mexico, on the question of Russia. That can easily be documented.

Trotsky wrote a whole book-a whole book which is publicly available-called "In Defense of Marxism" the bulk of which is devoted to a polemic against me and against our friends, our comrades, because we took the position on Russia that we did take, a position with which he disagreed.

We in turn of course just as vigorously-and permit me to say respectfully, because we had, and still have, a great respect for Trotsky as a socialist -to which we just as vigorously replied. For anyone who is familiar with the radical movement in the United States, that event is quite well known.

Since then our distinguishing feature, that which either attracts those whom it does attract, or repels those whom it does repel, has been the position we took on the so-called Russian question.

Q. That position was in opposition to the position that Trotsky took on Russia? A. Oh, in almost diametrical opposition.

Mr. Migdal: I have no further questions.

## Force and Social Revolution

By Mr. Waddel:

Q. There is just one point that isn't clear to me. Is it not true that prior to 1928 the Communist leaders-that would include Lenin, Trotsky, and the others-adhered to the Marxian view that while socialism should be introduced through at least democratic practices wherever possible, if that were not possible, then violence should be used, and that the existing capitalistic government should be overthrown by violent revolution? Is it, or is it not, true that that was the general belief of the early Russian Communists? A. No. The general interpretation of their belief, that is, a much more accurate way to state it, if I may-actually, all those who consider themselves-how shall I say it-more or less orthodox Marxists-the term is not too strictly interpreted, and Lenin was one, and Trotsky was one-took the point of view held by Marx and Engels, who are the two founders of what we call scientific socialism.

Our aim—the form of government which is most conducive to the advance of socialism is the democratic republic. It is for that that we form political parties, present candidates, seek to get them elected, try to get the greatest amount of support from the

When is violence indicated? I don't want to diplomatize with this Board at all. I am absolutely in favor of violence under certain circumstances-no question about that. If that statement imperils Mr. T.'s job, I regret it, but I am compelled to make the statement. But only under certain circumstances,

Any intelligent socialist would be preposterous to be for violence for the sake of violence, since the aim of socialism is to establish an order of peace. and it is inconceivable that they would be for violence just for the sake of seeing blood shed.

Violence, however, is justified from the socialist point of view when the regime against which socialism directs itself makes it impossible for the socialist movement or the labor movement, or the people at large, to enjoy and to exercise their democratic

I will give you two examples that actually occurred, and one hypothetical example:

Under the Czarist regime, which was autocratic despotism, no politically thoughtful and progressive or social-minded or liberal person in the United States ever dreamed of frowning upon those Russian revolutionists, of all schools of thought, who more or less openly proclaimed that they sought to overthrow the Czarist regime by violence inasmuch as there was no other way to alter the regime. It was a regime of violence, and there was nothing else one could do except overturn it by violence. I might say that the sympathy of all of the United States was with the Russian Revolution back before

Take a more recent example—the Hitler regime. How can I change that regime, I, a German? Simply by educational activity? How change it except by putting up candidates in an election and getting a majority of the Parliament? There is no Parliament, there are no elections! How can I change the Hitler regime? By force—an army. You sent an army. I don't think those are peaceful means. If they weren't violent, they were very vigorous, and in that manner the Hitler regime was changed.

How can peaceful means be conceivable under such circumstances?

Now, suppose in the United States a Ku Klux Klan regime were to replace the present regime, or some fascist regime which denied us all democratic rights, and when I say us, I mean not only the Workers Party but the people in general, where you would have no elections-none that could be called genuine elections? How can such a regime be altered in any way by peaceful means?

We would unhesitatingly, those of us alive and those retaining courage, unhesitatingly propagate the idea that it is necessary, once we are strong enough, to overturn this regime by violence.

During the war our Party supported the national underground resistance movements in Europe that were fighting with violence against the Hitler re-

But to speak about our seeking violence against

the regime in the United States today-it is ludicrous. Why? I regret to say this, but we are an insignificant minority. Our Party members, plus our Party sympathizers, plus those who vote for us, multiplied by ten, are still an insignificant number.

