CIO CONVENTION HAS TO FACE PROBLEM RAISED BY STEEL STRIKE-

It's Tough Going for Strikes Today: What's ClO's Answer?

Convention Faces Challenge to Knit Labor Front Against Boss Offensive

By EMANUEL GARRETT

The week has had its full share of rumors, many of them blessed by the "well - informed" sources close to the White House, that the steel strike will end within a matter of days. But in the realm of verifiable fact the situation remains very much as it was last week-a major contest between capital, represented by the steel profiteers, and labor, represented by the CIO's Steel Workers Union.

It is, however, possible that such action may be taken within the next few days as can hasten the end of the strike. On labor's side, we refer to the decisions of the CIO convention which opens its sessions later this week. We have no pipeline to the arrogant minds of the steel bosses, but we do not doubt that they are eyeing the CIO convention, calculating how far they can go in their attack.

WHAT STEEL IS AFTER

As we have observed in previous issues of LABOR ACTION, the steel. companies, masterminded by the fabulously gilded U. S. Steel, are not making a stand merely to avoid paying non-contributory pensions. It has been demonstrated over and over that the cost involved cannot possibly be the issue for Big Steel. They try to make it seem so.

The day before Olds spoke his latest piece, former Ambassador to Germany James W. Gerard, one of the largest stockholders in U. S. Steel, attacked the company's refusal to accept the fact-finding board's recommendations on pensions. Gerard, asserting that his family owned more stock in U. S. Steel than the board of directors, challenged the lie that the company cannot afford to pay employer-financed pensions.

The opinions of Gerard will influence the board of directors little. They know the facts themselves. If Gerard does not wish to play ball with their political-economic objectives, they view it as his headache. What they are after is beating down -not breaking or destroying (an utterly impossible thing)-but beating down the steel union on its demands, no matter what they are, to assert their mastery over labor, to compel the unions into docility, to buttress

the structure of Taft-Hartleyism. CAN PICK UP CHALLENGE

Conversely, the steel union is fighting for more than pensions. It is defending labor's battle positionsagainst Taft-Hartleyism, against employer domination. And this is pre-

cisely where the CIO convention comes in. Here at the CIO convention a substantial section of U.S. labor can pick up the challenge.

The CIO convention has before it the important business of the Stalinists, their split orientation, and related matters. These we discussed in last week's issue. Stalinism, which is alien to the working class, must be dealt with, and it is consequently an issue of central importance for the delegates. But no matter how that is handled-well or poorly, properly or improperly-it is not and cannot be, whatever its immediate importance, the sole occupation of the convention. Beyond the problem of settling with the Stalinists lies the over-all problem of settling with the bosses.

It goes without saying that the steel strike will come before the convention. The executive board has already announced that the CIO unions have

The CIO national convention, scheduled to open this coming week, faces deep-going problems more important, in the long run, than the problem of Stalinist influence in its ranks which we dealt with extensively in last week's LABOR ACTION and which will undoubtedly be the most attention-compelling issue in Cleve-

The basis of the problem can be given in a few words: The Fair Deal won a "great victory" in '48—but strikes have become long, and hard, and exhausting.

Two local stoppages ended after five months on the picket line. At Singer, in Elizabeth, N. J., unionists resumed work without winning their main demands, accepting minor concessions from the company. Not a single demand was won by the Bell Aircraft workers (Buffalo), who have called off their strike with an agreement to arbitrate all disputed questions. But the company, still out for blood, locked out more than twenty militants and presses hard for criminal action against strikers who carried the ball on the picket lines. The discharges, too, will be arbitrated.

Strikes in coal and steel cast the most disturbing shadow, for here we meet two most powerful unions. The coal diggers are still striking for their pensions. And after paring its demands to the barest minimum, the Steel Workers Union cannot get a settlement as its strike enters the fourth week. The two strikes are linked up; both come up against U. S. Steel, the stubborn and unvielding representative of the monopoly with tremendous captive mine

holdings, financially and commercially intertwined with companies producing the bulk of America's coal. No end of the struggle is in sight.

THEY DON'T EXPLAIN WHY

Ford workers are voting on an agreement which squeezes out a pension plan but gives little else. By previous UAW standards, the proposed contract is poor indeed. Although an active and articulate opposition would reject it. Ford workers will probably vote ves reluctantly-not ause they have lost their militancy but because they hesitate to strike now under disadvantageous condi-

A sober and realistic estimate doubtless leads them to conclude: (1) that such a strike would be drawn out and bitter; and (2) that any foreseeable contractual improvements would not outweigh the sacria strike, the new contract gives them as much as the steel workers will get with a strike; the prospect of winning substantially more now, in the auto industry alone, seems dim.

Such are the facts. Spectacular gains cannot now be made by mere strike threats nor by swift and easy stoppages. But why? The CIO officialdom shut their eyes at just this point. The failing of labor leaders today is not simply that they accept small strike gains but that they misrepresent the poor settlements as good' ones. And as a result, they do not and cannot explain to unionists why the fruits of their struggles are so meager.

What are the aims of the big industrialists? James H. W. McGraw Jr., publisher of more than 40 industry magazines, explains that "An influential group of employers have raised their sights beyond their immediate economic interests and have taken on a battle for a principle important to every business in the land. They have decided that the time has come to stop appeasing labor leaders."

BIG BUSINESS CALCULATES

How does the battle for this "principle" look in practice? When U. S. (Continued on page 4)

N. J. Loyalty Oath Killed by Court

The New Jersey loyalty-oath law, which required candidates for governor and the legislature to take an "anti-subversive" oath, was declared unconstitutional on October 19 by the state superior court, reversing a lower-court ruling. The court's ground was that the legislature, which had passed the law unanimously, had no right to supersede the oath already prescribed in the state constitution.

The invalidated law would have made it mandatory for candidates who did not take the oath to have placed on the ballot next to their names the legend "Refused oath of allegiance." Suit had been brought by James Imbrie, Progressive Party candidate for governor.

The state attorney general says he will appeal the ruling to the Supreme Court. Not hit by the Superior Court decision was another part of the law which applied the loyalty oath procedure to state employees.



Cast a Socialist Protest Vote In the New York Election!

All the major and minor parties in the New York City and State election this year are appealing for the support of the working class; and the organized labor movement, divided in its loyalties, spearheads the day-today electoral activity of both leading candidates. Yet, despite their energetic participation in the campaign, workers have no way of casting a ballot for their own class on the line of any of the big political machines.

Such is the ironical result of the present political policy of the trade unions, a policy which emphasizes above all the need to collaborate with the parties of capitalism.

The Candidates

Mayor O'Dwyer, Democrat, opened his appeal for re-election at the state CIO convention, calling for the defeat of the "party of Taft-Hartley." A joint AFL-CIO committee carries on his campaign while the regular Democratic machine pushes feebly in the rear.

Newbold Morris, Republican, recruits bellringers from the Liberal Party, staffed by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. His ticket wins votes of workers not by its moralistic exposés of bookmaking but because of the miserable record of the incumbent administration on transit, housing, and rent control, coupled with O'Dwyer's links to Tammany.

Vito Marcantonio and his American Labor Party finds party activists among workers who are, in one degree or another, adherents of the Communist Party line or who are convinced by his promises of lower fares and effective rent control. He picks up votes from among workers whose plight is worst and whose political experience is least.

Herbert Lehman, Democratic candidate for Senate, like the others calls for support from labor against "reaction." Dulles, his opponent, faces such hostility from the labor movement that this Republican strategist has not bothered to make a major speech in any of the five boroughs of the city. WHOEVER WINS, LABOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE. BUT WHO-EVER DOES WIN, LABOR ITSELF WILL NOT WIN.

The Parties

The Morris-Republican-Liberal-Fusion ticket is a conglomeration of divergent elements with no significant public program, even on so elementary a question as rent control. Its national hookup makes it the embarrassed local

representative of the party of Dewey and Taft. The American Labor Party is now the private domain of the Communist Party, abetted by the personal machine of Marcantonio. Its prime role is to bolster the foreign policy of the Russian bureaucracy. A vote for its candidates is a vote for the supporters of Stalin's totalitarian slave-labor

Labor supporters of the Democratic ticket call for support of Truman's Fair Deal administration. But the "great victory" of '48 has left things as they were. Rent control is emasculated; the Taft-Hartley Law remains on the books; and worst of all, the Fair Deal Democrats announce their agreement with the principle of injunctions against mass strikes and egg on the anti-Democratic witchhunts of the cold war.

No wonder that the unions face a confident and aggressive capitalist class in wage negotiations and strike struggles of 1949! Support to the Democratic Party wins little for labor, it fails to protect its rights, and above all it hinders the formation of a new, independent Labor Party.

The New York City election underscores the unlimited political resources and power of labor. Labor united and independent can win New York City! But its leadership refuses to wield its power toward that end. Timidly, it remains satisfied with tidbits or promises of the same, from its capitalist political "friends."

Vote Socialist!

None of these parties, we repeat-not one-permits 'workers to vote clearly and decisively for their class. The only alternative to capitalist or Stalinist politics in its many forms is to VOTE SOCIALIST IN THE NEW YORK ELECTIONS.

(Continued on page 4)

Vote for one of the socialist candidates on the New York City mayoralty ballot: Socialist Party: Joseph

Socialist Workers Party:

Michael Bartell. Socialist Labor Party (appears on ballot as Industrial Government Party): Eric

(Continued on page 4) **Detroit NAACP Wars on Restaurant Jim Crow**

Semitic attitude on the bench. Need-

less to say, the all-white jury ren-

which they were commended by the

words: "I don't see how the jury

could have possibly reached any

The case involved a Mrs. Jessie

Dillard, her teen-aged daughter and

two other teen-age girls, who at-

tempted to enter a restaurant in their

neighborhood, and were promptly

stopped at the door by the manager

and asked what they wanted. They

replied that they were planning to

have something to eat, whereupon

the manager informed them that he

was closing at 7:30 p.m. (This was at

7:15 and the restaurant is open all

night.) Mrs. Dillard then replied that,

in that case, they would just have

some fruit juice, which would not

The manager desperately looked

around, saying there was no room;

Mrs. Dillard, seeing many empty

booths, stated that she was sure they

could manage not to crowd anyone.

At this point the manager lost con-

trol and admitted that he did not

serve Negroes. Mrs. Dillard called the

police, who took her statement, but

when they returned to the restaurant

the manager had disappeared and

A warrant was issued after some

hedging by Assistant Prosecuting At-

torney Kaufman, and then the farce

Before the trial, Judge Gordan.

Kaufman and the defendant's lawyer

held a conference which did the trial

no good. The dispenser of "justice,"

Judge Gordan, allowed nine witness-

es for the defense to testify, while

refusing to allow the four complain-

Of course, the nine witnesses for

the manager were quite certain that

the manager was not at the restau-

rant, but they couldn't remember

WHO spoke to Mrs. Dillard and re-

could not be located.

really began.

ants to do so.

take much time to consume.

other verdict."

FARCE AT COURT

DETROIT, Oct. 23 - The Detroit branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored dered a "not guilty" verdict, for People has formed a Committee Against Restaurant Discrimination to dis-Honorable Judge Gordan with the launch a mass campaign against the restaurant discrimination that is so prevalent in this city despite the Diggs Law which forbids it. This is a long-needed program and is finding support among both Negroes and whites of the city.

Several meetings of CARD have been held, and the complete program of strategy has not been developed, but one of the first tactics is to literally "flood the court" with discrimination cases, to assure the tribunal that they mean business and bring psychological pressure to bear. The theory is that it will make it more difficult to render the usual verdict of "not guilty" in cases by the hundreds.

This campaign will gather support from the unions, since large numbers of Negroes and whites from locals will enlist in this fight.

The first case was completed on Friday, October 21, under the notorious Judge Gordan, who is well

French SP, CP Lose Hold on Labor As the Government Crisis Deepens

PARIS, Oct. 18 - The fall of the Queuille cabinet, over the wage-andprice issue that has been exacerbated by devaluation, led to a short-lived attempt by Jules Moch of the Socialist Party to form a government.

No more fitting symbol could have been selected for the degeneration and corruption of the French Socialist Party, and its lack of contact with the workers' movement, than the selection of Moch for premier. Moch is known to unionists as the No. 1 policeman of France. As minister of interior in the last three cabinets he carried the responsibility for mobilizing the hated Security Police to smash the giant strikes of 1947 and

Moch's attempt to form a government had no future from the start. His vote of investiture as premier, the lowest in French history, with 311 votes as against a constitutional requirement of 310, was obtained by offering the vaguest possible program: on the "dirty war" in Indo-China-"peace," with no specification as to the terms or even with whom it is to be negotiated; on wages-a bonus for one month only to bring workers who receive less than 15,000 francs (\$40) a month up to that figure; on prices-a subsidy to bring down the cost of butter, perhaps some other subsidies later; on the budget-economy, somewhere, some-

On the basis of this program, he tried to hold together a motley crew extending all the way from the SP to René Pleven's semi-Gaullists and the conservative parties of the right. The one group that could not possibly be satisfied by his government's program was the organized tradeunion group. The most conservative trade-union federation, the reformist Force Ouvrière, condemned Moch's program as completely unsatisfactory, while the others (the Catholic CFTC, the Autonomous Federation, the Stalinist CGT) all had a stronger series of demands than Force Ouvrière.

CP DOESN'T DRAW

At the same time that the SP once again showed its complete lack of contact with the working class, there was also a convincing demonstration of the inability of the Communist Party to mobilize its supporters.

When Moch formed his government, the Paris region of the CGT, which theoretically leads one half the workers in the region, called for a threehour work stoppage and demonstrations. This call was totally ignored in the center of Paris and affected only forty of the largest factories, in which a miserable 15 per cent of the workers walked out at the appointed time. A typical example was the Renault plant, where 17,000 workers out of 30,000 voted CGT in the last factory - council election. Less

the small, spiritless demonstration held outside the plant gates.

Last month the CP ran a "peace a rally was held on October 3 at the this time.

as they are with the government, the workers are entirely fed up with the Communist Party. Their support of the CP is dreary, hopeless, negative electoral support, and nothing more. They steadfastly refuse to be drawn any longer into CP-sponsored political strikes and rallies.

There is all the more reason, then, for the strong independent left-wing minorities in the non-Stalinist unions to drive for unity of action around their program of demands. By uniting the growing number of federations in the different unions that support a. militant program of struggle, the left wing can begin to offer an alternative to the bankrupt SP and the totalitarian Stalinists. The tremendous political vacuum in the French labor movement still exists: the social crisis is unresolved. It remains a problem of forging the movement to fill the vacuum and to offer the indepen-

campaign" involving a tremendous flood of propaganda. As its climax Porte de Versailles in Paris. Everything possible was done to mobilize for this rally. Yet the party that mobilized one million workers for its May Day demonstrations in 1945 and 1946 was able to rally only 30,000

It seems evident that, dissatisfied

than 5,000 walked out there, and most dent socialist solution to the crisis.

fused service. So it was very plain to Judge Gordan and the white jury that "the little man who wasn't there" obviously couldn't have refused service and the whole case was a fantasy of Mrs. Dil-

lard's imagination. Being forthright in his bigotry, Judge Gordan referred to Mrs. Dillard and the girls during the trial as "these colored folks" in a contemptuous tone, and warned if there was a single comment on the jury's verdict in the court he would promptly place in the jail the person who dared to make it.

PROTEST PLANNED

On the heels of this case, a mass meeting will be held on Friday, October 28 at St. John's CME Church, 2009 St. Aubin Street, which is expected to draw a large number of Negroes who have not found a way to function in the NAACP before. The week following the mass meeting. CARD plans to divide the city

(Continued on page 4)

Navy Men Blasted Strategic Bombing- Readers Take the Gloor When They Failed to Get Their Share

In the recent hearings before the House Armed Forces Committee some of the dirty linen of the "Battle of the Pentagon" was revealed. Not all of it, to be sure, but enough of it to reveal that this performance is of greater interest than the August hearing on the procurement procedure for the B-36. At that time the relationship of Louis Johnson, secretary for defense, to B-36 procurement was to have been investigated. Instead, the air force brass beat their breasts in support of the B-36.

The highlight of last week's hearing was the navy's criticism of the chief of staff's concept of strategic bombing. The navy claimed that it would result in the mass slaughter of civilians—a very commendable moral attitude to adopt. The navy, it claimed, was opposed to mass slaughter and strategic bombing-but only by B-36s, we might add.

The air force's defense, though not on as high a moral level, was rightously indignant. How come all this talk of mass slaughter of civilians? After all, they pointed out, wasn't the navy arguing only yesterday that naval aviation should become the strategic bombing arm to deliver the atom bomb (to slaughter the same civilians)? This emphasis on morals is somewhat new for those who were saying that "we don't believe in strategic bombing, but we want a part of it." The moral suspenders of the navy bureaucrats certainly stretched to fit

JOHNSON GOES TO WORK

The immediate background to this flareup in the Pentagon battle over military unification goes back to last August. At that time the same Armed Forces Committee was "investigat-

of irregularities in the procurement of the B-36 bomber designed to deliver the atom bomb. These accusations were raised by a naval reserve captain in Congress, Representative Van Zandt.

The fly in the cracker barrel was Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, former commander of the American Legion. As Legion boss and superpatriot, Johnson was a strong supporter of the Roman doctrine that a strong military machine paves the road to peace. In those days he was not too explicit in detailing the relationship of forces inside of this war

Then one day Johnson became a director and legal adviser to one of the largest aircraft manufacturers in the United States, Consolidated-Vultee. The next day he became a little more explicit about the type of war machine he meant. We find out that what he meant all along was one with a particularly strong air force -one that had a large concentration of heavy bombers for strategic bombing. Consolidated - Vultee specialized in heavy bombers.

One of the first official acts by Johnson after his appointment as secretary of defense last spring was to halt construction of the super-carrier, the navy's bid for the strategic-bombing role. At the same time there was a transfer of a considerable portion of the air-force appropriation to heavy bombers with emphasis on the

In addition to this, Johnson began to cut down the size of the military appropriation going to the navy and the marines. This was accomplished by rigid control of the military budget handed over to Johnson by the Unification Act. The navy, feeling

ing" some rather interesting charges that it was now or never, began fe- man Carl Vinson of the Armed Forces verish plans to defend its position.

INQUIRY STARTS

This was not as easy as it may sound. Johnson, through the power of "coordination," was able to censor all public statements by the military chiefs. Consolidated Directive No. 1 was designed to gag everyone from giving information or talking about military matters concerning "security" and "propriety" without the prior approval of Johnson.

On this he had to beat somewhat of a retreat because of the furor it raised, though it still applied to military men with "propriety" eliminated and "security" expanded to include "propriety."

The first device used by the navy was the "anonymous" letter by a Navy Department official, Cedric Worth, which was broadcast by the above mentioned Representative Van Zandt in Congress. This provided enough of a jolt so that the House. Armed Force Committee was forced to call an "investigation."