If every single one of us, every single one of us enumerated, had a rifle in his possession now, we could all be dispersed by five policemen, if we were mad enough to think in such terms.

As I said, gentlemen, we are an educational organization. We seek first, over the whole next period-I hope it is shorter than it probably will be -to win the minds and the hearts of the bulk of the people of this country.

I might add something that may be of interest to you, gentlemen. So much are we an educational organization that at this very moment there is an active discussion in our party ranks over a proposition submitted by myself, personally, to relinquish the name "Workers Party," not because of the first word in it, but because of the second word, because I have contended that we can't deceive ourselves, let alone anyone else. We are not a political party in the proper sense of the word. An organization with a few hundred members should not call itself a party. The Democratic Party is a party. The Republican Party is a party. The Communist Party is a party, that is, in the sense it has enough strength to accomplish things, good or bad-I leave that aside. We, unfortunately, are not. I have therefore proposed that we take a name which will indicate more clearly than does the name "Workers Party" that we are an educational organization. We hope one day to become a party, but we are not one now.

I have reason to believe that at our convention a sufficient majority of the delegates representing the membership of our organization will support this proposal to abandon the name "Workers Party," and to adopt one which will indicate primarily the educational nature of our movement.

Q. Will the convention be held in New York? A. In all probability.

Chairman Short: We certainly thank you very

Mr. Migdal: I would like to ask one more question.

Q. You do not, or do you, attribute any of the views you have here expressed to Mr. T.? A. I am sorry for this, but I do not know Mr. T .- what his views are I do not know. I know only what you have told me, namely, that he is a sympathizer of our party. If I know him-I am trying to say, if he is as much of a sympathizer as those I know personally, I would say, broadly speaking, in a general way, he would undoubtedly sympathize with the general aims of our Party.

Q. But you don't know how close a sympathizer he is, and you have never known him before in your

Mr. Migdal: Thank you. (Witness excused)

# Filibuster Coalition Blocks Legislation

# By SUSAN GREEN

The unholy coalition between the Dixiecrat filibusterers and the "Old Guard" Republicans in the Senate is not only a voting coalition but a coalition in action as well. In the second week of the filibuster, which began on February 28, the yap-

# Chicago

(Continued from page 1)

efforts to perpetuate discrimination. As though to make this fact crystal clear, aldermen fighting the ordinance showed that under it there would be many lawsuits over the selection of tenants, and private interests would not invest under such unsettled "risky" conditions.

# WHY DEFEATED

In spite of all logic, human need and democratic argumentation being on the side of the labor, Negro and progressive forces favoring the ordinance, it was overwhelmingly defeated. Why? There are in brief several major economic and political reasons for this, upon an understanding of which rests the future of the abolition of Jim Crow in housing.

Private capital, reserving to itself the right not to invest in needed housing unless ITS terms of profitable security are met, sabotages slumclearance and rebuilding altogether. Unless other financial sources are found which are free from these restrictive and discriminatory terms, the process of guaranteeing future profits to private interests means—no social progress, no break down in Jim Crow housing, even its extension!

Secondly, the struggle over the Carey ordinance demonstrates conclusively that those forces representing progress can place no reliance upon the "liberal" politicians of the Kennelly stripe who vote at the Democratic Party convention for broad civil rights measures, only to strangle them in practice in a pious welter of phrases about legality.

Finally, those mass forces seeking decent housing under decent unsegregated conditions know that in the government itself lies the other realistic source of financing for housing. It is up to them, by their own political activity independently of the Democratic and Republican Parties, to see that government provides this. ping Southerners took a breather and yielded to Republican Senator Cain from Washington who was prepared to gas for sixteen hours, not on the civil rights program, not on Senate rules, but on another subject altogether, namely, a presidential appointment of which Senator Cain disapproved.

Senator Cain came with a supply of milk, with which he refreshed himself, with a supply of candy, with which he pepped himself up, and with an extra pair of shoes into which he changed to relieve his feet.