Van Zandt at that time demanded an inquiry into (1) the relationship of Louis Johnson to Consolidated-Vultee and B-36 procurement: (2) the role played in procurement by Floyd Odlum, head of Consolidated-Vultee and large contributor to the Democratic Party's war chest in the last election (Van Zandt is a Republican); and (3) the reasons why the the air force changed its opinion of the B-36 after it was ready to reject it as inadequate. In short: What was to be the role of strategic bombing in the mass slaughter of the next war (this being the heart of the allega-

An investigation was promised in a few days; this was late May. Chair-

ton today under the stepped-up international tension induced by the knowledge that Russia possesses the atomic bomb is the preparation of

twentieth-century barbarism.

Let nobody be deceived by the ham acting of the admirals and their opposite numbers in the other services into thinking that anything less is involved. Cultures in decline don't produce heroic figures. It is our fate that sorry comedians are the custodians of the atomic bomb.

Committee promised that "this is not going to be a whitewash" and that he was going to "let the chips fall where they will." The navy, now trying to set up a case showing the direct influence on Johnson of Consolidated-Vultee, did not at this time introduce any of its own chips, however. What went on behind the scenes on this score makes for some interesting speculation.

Besides, it was rather difficult to show a direct deal between a government official and the head of a large corporation. The very fact of the previous positions held by an official in these corporations, the law or banking firms with which they are connected, and the circles in which they travel, obviates the necessity of the DIRECT deal. The five-per-center probe held in late August in which these direct deals were shown indicate the different way in which bigtimers such as Johnson operate.

B-36 CHORUS SINGS

Before the probe actually got started in late August, Johnson did have time to get his machine into a welloiled condition, as revealed in the hearings. On June 11, Van Zandt made public a memorandum sent by Johnson to the joint chiefs of staff and other military agencies. In it he directed them to submit all proposed testimony first to Stephen Early, the then under-secretary of defense, for "such coordination as is needed."

Johnson was going to make certain that "responsibility be placed in a single person," as he phrased it. Thus there is a picture of the person who is being investigated censoring all the information to be used in the hearing from the only source that is able to give this information.

Back in August the navy thought it was going to get the type of hearing it is getting now. But the breastbeating performance given by Johnson and associates indicated to the nay that it was going to have to blow the lid off in the manner it is doing at the present.

No one seriously thought that there would be much discussion on the financial deals involved in B-36 procurement. Known were Johnson's ties with the Schroder Banking Corporation the U. S. financial agents of I. G. Farben, and it was known that the Research and Development Board which normally handles procurement was deliberately bypassed by extraordinary and unprecedented instructions by Secretary Johnson," as reported by David Lawrence in the

On the agenda, the navy thought, was to be the role of strategic bomb-

Army vs. Navy

The article by Stewart Pitt (Oct. 24) on the "Battle of the Pentagon" develops some interesting speculation as to the underlying causes of that curious spectacle, but his thesis seems highly doubtful. No one will disagree, of course, with his underlining of the fact that, when all is said and done, we have witnessed a scene in which assorted scoundrels, known as generals, admirals and strategists, dispute as to which is the "best" method to be employed in wiping out millions and assuring American world mastery. But we cannot follow his reasoning in concluding that the navy's standpoint "does probably fit the pattern of American imperialism's world role more clearly than that of the B-36" (that is, the army viewpoint).

To bolster his concept of the navy being more in tune with "advanced" American imperialist strategy and ideas, Comrade Pitt tells us that the army concept is an "insular" oneevidently isolationist - whereas "The navy's proposals, by rejecting absolute dependence on the superatomic

ing and the balance inside of the

military establishment. The navy was

not then an opponent of strategic

bombing as such, but opposed it ra-

ther only if it could not get its own

share of it, as subsequent testimony

has revealed. The official report of

the Strategic Bombing Survey (which

pointed out the frightful havoc

wrought by strategic bombing on ci-

vilians with an absolute minimum of

military gain) was scarcely even read

by military men, according to Han-

son Baldwin, military affairs expert

At the hearings, one after another

of the air force generals got up and

stumbled over one another in their

praise of the B-36 and all sang eulo-

gistic paeans over what it could do.

joined in the chorus, including Gen-

eral Kenny, former chief of the Stra-

tegic Air Command, who joined in

the unanimous approval of the B-36

after seven years of criticism. This

happened in June of this year, at the

time the "coordination" directive was

attack onto a different level. Secre-

tary of Air Symington denied the

allegations of impropriety in B-36

procurement and inaugurated the

hunt for the culprit who had cir-

culated these allegations. By this

time it was plain to see that there

was going to be no consideration of

the balance inside the military estab-

Then the air force team shifted the

Even the earlier critics of the B-36

of the New York Times.

NAVY BLOWS THE LID

world-conscious plans. . . ." Presumably, this would mean bases located everywhere possible, taking over the dwindling role of the British fleet,

There is little evidence that this is what was (or is) involved in the Pentagon battle. The issue, rather, would appear to be over the strategic concept of how to wage future war, with the navy clinging to its traditional viewpoint, and the army-in its bureaucratic way-attempting to stand by and state a new viewpoint, i.e., the development of a war strategy for the atomic age.

From this analysis, one is obliged to conclude the exact opposite inference than that of Pitt-namely, the navy thinks that atomic warfare is largely imaginative and that, at hottom, the Third World War will be fought the same way that the past one was. Also involved, of course, is its desire to retain its ancient (but challenged) powers, privileges and prestige. (No one takes seriously its humanitarian preachings.)

As for the army, it recognizes that war is now total, global and all-embracing; including warfare deliber-

lishment and none of strategic bomb-

The air force had used the tactic of picking on the smaller aspect of the accusations in order to avoid any consideration of the larger aspects. Both Symington and Johnson made frequent statements on how this entire "investigation" was hurting the "security" of the country and hindering "national defense." It had all the earmarks of a successful whitewash.

The victim for this failure had to be found and made to account for the blunder. Cedric Worth was revealed and the navy began an "investigation" into the sources used to compile the series of allegations. By this time that naval board and Worth have slipped back into the oblivion they well deserve.

The navy was not to be defeated by this bungle. They learned that in order to get any kind of a hearing, in which they could seek to preserve their budgetary base, it would be necessary to break the "coordination" directives of Louis Johnson and take the offensive. It was necessary for someone to step out and make the direct accusation, even at the risk of his career. A naval captain did so.

Thus it was that, with their backs to the wall, the navy chiefs raised the curtain on the moral and political issues of civilian slaughter and strategic bombing, in which they had been denied their share. The truth has come out into the open through devious pressures, but such things have happened before.

bomber, calls for more aggressive ately aimed at civilians and productivity. It callously proposes to prepare now for such a war, and states that atomic weapons, guided missiles, bacteriological bombardment, rockets and jet planes, etc., will be the technical means, not large mass armies conveyed by a navy, for carrying out its objective.

The navy centered its attack upon the army B-36 plane (developed to carry the atom bomb), but the army spokesmen (who had not yet replied at the time Pitt wrote his article) correctly answered this criticism by pointing out that the B-36 was but one part of their war preparation pro-

We should not like to be drawn into any dispute as to who represents "progress" and who "reaction" in this quarrel between the army and navy, but nevertheless it would seem to us that Pitt has misunderstood the issue at stake. We cannt always trace back to class or imperialist sources a dispute of this nature. This is essentially a technical or strategic dispute by two groups, each of whom equally have American imperialist advantage at heart. But one has failed to see that a new war always starts where the last one stopped-in this case, at the threshold of the atomic warfare

It might be better for humanity at large if the navy won out, but that hardly seems likely. The imperialist leadership of America is too well aware of what is involved to make that mistake, and the navy has little

We may only hope that the American masses become as well aware regarding the real issues as their rulers are-that is, learn the need to POLITICALLY "sink the navy" and "damn the army."

Henry JUDD

Unspoiled Natives

"It is pleasant being a European in the Congo. The natives appear still unspoiled and are pleased to work for the whites."-Article on Africa in the London Sunday Express.

Books Received

Published on October 26 by the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocketbooks:

COMING OF AGE IN SAMOA, by Margaret Mead. 192 pages, 35 cents.

HUMAN DESTINY, by Lecomte du Nouy, 192 pages, 25 cents.

FOR EVER WILT THOU LOVE, by Ludwig Lewisohn. 144 pages, 25

Battle of the Pentagon Is Conflict over Strategy of Slaughter In Third World War

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The B-36 hearings have more profound origins than simple inter-service rivalries. What is at stake is no less than the basic military strategy to be employed in defeating Russia.

The nub of the controversy at this early stage of its evolution, as will be eventually revealed in the press, is the whole concept of strategic bombing. Opinions on the permissible limits of strategic bombing cut through all services, including the

Objections to the overextension of strategic bombing come under four

(1) Its utility is limited, as the Strategic Bombing survey in its analysis of the effect of such bombing upon Germany in World War II

(2) Emphasis upon strategic bombing, and the consequent financial and industrial mobilization necessary to produce long-range bombers and keep them in operation, will pare down the tactical (troop support) air force and the ground materiel which war against Russia with its vast terrain and tremendous manpower necessitates;

(3) The destruction which strategic atom-bombing entails would prevent a post-war consolidation of the world: and

(4) Strategic bombing, because of its lack of precision, is actually terror bombing of civilians. Nobody among the military takes this latter argument seriously, least of all its naval proponents.

NAVY POWER IN ECLIPSE

This picture has been obscured by the hysteria of the admirals. The facts behind their neurotic symptoms are very simple. Russia is a land power; except for its submarine fleet, its naval forces are negligible. All present development indicates that in the coming war the navy will play a role entirely different from that it played, for example, in the Pacific operations of World War II.

The battleship and the heavy cruiser will have no genuine function. Naval activity will probably be confined to convoying, anti-submarine patrolling, assault landings and, if Russia should deny her opponents continental bases, some strategic bombing. Naval power as classically understood is entering an eclipse which may well be permanent.

Another factor making for a relatively reduced navy is the necessity for a maximum economy of the nation's productive facilities. The commitment for the land forces will be so great (Russia, says General Bradley, can mobilize 500 divisions) and, given the effects of atomic-bombing upon men, matériel and productive equipment, the replacement demands will be so tremendous that the most careful budgeting will be necessary.

The navy will feel its effects. Whatever else may be said about bureaucracies, they are not insensitive to their own self interest. Hence the genuine and agonized cries of the admirals in recent weeks. Their con-

demnation of atomic strategic bombing as being ineffective and immoral and the simultaneous demand for a larger share in these ineffective and immoral operations is a contradiction only for the limited civilian mental-

That there may be validity in some of their criticisms of the B-36 is largely beside the point. The B-36 is undoubtedly an obsolescent design. But, obviously, better designs are in prospect. Its employment is premised upon the worst variant in the military conjuncture-the denial of Euor North African bases to United States aircraft by Russian occupation and the consequent necessity of flying from domestic bases without fighter escort. But this might well be unavoidable. It is possible that the 65,000-ton carrier advocated by the navy would obviate some of these difficulties. But these arguments are largely rationalizations for their bureaucratic exclusivism.

NO ONE KNOWS THE END

The navy's mass weeping of the past months has demonstratively revealed that the military unification program has run into rough weather. Its violence has temporarily obscured other conflicts-that of the air corps and the army over strategic versus tactical bombing, for instance.

History, it would seem, is posing problems which the inexperienced top military leaders of the United States are having grave difficulties coping with. The personnel problem is well symbolized by Francis P. Matthews, the secretary of the navy, who, when he took office, announced (with that militant amateurism characteristic of public figures in the United States) that all he knew about ships was gained handling a rowboat in Minnesota. Wherein lies the superiority of the sulking admirals has not always been obvious.

To bring about the successful conclusion of a war against a giant bureaucratic - collectivist power like Russia, with all its experience in manipulating masses, requires a combination of military competence, political insight, and emotional maturity which is hardly in evidence in the United States today and is probably impossible of achievement. Hitler was able to perform the feat-but only for the first two years of the war. And he was immensely more gifted in that direction than any visible public figure today. To mention the best of them, Eisenhower, is only to underscore the problem.

In truth, the problems of a war against Russia are fantastic in their magnitude and their complexity. A hitherto unparalleled industrial mobilization, material and human, will have to be made. Controls upon labor will be much more severe than they were in World War II. Living conditions will be more stringent. Nobody, least of all the military leaders now testifying before Congress, knows where it will all end.

But any outcome short of the socialist revolution will be an indescribable catastrophe for humanity. What we are witnessing in WashingStarting November 8-

The 1949 Labor Action School Presents—

Five Classes by Outstanding Socialist Teachers—

Marxist Study Courses on Major Political Theoretical and Historical Problems-

LABOR ACTION SCHOOL

TUESDAY EVENINGS

Significant Events

and Documents

Dynamics of the American **Labor Movement**

8-9:10 p.m.

Development of the labor

movement—founding of the CIO

Rise and decline of Stalin-

Bureaucracy and democracy

The trade-union left wing

Prospects for a labor party

Unions and the state

Nov. 8

Nov. 15

Dec. 6

BEN HALL New York Organizer, Independent Socialist League in U. S. History 8-9:10 p.m.

E. R. McKINNEY Former National Secretary

Independent Socialist League

Hamilton's system-his ma-

Jeffersonian democracy

Jacksonian democracy "The Irrepressible Conflict"

The rise of Populism

cestry of Point Four

"Manifest Destiny": the an-

The Modern State 9:20-10:30 p.m.

MAX SHACHTMAN National Chairman

Independent Socialist League

Marxian theory of the state

State capitalism and the cap-

Decay of the bourgeois state -fascism in power

Decay of the bourgeois state -reformism in power

The Stalinist state

Trends in the United States

New Asia

Nov. 11

Nov. 18

Nov. 25

Dec. 2

Dec. 9

Dec. 16

Staff Writer on Asia, Labor Action

The new imperialism

The revolt of Asia

India: the traditional way

China: the Stalinist way

Sociology of Chinese Stalin-

disintegrative forces

cratic collectivism

FEES: Each six-week course \$1.00 (Students 60 cents)—Individual sessions 25 cents (Students 15 cents) ALL CLASSES held at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14th Street, New York City



FRIDAY EVENINGS

Problems Contemporary of the **Problems**

8-9:10 p.m. JACK BRAD

HAL DRAPER Editor, Labor Action Author, ABC of Marxism

Sidney Hook's criticism of

of Marxism

9:20-10:30 p.m.

Marxist organization today

0

Can capitalism end Jim

Russia: contradictions and

"Historic role" of bureau-

Which way for Asia? - So-War economy and the trends cialist prospects of modern capitalism

PENSIONING A DREAM

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO THE HORATIO ALGER LEGEND?

By STAN GREY

With pensions and pension plans the burning issue, the actuary is obviously the expert of the hour. Still, it would be fitting, before he takes the stage, for a properly accredited mortician to perform his duties in the disposal of an old American myth whose feeble body, lingering with us now for many years, emitted its last, futile gasp with the proclamation of the American Pension. Let us now pay our respects to the Great American dream of Unlimited Opportunity for All!

Rumor has had it now for many decades that, in the United States, every man has the same opportunities for scaling the heights of success. A pocketful of initiative, a bellyful of guts and some good old Yankee ingenuity were the only ingredients necessary. Mix them up well in proper proportions and you could become the president of some large corporation or even, if the proportions were a little different, establish a corporation of your own.

Opportunity was a door which discriminated against no one, and if the rich and the sons of the rich always managed to stagger through into an executive's chair while the working class rarely if ever located the threshold, the fault was not in the stars but in their lack of initiative.

What's Happened to the "American Dream"?

There were, of course, more modest goals. The workers in the shops dreamed of escaping the relentless, dehumanizing toil at the machines. They dreamed of having their own garages, of owning their own chicken farms, of opening small businesses. These goals were in fact attainable for many workers some decades back. But when this dream disappeared as a possibility, it persisted as a myth.

Professors spent a lifetime of scholarship in the repetition of the notion that there were no classes in America. Workers didn't have to remain workers in this country, and if they did the responsibility was obvious. All they had to do was climb the famous "ladder" which leads from one class to another. There was what was scientifically called the "fluidity of classes" and any worker could get into the swim.

When the capitalist class fought the development of unionism, its propaganda urged the American worker to rely on himself, to work hard on his own, for that way was the road to success. The capitalists insisted on this point, it should be mentioned, despite the fact that the lack of unionism would mean greater profits for themselves. Such is the righteousness of

This, then, was the American myth. Every man his own boss at 40!

And now—we have pensions. Pensions which are fought for at tremendous sacrifices by the workers in the shops. Pensions which are increased by legislation of Congress. Pensions which are agreed to by the capitalist class. Anyone who relishes opposites will be intrigued by the contrast between the American dream and the pensioned reality.

After working thirty years in one plant, a man is to get a meager sum of money to keep him technically alive in his old age. But by the lights of the American Dream, it is fantastic to think of a thoroughbred American working for a boss, much less the same boss, for thirty years. What has become of the garage, the chicken farm, the small business? Certainly they are no less desirable than they were before. Certainly the thought of being shackled to the faotcry for thirty years is not an overnight passion of the American worker.

Facts of Capitalist Life Kill Off the Myth

Yet here he is fighting for a pension on the basis of what he expects he will have to do, namely, remain a worker in the same plant for the rest of his unpensioned life. This pension struggle signalizes the completion of his disenchantment in the limitless possibilities of capitalist life. The worker is convinced that despite whatever fluidity may exist in the world or in any professor's mind, the working class is a separate and distinct stratum of capitalist life, and that there is no escape for him.

This has become so patently a fact of life that even capitalist propaganda no longer blows the old horn. Instead of telling the workers that their pension demands are preposterous and are a mockery of the American way of life in which every worker can become a boss or save enough to live on comfortably in his old age, they are agreeing to pensions. The old propaganda no longer goes over for the myth no longer has that shred of support in reality which even myths require to perpetuate themselves. It should not be forgotten, however, that this will probably not prevent some professional cultural-laggards from making their living the same way they always did.

In fact, as if deliberately to prove how hard it is to kill the old myth, the N. Y. Times only last week (October 16) writes in its lead editorial: "Here in the United States, where one class merges into another or changes from day to day, there is little factual basis for a rigid picture of eternally

divided and antagonistic classes." The American Dream has been pensioned off, and the legend should be given a decent burial, but there are still some diehards who refuse to call a stinking corpse dead. Take it away, mortician.

Books for Germany: Help Build Socialism!

From many parts of Western Germany we have received requests for Marxist literature IN ENGLISH. Lenin, Marx, etc., are in urgent demand, but any Marxist works are needed. Almost none of this literature is available at present. All books and pamphlets contributed will be widely

Help rebuild Germany's socialist movement! Send us your unused or duplicate copies of any and all Marx-Books and pamphlets by Trotsky, ist literature, or any you can spare. They will be forwarded immediately to those who will make good use of

> Send them to: LABOR ACTION (Attention: H. Judd), 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

New York ISL Fall Festival and Dance

Featuring Rex Clayton and his Jumping Jive Band

First N. Y. Performance by **Leon Del Monte**

"Debate between Thomas Norman and Shack Maxman"

FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 4 CARAVAN HALL, 110 East 59 Street, N.Y.C. Admission \$1.25

LABOR ACTION

A Paper in the Interest of Socialism Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co. 114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117



Vol. 13, No. 44

October 31, 1949

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

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign) Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office

at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.