With all his preparations, Cain lasted only six hours and forty-five minutes. The spectacle he presented, with the Dixiecrats standing by to take up the yapping where he left off, is the measure of the irresponsibility of this Democratic-Republican coalition. While they yapped, all legislation was tied up, not only the civil rights program, but matters of such immediate urgency as the renewal of rent control.

# DEFEAT BARKLEY RULING

In the showdown vote on Friday the coalition defeated Vice-President Barkley's ruling that cloture can be enforced on a motion as well as on a measure. The filibuster now going on is on the motion to bring before the Senate the measure to change the Senate rule so as to put an end to the vicious obstructionist tactic known as a filibuster.

Twenty - three Democrats voted against the Democrat Barkley and the same number of Republicans did likewise, making a total of forty-six against. Twenty-five Democrats and sixteen Republicans supported Barkley. All but three of the Southern senators opposed Barkley. The majority of the Republicans opposing him are of the "Old Guard" from the Midwest, where there are not so many large cities and where the racial minorities are small, so that these senators do not worry about the Negro vote and can concentrate upon defeating the Democratic administration program.

In the debate on Friday, the chief contestants were the Democrat Barkley and the Republican Vandenberg. Barkley contended that there must be the right to close debate on a motion to bring a measure before the Senate as well as on a measure, otherwise all possibility of legislating could be cut off. Indeed, this is exactly what the nation sees today; all legislation is blocked. Vandenberg, who holds that cloture applies only to a measure and not to a motion. expressed the view that the Senate rule must be rewritten and that re-

posed to be not in sympathy with the Dixiecrats, failed to show how to get by their filibustering to rewrite the rule, without first allowing cloture on a motion to present the rewritten rule to the Senate.

Over the week-end there have been rumors of a compromise. Senator Mc-Grath, chairman of the Democratic Party, has been in communication with the President, vacationing in Florida, who reportedly favors a compromise to get some legislative business done. On the other hand, Senator Russell, who with Senators Connally, George and Long, led the filibuster, hastened to inform the press that "We're not ready to go into any horse and rabbit trade where we swap a good strong horse for a mangy little rabbit." And Senator Lucas, administration leader in the Senate, dolefully but realistically states that even if some compromise is arrived at, it will not be such as to permit the Senate to go on to debate and vote on changing the Senate rules so as to allow the civil rights program to get to the floor of the Senate.

# MAY DROP ISSUE

The Administration Democrats are not in an enviable position. They are up against the coalition between the Dixiecrats and the "Old Guard" Republicans, which they don't know how to crack. Senator Lucas, administration floor leader, has been accused of very easy-going tactics against the filibuster, of making no real attempt to wear out the windbags. Now he is reported to have promised that if no compromise is reached, he will launch a round-theclock session designed to exhaust the yapping filibusterers and get on to the amendment of the rules to bar future filibusters.

It is supposed that once the amendment gets on the floor, the Republican Vandenberg and other Republicans will vote for it. But the unknown factor is how long it will take to exhaust the coalition-and there is, for example, such important business as the rent control law which expires on March 31. On the other hand, the expiring rent control law can well be used as the excuse for abandoning the fight against the filibuster at this time. In fact, Senator McGrath, in a press conference, indicated that that fight might be

dropped for the present. There is miscellaneous talk around the whole question. Speculation is rife on the possibility of the coalition between the Dixiecrats and the

liance must not be placed on the in- "Old Guard" Republicans jelling into terpretation of the presiding officer. a new party with old ideas, with the However, Vandenberg, who is sup- more liberal Republicans and the Truman Democrats also coalescing into a party. More moderate commentators express the hope that in the 1950 election the reactionaries in the present parties will be turned out of office, and only then will the Senate rules be changed and a civil rights program be acted upon.

In the meantime the nation looks on while all legislation is blocked by the tricky obstructionism of the Southerners. There is involved in the abolition of the filibuster no question of freedom of speech, of debate, of the rights of legislative minorities. What is involved is whether a reactionary minority shall be permitted to use an outdated technicality to obstruct the legislative machinery, such as it is.