WORLD POLITICS

Nehru Visits United States: A Profile of India's Government Leader

Not so many years ago this writer had the opportunity to meet Jawaharlal Nehru in India and spend several hours in discussion with him. At that particular moment England was at war and was doing its utmost to drag a highly reluctant India into the conflict. The Indian Congress Party was meeting at Poona, India, to decide what should be done about organizing resistance to British attempts; responding to the mass sentiment which existed at the time, the Socialist Party (at that time affiliated with the Congress) was presenting a proposal for open mass resistance to the British. Their viewpoint was essentially that a particularly effective moment for gaining India's independence was at hand.

If their viewpoint had carried, the story of India would have been far different, not to mention the story of Asia itself. Power literally lay within the grasp of the Indian nationalist movement; the reactionary pro-Moslem Pakistani movement was weakness personified -all was set for a call to immediate action. A unified and united India, really free of British domination, was the perspective.

It was one of those historic moments when a political leader indicates his real character and understanding. One conversation with Nehru, plus a few days observation of him in action at the Congress gathering was enough to answer the question. Here was a weak and characteriess individual who accomplished what little he did largely by default—i. e., finding others still weaker than himself.

Nehru well earned his title of "India's High Priest of Confusion" and even those among the Socialist leaders who nursed various illusions about him were shortly cured. Nehru is the only man in political life whom this writer has ever seen speak both "for" and "against" a resolution (the resolution to launch an immediate campaign for India's freedom) and then, when voting came, "abstain"! This feat was typical of the man who impressed one most of all by the circuituous way in which he spoke, never arriving at any conclusion-in fact, never saying anything definite.

By contrast, with him, Mahatma Gandhi was a refreshing example of simplicity, logic and sincerity. An honest and open conservative is worth an infinite number of self-labeled "Marxists" and liberal "socialists."

But look at Nehru now! Here he is making a triumphal tour of America, welcome everywhere, impressive as ever with his handsome appearance and with his charming manners. His presence reminds us somewhat of another famed Oriental charmer (Mme. Chiang Kai-shek). What, by the way, has happened to her? We do not mean to imply, of course, that Nehru belongs to the outrightly reactionary category, completely feudalistic in approach, that Chiang Kai-shek does. That role in India is filled by others in Nehru's party, men who constitute the real High Command (Patel, C. R., etc.) and who manipulate Nehru as they please. Nehru is unquestionably a liberal, but a liberal pushed into power at a moment not exactly favorable to liberal behavior!

Is This Gandhi's Heir?

Nine years have passed since we last saw and heard Nehru. He recently addressed a distinguished audience of American liberals in the luxurious Grand Ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. We listened as respectfully as possible to a lengthy and rambling speech which, literally, told us exactly nothing. His involved way of talking had surely not changed; nor his capacity to say nothing in an affected way. His well-known touchiness, vanity and dislike of criticism were carefully concealed behind gobs of diplomatic friendliness and unctuous flattery of those Americans present.

Is this Gandhi's heir, the "idol of the Indian masses" as our American press would have us believe? No, this is a Nehru who clearly has lost whatever contact with the "marketplaces of India" he once had. This is the diplomatic front of a newly created, weak and confused national state which is unsure of both its direction and the perspective history offers it. Worth infinitely more as

its circulation among UAW readers.

CIO News, National Organ, Boosts

UAW and Reuther' by Howe-Widick

A further boost for "The UAW and Walter Reuther," by Irving Howe and

B. J. Widick, which has received enthusiastic reviews throughout the country,

come this week from The GIO News, organ of the national CIO. The review,

warm in tone and is certain greatly to embarrass those top UAW officials

who, because they are criticized in the book, would like to limit or suppress

it, is full of information that only an insider would have, and is so interest-

ingly written that it will hold the attention not only of trade unionists but

also of anyone concerned with today's vital movements." Howe and Widick,

with their different backgrounds, continues the reviewer, "made a good writing team." There then follows a detailed summary of the book which

is described in such terms as "penetrating" and "provocative." The review

printed a review that said in part: "This is a new book that every member

of the Rockford CIO should read . . . [it] has the feel and flavor of the

growing, giant, turbulent people's movement that is the UAW-CIO. This is

a book that races with history. . . . The authors of this book have told the

story well: their few references and inferences as to current, internal politics

of the UAW will no doubt provoke a great deal of discussion and comment

In the 719 News, organ of Local 719 of the UAW in Chicago, the book

is said to be "worth every member's attention." The reviewer, apparently a

shop worker, writes of the book's description of factory work: "While you

read this chapter, you picture many conversations that you have had your-

self on 'layoffs, the last depression, jobs.'" The reviewer criticizes the book

on the grounds that it does not adequately discuss UAW Vice-President

Gosser and does not "picture the relationship between the UAW and the

jamin Masse, who notes the "forthright approach" of the writers. He finds

it "a first-rate, exciting book-probably the best history of the UAW that

has yet appeared. It is possible to say this even though the reviewer may not

share the ideology of the writers. . . . " After which Masse attacks the book's

In conclusion, he says: "If books about unions ever reach the best-seller

Get it EVERY week!

A sub to LABOR ACTION

is only \$1 for 1 year,

In "America," organ of the Jesuit Society, the book is reviewed by Ben-

rest of the CIO." But, he adds, "the defects are minor."

estimate of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists.

class, that is where the UAW and Walter Reuther is headed."

The Rockford Advocator, organ of several UAW locals in Rockford, III.,

is headlined: "A Flesh and Blood Story of the GIO Auto Union."

written by Hollace Randsdell and running to over a half page in length, is

commentary on Nehru's speech was a remark overheard afterwards as two portly American dowagers waited for their elevator: "I was so relieved to hear him say that they are reimbursing all those landlords when they divide their land!"

Nehru will continue his tour of America for the next few weeks, welcomed everywhere by the most conservative and reactionary elements of the American population in a manner befitting a future ally of the United States. What would Gandhi, his master and the rightful author of the doctrine of non-violence, have to say at the sight, of Nehru receiving an honorary degree at the hands of General Dwight Eisenhower, conqueror of Germany and now president of Columbia University? Or his dining at the Waldorf-Astoria with Lieutenant General Walter Smith at his elbow?

The purpose of Nehru's visit is essentially exploratory in nature. Relations between America and India must necessarily deepen and expand within the next period. The America perspective to contain Asiatic Stalinism, now victorious throughout China, depends upon its ability to gain support from the ruling Congress Party of India.

For its part, the Congress Party-the party of India's landlord and capitalist class-is in serious straits and badly in need of help. We cannot describe all the aspects of this here; suffice it to say that the worst need of all is for capital, new and fresh capital. England can no longer be a source for such capital, particularly since the pound devaluation. Only America has capital to offer, and all seekers after it eventually come to the White House in Washington.

But, at the same time, it would be foolhardy for Nehru to be openly pro-American or offer to become the leader of an American bloc in Asia. He must proceed much more cautiously and avoid open commitments. That will come later, after others have worked out terms and details involving loans, guarantees, promises and conditions. That will come later, after developments in Stalinist China are clearer.

In any case, Nehru provides an absolutely vital link between the hard-headed industrialists and businessmen of India and the equally hard-headed imperialists of America. We know that Nehru has much to worry about, but if historic precedence runs true to form he need have no fears about his job over the next few years! No American-Indian alliance in Asia is conceivable without his blessing.

He Isn't Talking About It

Nehru's visit, then, is a masterpiece of evasion and evasiveness. His speeches will tell us nothing of his intent or perspective. He will talk of the need and desire for investment capital, but always "neutralize" this by insisting upon no conditions being attached to such investment. He will talk of India's commitment to Gandhist non-violence doctrine, but assure his audience that India "knows its responsibilities."

He will carefully ignore any attempted critical questions or remarks, such as his refusal to answer questions posed by a group of American journalists as to why Socialists, Communists and trade-union leaders are still jailed in his country. Of the real basic problems facing India—the end of feudal land relations, the rivalry with Pakistan, condition of the industrial working class, etc.-Nehru has literally not had a word to say, as of this

Within two years, the party of Nehru has proven its inability either to unify India or find a new place for it in the world. Within two years time, it must turn elsewhere, to the mighty American imperialist center. for assistance. We would hardly be wise to bank upon a brighter future for such a party or government than that of the Kuomintang Party and its "government" in China. The real future of India, it would seem to us, lies in the hands of the mass, growing Socialist Party of that country. This, is the party with a great future ahead of it, if it continues to offer its own independent program for India and does not fear to combat the Congress Party at every instance.

SPARKS in the NEWS

Tito Doesn't Know

In a speech to Yugoslav army officers on October 4. Tito referred to the Budapest confession trial of Laszlo Raik and said: "The book," says the reviewer, "has the feel of the labor movement in

"How does one go about making people accuse themselves? I do not know the answer to that. I do know that some monstrous methods were employed, in the attempt to frighten Yugoslavia through the trials."

Maybe the marshall, himself an old hand from the GPU school in his time, didn't get to the post-graduate course-or maybe he just isn't talking. The Yugos have had two high Cominform stooges, Zujovic and Hebrang, in the jug, since before the break with Moscow, and they may still be useful. . . .

The War's Over

"Your corporation may be in line for a refund on the excess-profits tax you paid on wartime earnings. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has just issued a ruling that may pave the way for several billion dollars of such refunds."-Business Week Magazine, September.

Going to the Dogs

This sounds as good as a lot of other peace schemes floating around: "Dear Sir," a Brooklyn boy wrote in a letter to the UN, "I have a dog. He is a German shepherd and his name is Butchie. Everybody in our house is happy when Butchie is around. He is so good in keeping peace when my friends start to fight. I would like to bring Butchie to the Security Council. If there are any arguments Butchie would bark and tell them to be more quiet. I think everybody will then get along much better." (N. Y. Times, October 6.)