Even though the working masses and the oppressed minorities cannot expect too much from even the most liberal elements in the capitalist parties, it is definitely in the interests of the people to have abolished the filibuster which serves as a tool for the most reactionary politicians. Accordingly, it is to be hoped that the union movement will apply the pressure of its strength on the administration to force its uncompromising action to break the filibusterers once and for all.

**New Yorkers!** You'll Meet Your Old Friends From All Parts of the Country And Make New Ones

# DANCE

at the

Organized by Local New York of the **Workers Party** Sat. Eve., March 26

**Labor Action Hall** 114 West 14th Sreet

# Editorials

Under cover of a new barrage of cold war propaganda (of which the attacks of Stalinists in schools is a part), and in the circumstances of general apathy on the part of the American people, a momentous change in U. S. foreign policy is about to be carried out.

We refer, of course, to the impending North Atlantic Security Pact, as it is politely called. On Friday of this week, its terms are to be formally announced to the 147 million Americans and the hundreds of millions of European peoples whom it concerns! By that time, it will actually be in effect and accepted by a dozen European nations. While, from a formal standpoint, it will not be legal tender in the United States until the Senate has ratified it, everyone knows that in reality it is already in effect.

In total diplomatic secrecy, then, the formal line-up for World War III, and the conditions under which the war will begin, have been decided upon. No one has been consulted about it, beyond the leading handful of top statesmen; no popular discussion or vote has occurred on it-in fact, it is to be revealed to the world only after the whole matter has been decided upon, even including the working out of all differences which divided the various powers or split opinion in the Senate. That is to say, a total commitment for another disastrous war has been imposed upon hundreds of millions, and a dozen nations, without the slightest pretense of a democratic hearing. Total preparation for war now precedes the total war

What is the heart of this new Pact? First, it is a Pact in which the U.S. takes the leading role. It is a Pact between U. S. imperialism on the one hand, and all of western Europe on the other. All traditional prétense at "neutrality," etc., is flung aside and the U. S. proposes to openly create, back up, build up, arm and reinforce a powerful military bloc of European nations. Without a follow-up of a huge armaments program, amounting to billions, the Pact itself will be meaningless. The Western European leaders will insist upon this, and Truman is not amiss to oblige. Thus, the first concrete result of the Pact

### LABOR ACTION A Paper in the Interest of Socialism Published Weekly by the

Labor Action Publishing Co. 114 W. 14th St., New York City 11, N. Y. General Offices: 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. N. Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117 Vol. 13, No. 12 March 21, 1949 Emanuel Garrett Geltman,

Draper, Henry Judd. Business Manager: Joseph Roan Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50¢ for 6 Mos. (\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874

Editorial Board: Jack Brad, Hal

will be a spurring of not only the U.S. rearmament program, but that of Western Europe. The hard truth is that a new, and even unprecedented armaments race has just about begun.

Secondly, the terms of the Pact (regardless of how legally evasive and deliberately ambiguous the wording) will be such as to clearly signify that the involvement of any Western European nation in war with Russia, regardless of the particular circumstances of its origin, will mean that the United States is likewise involved, together with all of Western Europe. What can this mean except that next time, the U. S. will find itself in the war without any such build-up period as FDR went through; in fact, from the very first day. America will be the leading force in one of the war camps, with Western Europe simply serving as its first and frontal battle zone.

The North Atlantic Pact thus signifies, on the diplomatic and military front, that American imperialism has come of complete age. Already dominating a large part of the world economically, the inevitable military consequences of such domination are now with us. The reaction of Russian imperialism will be to formally organize its satellite states into a Kremlin equivalent of the North Atlantic Security system—an Eastern European Security system. The cold war marches on and forward, straight to disaster for all concerned. The opposition organized by Stalinism to this Pact is largely fraudulent and deceptive, since it is exclusively on behalf of the opponent's Pact and its (Russia's) system. What is needed is a strengthening and building up of a movement, which wages war equally against both Pacts and both militarist systems.

# 1947 **BOUND VOLUME**

The New International \$4.00 each

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

Limited quantity at this price—

First Come—First Served

Order from:

**WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS** 

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