JOHN DEWEY AT 90

SALUTE TO A GENUINE LIBERAL AND COURAGEOUS INTELLECTUAL

In many quarters, and for a variety of reasons, the 90th birthday of John Dewey is being celebrated. Dewey, who is one of the few genuinely original thinkers of 20th-century America and who has made significant contributions to philosophy, education, psychology and esthetics, is rightly receiving the applause of everyone in the slightest degree interested in

For our part, we leave to others—that is, to specialists in the various fields in which Dewey has worked-a proper assessment of his contributions. As Marxists, we find ourselves in certain basic disagreements with Dewey's theories of social class and social change; but, for the moment, these disagreements need not be rehearsed.

We wish only to say a few words about John Dewey, the public figure. There has arisen over the past five or six decades an ideal notion of what a liberal or radical intellectual should be-a thinker and writer who, while devoted to his special pursuits and not directly involved in immediate political activities, is yet so socially generous, so wholeheartedly committed that he conitnually gives of himself and his time to a variety of

causes that elicit his support. Few American intellectuals have come closer to this ideal figure than John Dewey. He has thrown himself into innumerable labor-defense movements, into the committees that supported Sacco and Vanzetti, and Tom Mooney. He has repeatedly participated in movements to orgainze a new, left-wing though non-Marxist party.

Unlike so many other intellectuals, he has remained true to the convictions of his young manhood. In an age when so many have beat a ridiculous retreat to religion and mysticism, he has retained his belief that men can solve their problems through the use of reason and scientific method, that there is no need to seek for supernatural crutches. He is, at the age of 90, as much of a radical as ever, and he has continually supported socialist candidates for office.

No. Atom-Romb Liberal

What a striking contrast with those brave souls who were radicals at the age of 19 and became soul-sick and weary cynics at the age of 23veterans of brief flirtations with the edges of radicalism who retired themselves from a world that will not let them go!

Here is a man whom one can respect even when, and often particularly when, one disagrees with him-a man who honors his views of vesterday, who does not flit from intellectual novelty to novelty like a drunkard trying new brands of whiskey, a man who establishes a tradition within his own life and thought, a man, in other words, who believes in himself. How much more admirable and dignified than those radicals-of-yesterday who today have become "atom-bomb liberals"!

We are particularly mindful of John Dewey's heroic service as head of the commission which investigated the Moscow Trials. At a time when intellectuals were apologizing for Stalinism wholesale or were being intimidated by it like frightened prisoners, Dewey did not fear to defend Trotsky's right to be heard. Only those who remember those harried days of the mid-thirties from personal experience will know what courage it took for John Dewey to resist the numerous and often vicious pressures brought against him by the then-powerful Stalinist intellectual machine.

And we think too of Dewey's recent stand in favor of academic freedom for all teachers, including Stalinists—so fine and rebuking a contrast to those of his disciples who would deprive teachers of their jobs because of their beliefs. At the age of 89, John Dewey spoke up on this issue, modestly, clearly and honorably.

There is a story about Dewey and Trotsky which we have heard; perhaps it is merely legendary, perhaps it is true. But it does not matter; it is a good story all the same. When Dewey heard Trotsky speak in Mexico (the story runs) he told Trotsky that if all Marxists were like him, then he, Dewey, would also be a Marxist. To which Trotsky is supposed to have replied that if all liberals were like Dewey, then he, Trotsky, would also

Happy birthday, John Dewey!

R. F.

KOSTOV AND TITO

YUGOS BACK UP GPU CHARGE AGAINST PURGED "TITOIST"

A curious but revealing circumstance becomes evident with respect to the new trials about to commence in Bulgaria.

The Yugoslavs denounced the Hungarian trials which resulted in the death of Rajk as clear frauds and frameups. Tito maintained that Rajk was brought to confess by some "monstrous" methods. Now, however, the Bulgar, Kostov, is to be tried, and we find the Times quoting the official Yugoslav paper, Borba, as saying that in Kostov's case, the Yugoslavs had long ago "warned" the Bulgarians that Kostov was a Gestapo agent and a spy for the "imperialists." How is that?

Let us first be reminded of the record of Kostov. The mere enumeration of his posts and his history will make it plain that this Stalinist is not one who joined the movement yesterday: Member of CP and secretary of Central Committee of Sofia Communist Youth organization, 1920. Active in underground CP press since 1921; took part in September 1923 CP uprising. In prison 1924-1929. In USSR working for Central Committee of Bulgarian CP, 1929-1931. Returned to Bulgaria 1931. Edited illegal CP publications. Member of Central Committee of CP since 1931 and political secretary since 1940. Engaged in partisan anti-Nazi resistance, 1941-42. Arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment, 1942. Released September 1944. Member of National Committee of Fatherland Front, 1945-6. Deputy prime minister in second Kimon Georgiev cabinet, 1946. Deputy prime minister, first Dimitrov cabinet, 1946-7. Served as acting premier at times.

Kostov's record thus runs pretty much parallel to that of Tito, due reservations being made. Why is it that Tito and his aides denounce Kostov as a spy, thus adding to the "credibility" of the trial about to take place?

The answer is obvious. The new frameup trials that take place periodically in the satellite countries are engineered directly by the GPU. The dossiers for these trials are prepared long in advance. The GPU can easily get one satellite clique under its thumb to help prepare the frameups against members of another satellite clique. Stalin, in fact, could well use this method to maintain proper disunity among the satellites, so they could not unite against Russian domination.

Tito, an old and tried GPU hand, was evidently not averse to obeying instructions along these lines before he was forced to break with the Stalin regime in order to save his own neck. That would account for the "letters" sent to the Bulgarians while everything was still "friendly," denouncing Kostov into the hunds of the GPU.

There were rumors that Kostov was to be brought to trial some time · back. Could it be that the postponement had to do with the new status of

At any rate, Tito and Co. do not dare now to "confess" their own hand in the frameup. They are fearful of just how the GPU will make use of the "information" supplied by them. Hence their revealing break in the press, in advance, of part of what went on behind the scenes in the good old days.

The Yugoslavs are caught in a web that should prove highly enlightening as to the nature of the Titos and their regime. Think of the ludicrous position of the Yugoslavs! They will be accused by Kostov (if he is brought to trial after being schooled in "confessing") of themselves being spies and agents of "imperialism." They will indignantly deny the accusation but will "corroborate" the allegation that Kostov is indeed such an agent.

No, Tito cannot possibly tell the truth about his role, either with respect to the Kostov trial, or with respect to his past activities in the services of the GPU. There are those who apply the old adage about politics making strange bedfellows to themselves by evincing every desire to come to the aid of Tito as against Stalin; any stick to beat Stalin! They are welcome to their politics. For our part we would like nothing better than to encourage both Stalin and Tito: "Lay on, MacDuff!" And may there be no best man!

Get acquainted with the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

For information and literature, write to:

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

Judge Medina versus Justice Holmes On 'Clear and Present Danger' Doctrine

"If in the long run the beliefs expressed in proletarian dictatorship are destined to be accepted by the dominant forces in the community, the only meaning of free speech is that they should be given their chance and have their way." Justice Holmes

The monstrous sentences imposed by Judge Medina on the defendants in the recent trial of the 11 Communist Party leaders is a consistent conclusion to an essentially military operation. Operation Justice ended with a mopping up of the enemy forces which should be the envy of any thorough military tactician.

Not only were the onerous sentences of five years in jail and \$10,000 fine imposed on all but one of the defendants, but the judge refused to allow them their freedom on bail pending appeal. With a certainty which no doubt derives from some personal contact with the eternal principles of justice hovering over his high-backed chair, the judge was willing to risk the freedom of the defendants on the conviction that his ruling will be sustained on appeal. This choice bit of judicial despotism climaxes a trial which was a triumph of legal persecution matched only by the political stupidity which was its inspiration.

More subtle but no less pernicious than the political aspects of the trial is the legal hypocrisy with which the judge's ruling has been cloaked. It has been said that hypocrisy is the tribute which vice pays to virtue. In the domain of politics, it may be said that "legality" is the concession which reaction makes to progress. This observation is illustrated again by the instructions to the jury by Judge Medina and a long (obviously inspired) article in the N. Y. Times by Russell Porter on October 20.

The main objective of the Porter article is to connect the Medina ruling with the tradition of liberalism and to demonstrate that Medina was only extending and fulfilling the liberal tradition set by the "clear and present danger" doctrine of Justice Holmes. It must be said about Porter

PITTSBURGH, Oct. 15 - More than

22,000 striking steel workers jammed

West Field in Munhall, Pa., on Thurs-

day, October 13, to hold the largest

meeting yet held during the current

steel strike. The crowd began to as-

semble early in the morning, although

the meeting was not scheduled until

mid-afternoon. Workers from as far

off as Ambridge, New Brighton and

Donora came in streetcars and bus

Riding to Munhall from McKees-

port in one of the streetcars jammed

with steel workers on their way to

the rally, it was quite obvious that

there was a lack of the joviality that

one notes even in the grimmest and

hardest of strikes. There was no

tenseness, no excitement, no militant

enthusiasm, but at the same time

there were no veiled anti-union re-

marks of any kind, nor were there

any of the "innocent" questions that

the weak ones put out as feelers

when they are getting tired of a

The more militant members of the

union explain the prevailing mood

in terms that seem quite correct. The

present demands of the union are not

the kind to arouse "fighting enthusi-

asm." The members feel that the is-

sues involved are important and that

the union had no recourse but to

strike for them. But the members do

not really feel that the future of the

union is in jeopardy at this time.

They point to the two token pickets

in front of a huge steel mill who are

there only as symbols that a strike

the trial became him like this concluding piece on it.

As all readers of his reporting know, his article rendered a scientifically accurate account of his prejudices in the case. It was not always certain, from any day's account, just what took place in court, but there was no room left for doubt as to the nature of Porter's animus. A natural envy of the prosecutor's job may have induced him to extend somewhat the proper limits of reportorial privilege.

WRECKING THE HOLMES DOCTRINE

In this article, Porter matches his previous "impartiality" by a vigorous display of legal knowledge. In the course of his exposition he succeeds in clarifying, magnifying and underlining the thoroughly reactionary character of the Medina ruling. No better insight on the insidious consequences of the government's attack on the Stalinists can be had than by a study of this article.

First, Porter tries to demonstrate that Medina's ruling was in the tradition of the Holmes doctrine. Writing the unanimous decision of the court in the Schenck case in 1919. Holmes enunciated the doctrine that free speech could be abridged when "the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evil that Congress has the right to prevent." Then Porter proceeds to find a hole in the doctrine in order to drag Judge Medina through

He writes about Holmes: "But he did not answer the question 'clear and present danger'-of what?" This profundity overlooks the basic consideration that it is not the function of the judiciary to enumerate all the possible "substantive evils" in the case of which a clear and present danger would warrant an abridgment of free speech. It was not Holmes' omission-it was his function not to make such a listing, which is essentially legislative in character.

Despite this, there was never any mystery about the nature of the in the Schenck case, Schenck was fillment is like the fulfillment of a man's life by accomplishing his execonvicted because it was held that cution. This ruling cuts the ground given the nature of his words and the context of the situation (war). from under the idea of a trial by one's the consequence of his utterances were such as to obstruct recruiting and spread disaffection in the armed

services. The "danger" there was

clear and was adjudged "present." In

Abrams v. U. S. (1919), Holmes dis-

sented from upholding the indictment

of some Russian emigrants for dis-

tributing leaflets whose consequence

was held to curtail war production.

Holmes argued that "nobody can sup-

pose that the surreptitious publishing

of a silly leaflet by an unknown man,

without more, would present an im-

mediate danger-that is, opinions

would hinder the success of the gov-

ernment arms." Thus in these cases

an examination of the facts of the

'case led to Holmes' opinion of the

immediacy of the danger. The nature

of the danger was, of course, clear

But Porter proceeds with his at-

tempt to lay the ground for Medina's

"fulfilling" of Holmes' doctrine. He

writes: "He [Holmes] did not limit

this evil to the danger of the 'imme-

diate' overthrow of the government

by force and violence." Alas for Por-

ter's scholarship, Holmes did precise-

Gitlow had been indicted for publish-

ing a pamphlet called "The Left Wing

Manifesto," This pamphlet concluded

with the sentences: "The proletarian

revolution and the Communist recon-

struction of society-the struggle for

these—is now indispensable. The

Communist International calls upon

the proletariat of the world to the

In his dissent, joined by Brandeis,

Holmes wrote: "It is manifest that

there was no present danger of an

attempt to overthrow the government

by force on the part of the admit-

tedly small minority who shared the

defendant's views," and then later,

as if to anticipate his future abusers,

he wrote: "If the publication of this

document had been laid as an attempt

to induce an uprising against govern-

ment at once and not at some indefi-

nite time in the future, it would have

Thus Holmes distinguished explicit-

ly between immediate overthrow and

something "in the future." It will re-

quire more than Porter's gymnastic

jurisprudence to transform the mean-

ing of a "clear and present danger"

into a not-so-clear and future danger.

In his instructions to the jury, Me-

dina distinguished between talking

about ideas as ideological or philo-

sophical abstractions and using them

as words "reasonably calculated to

incite somebody to action." This is a

futile attempt to cover the nakedness

of the decision with the figleaf of a

sophism. Holmes dealt specifically

with this point and with such telling

effect as to leave no doubt about the

connection between the Medina view

In the Gitlow case, he wrote: "Ev-

ery idea is an incitement. . . . The

only difference between the expres-

sion of an oninion and an incitement

in the narrower sense is the speaker's

enthusiasm for the result." It is easy

to see the FBI planting enthusiasm-

eters in people's homes to determine

whether the culprit was enthusiasti-

cally inciting or only philosophically

While it is possible that some phi-

losophers, properly accredited, may

be permitted to continue talking their

"abstractions," the Medina ruling has

real applicability and will actually

be applied in practice to any expres-

sion of ideas. Such is its inherent

After committing this intellectual

violence in trying to marry the Me-

dina ruling to the Holmes tradition.

Porter deals up his ace: "Judge Me-

dina thus evolved what may become,

if upheld in the higher courts, new

constitutional doctrine to fulfill the

'clear and present' danger doctrine.

This new concept is that it is a mat-

ter of law to be laid down by the

judge whether such danger exists, not

a matter of fact to be submitted to

Notice-not to CHANGE the Holmes

OUT OF JURY'S HANDS

and the Holmes tradition.

ruminating.

presented a different question."

final struggle!"

In the Gitlow v. N. Y. case (1925),

ANSWERED IN ADVANCE

from the case itself.

The existence of the "present danger" is now no longer a matter of fact to be investigated and presented to the jury for their decision, but has become a matter of judicial fiat. The judge will announce what constitutes a present danger, and it is a marvelous twisting of logic which can convert a question which is so obviously a question of fact into a matter of "law." of judicial opinion.

And this judicial opinion already has indicated that "clear and present danger" need be neither so clear nor so present As Porter describes it the judge instructed the jury that if it found that the defendants had the huge organization the prosecution said they had, with its secret schools, etc., "with the specific intent of violent overthrow-the 'clear and present danger' was hidden there."

Thus the "clear" danger becomes the "hidden" danger of a future event. With the deprivation of the jury of its prerogative of deciding on the existence of the danger as a matter of fact, with the relegation of this duty to judicial opinion, and with the specific decision of Medina that a danger to be "clear and present" need not be clear and present, we have the latest blow to the liberal tradition of free speech as upheld by the courts.

This decision has consequences which are even more far - reaching than is apparent. Porter leaves nothing unsaid in his little tribute to Medina. "That 'clear and present danger,' he [Medina] said in effect, might be anything that might be detrimental to the public under the clauses of the preamble of the United States Constitution which says the Constitution was established by the people of the United States, among other things, to 'insure domestic tranquillity and promote the domestic welfare.' Such 'clear and present danger,' he said in effect, might be serious bloodshed, political strikes, riots like the Peekskill affair brought on by provocation from the defendants, or any such events, which need not be specified, that might lead, if the defendants were allowed to do such things unchecked with the specific intent of overthrowing the government, to its eventual overthrow by force and violence."

THE AX IS SHARP

This is the distilled essence of the whole ruling. This interpretation and extension of the ruling indicates that acts or words which may upset "domestic tranquillity" (blood brother to the historically notorious "law and order") falls within the scope of and present" dangers

This legal atrocity should lay the ghost once and for all to the cherished and naive beliefs of some trusting souls that all that was involved in this trial was a matter of law and that the government can be trusted to prosecute the Stalinists and rest content. The ax which is being brought down on the Stalinists is not to be dulled by this one quick stroke. It is made of harder steel and is kept sharpened by the increasing pressure in our society for total loyalty and support to the capitalist

Holmes' doctrine, which was a preservative of a larger measure of free speech, is being buried. That the government will not proceed to prosecute all opponents of the regime immediately or even in the near future does not alter this fact. When politically necessary it will proceed with all the energy its judiciary is now permitting it to have. While there is no certainty of how the Supreme Court may rule, the gulf between the Medinas and the Vinsons, in social temperament and outlook, is not so great as to be any guarantee of a satisfactory outcome.

The task remains for the labor movement and for all people who think and are concerned for a democratic society to protest the trial's outcome and to work for the repeal of the Smith Gag Act on which the trial was based-not in order to defend the eleven Kremlin puppets but to defend basic democratic liberties

of the Tito-Stalin Fight HAL DRAPER RUTH FISCHER

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13, at 8 p.m. CORNISH ARMS HOTEL 311 West 23 Street (near 8th Ave.), N. Y. C. Admission 75 Cents - - - - Students 35 Cents

But this strategy can work only

OHIO LABOR NOTES_

Beck Defeated in East Bay Raidings; Employers Sign Up with the Clerks

OAKLAND, Oct. 21-The threatened general strike in the East Bay area was averted this week by' the combined backwatering of the Teamsters and the Retail Food Stores Employers Association. As a result of the solidarity of the whole union movement in the area with the life-anddeath struggle of the Clerks to maintain their status as representatives of the employees of all retail food stores, as against Beck's Teamsters, the Employers Association backed down on its proclaimed union-busting fight and signed individual contracts with the Clerks, defying the Teamster threat to boycott their

The Teamsters, left out on the limb by their previous ally, the employers, were forced to pull their picket lines from stores that had signed with the Clerks, with vague mutterings that the fight had only begun, etc. One chain has remained alone to fight the association's policy through to the bitter end.

However, the Clerks have every right to expect a favorable ruling from the NLRB this coming week regarding their jurisdiction over this chain since they have held it since 1938. With weak bellows from Dave Beck to the effect that he was in Europe while the Teamster power drive was conducted unsuccessfully in the Bay area, the curtain falls on what may well be the first act in the drive of King Beck to extend his domain points south from his domain in the northwestern states. The local union movement has shown in word and deed that it will not tolerate Beckism in northern California.

A side note on Beck's activities elsewhere in the state: The Teamsters lost an employee-representation election this week (2163 to 1011) to the Food, Tobacco & Agricultural Workers Union (CIO) for jurisdiction over lettuce packers in Salinas.

The East Bay Labor Journal, official AFL publication for Alameda County, which ordinarily is a model union newspaper in the sense that it presents an honest interpretation of the news from the union man's point of view, this week departed from this policy to engage in regrettable namecalling and vilification.

In an editorial entitled "No Help

from No Snakes," the Journal repudiated "any help offered by Stalinites or Trotskyites" in their fight against Dave Beck. Ordinarily the lumping of LABOR ACTION and the Stalinist People's World into the same category is the practice of colorblind editors, but Editor Burgess of the Journal has seen fit on numerous occasions to reprint articles from LABOR ACTION dealing precisely with our attitude on the union-wrecking policies of the Stalinists. We can say to Burgess and his staff: Why not read the articles that you reprint from our press before you start your name-calling?

Marxist Atoms

In the London Evening Standard for September 7. Bertrand Russell said: "An atom bomb made on Marxist principles would probably not ex-

We imagine Lord Russell is talking about a Moscow-made bomb, but the lord only knows what he means by making an atom bomb on Marxist principles. In any case, we suggest a correction: "An atom bomb made on Marxist principles would probably

it so easy to digest.

(Continued from page 1) into sections and assign teams to visit restaurants and thus to "feed" the courts a heavy, uninterrupted dose of Diggs Law violations, which they

hope the legal stomachs will not find

Detroit - -

Despite the present necessary emphasis on legal redress in these cases, it is good to note that CARD leaders do not plan to rely completely or solely upon legal procedures. They realize that the Diggs Law has rested quietly on file for a number of years. while flagrant violations have been tossed into the wastebaskets of numerous prosecuting attorneys. Especially to be supported is the suggestion that the CARD leaders organize a mass picket line, and rally at City Hall and serve notice on the worthy councilmen that 280,000 Negroes are determined that the Diggs Law be

This mass rally could be most effective if held before the elections in order to give the electees an opportunity to take a position on an important social problem of discrimination, along with their expansive plans for the problems of rats, highways and transit.

Calamity Judd

Walter H. Judd (R., Minn.), speaking at Columbia University, demonstrates how to make a point-out of whole cloth: "Freedom from want, if interpreted as freedom from the necessity to struggle, would be a calamity, if ever realized."

The possibilities of this method are practically endless. Thus: "Freedom of speech, if interpreted as freedom to slander, ought to be abolished." Or: "The right to vote, if interpreted as the right to stuff ballot boxes, is un-America." Or: "A demand for a wage increase, if interpreted as a demand to subvert the government, ought to be outlawed." And so on to the end of a term in Congress.

Faces Challenge - -

(Continued from page 1)

undertaken to support the strike financially. A mighty important thing -and no mistake about it. But finances alone will not win this particular strike. The employers are out for big

Taft-Hartley hasn't proved to be as much as the bosses had hoped for. Also, labor has given signs that it is getting over the shock of its defeat. Moreover, the steel profiteers see the possibility of T - H being legally scotched - if not this year, then in 1950. Hence their determination to set labor (the steel union) back today. They are far-seeing people, these big profiteers. They think and act politically. They keep in mind the over-all interests of their parasitic class. Labor can beat them only if it manifests the same, or a greater, degree of understanding and determination on its own behalf. And the CIO convention is a wonderful place to show that understanding.

We do not presume to outline the details of the required strategy. We can however, suggest that once financial support is guaranteed, there is the further necessity of involving all the unions in a common strategy to defeat the steel monopolists, and all other employers, who enter into the

WHAT CAN BE DONE

Why not a decision by the convention to form a board of strategy, representing the union's ranks as well as the leadership, to sit together and map common plans to beat the steel industry, etc.? Why not an invitation to other unions-AFL and independent-to join hands in the fight, to link and decide strategy in common? If we cannot speak of the great problem of labor unity, for that is not easily accomplished, why not the steps of coordination that can win the battle today and can lead ultimately to unity?

WHY NOT, ABOVE ALL, A FORTHRIGHT DECLARATION OF POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE, WHICH WILL DO MORE THAN ANYTHING TO MAKE THE STEEL BOSSES QUAVER IN THEIR AR-ROGANCE? Why not, specifically, plan at this convention to call local and national conferences of all the political bodies set up by the unions, AFL and CIO, to consolidate their plans and strength?

The necessity, as we see it, is to present the employers with so determined and so aroused and so understanding a union movement, ready to go all-out in defense of any one of its sections, and laying plans for greater objectives, that U. S. Steel and other bosses will have to beat a retreat, run for cover. The CIO convention can make an accomplished fact of this necessity. It can pick up the employers' challenge and win-for the steel workers and for

What's CIO's Answer?

Steel, most "influential" of all em-

ployers, rejected the fact-finding report, one conclusion emerged from the welter of argument and counterargument. It was forcing strikes in steel and coal for political purposes. And this was possible because it knows that the Truman administration is basically a pro-capitalist re-

Certainly Truman flirts with labor, and the big capitalists prefer a less unpredictable representative. But the Fair Deal Democrats know where their first loyalty lies. The police of "liberal" Mayor O'Dwyer protected scabs in the American Machine and Foundry strike while Republican Dewey watched the not-so-liberal police escort strikebreakers into the Bell factory. From all these men, U. S. Steel has nothing to fear.

U. S. Steel bluntly shows where real power lies. The official labor leadership relies upon the Fair Deal Democrats to help fight their battles. If the steel magnates can demonstrate the impotence of the Fair Deal to solve any of the problems of the class struggle, above all if it can force through the invoking of the Taft-Hartley Law, they will upset the political equilibrium, strike a blow at the political perspectives of the labor movement, leave it politically demoralized and disoriented and incapableof rallying its followers to the polls. At least, such is their calculations.

THEY CAN BE STOPPED

On the other hand, if by some accident Truman should make a mild and ineffectual move against the steel companies, above all if he should dare to seize their plants, U. S. Steel will vell bloody murder about the "rights of private property," hoping to split the Democratic Party from stem to stern. Regardless of the outcome of the steel strike, Big Steel's political gambit wins.

because labor does rely upon the Fair

Deal, because the failures of the Fair concessions, new compromises. Deal do throw the labor leaders into political hopelessness. U. S. Steel banks upon political confusion; its

as labor begins to display political resoluteness and clarity. If the union movement raised the slogan of a new Labor Party, and if it pointed to the weaknesses of the Democrats and the Republicans as evidence of the need for a class party, the representatives of the capitalist class and the big monopolists would be compelled to take a new tack. To compete with the labor movement

for the support of the American peo-

policy can be stopped dead as soon

It is the present political policy of the labor movement, which relies upon capitalist politics, that makes possible the offensive of big business in the 1949 strikes.

Until the CIO (and the AFL) take a step toward solving the political impasse of labor policy, it will not see light in the economic blind alley where it is fighting now.

Such a step can be nothing else than a step toward an independent party of labor, breaking loose once and for all from the two old-line machines.

Such a step would be the formation ple, they would have to offer new of an independent labor party.

Vote Socialist

(Continued from page 1)

The Independent Socialist League, which itself runs no candidates in this election, calls upon all its friends and supporters and on all classconscious workers to cast their ballots for the candidates of any of the three socialist parties on the ballot: Socialist Labor Party, Socialist Party, or the Socialist Workers Party.

We make this recommendation as the only way to cast a working-class vote in the absence of any genuine labor candidate, in the absence of a real labor party in the city election. We make this recommendation as the means of casting a SOCIALIST PROTEST VOTE against the candidates of the capitalist parties and against the capitalist politics of the labor leadership.

None of these groups are genuine parties in the real sense of the word; they do not enroll masses of workers; they remain in fact small socialist propaganda sects. The SLP abstains on principle from the real class struggle carried on by the workers as they are with the unions they now possess. The reformist Socialist Party inclines heavily toward the support of American imperialist policy. The SWP, on the other hand, leans toward support of Russian imperialism.

On the basis of what sets each apart from the other, the Independent Socialist League does not and cannot support any one of them as against the others, and hence we do not choose among them. The ISL stands for independent, socialist class politics in the fullest sense, summarized in the viewpoint: Neither Washington nor Moscow! For the Third Camp of Labor and the Oppressed Colonial Peoples!

However, since all three socialist parties which appear on the ballot have been and are traditionally associated in the minds of the workers with labor and socialism; and with labor and socialism alone, they offer the only vehicle for a socialist protest vote: For socialism-for the independence of the labor movement.

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE New York Local

But the steel barons had better not

NO SHAKY TALK

strike.

permit this "quietness" of the workers to fool them. For should anything be done by the owners that seems to threaten the wage structure, shop conditions or the life of the union itself, the mood of these striking steel workers will change overnight.

On the streetcar, one of the workers, reading from a Pittsburgh newspaper, announced to those sitting close to him: "Well, listen to this. Here is a story from the reporter who was here in town yesterday. He talked to the guy who runs the florist shop, to the drugstore manager, to the head of the Kiwanis, and they all told him that we didn't want the strike but that Murray did, and that up to now it's been a picnic, but that today we got our last check and by next week we will want to go back work." The man sitting next to the worker with the paper said: "That reporter has some things straight, but he didn't get his whole story. Sure we want to go back as he says, but he doesn't say HOW."

Portrait of a Steel Workers' Rally: There's No Talk of Quitting Fight The conversation dropped there, and that's how it was during the entire trip. Flashes of solid union and strike talk and then silence or discussion of other than union subjects. But no anti-union or timid "Do-vou-

> show their solidarity with the union should convince the steel barons to stop messing around West Field was packed a full hour before Philip Murray and other union officials arrived. Signs read: "Too old to work, too young to die. Pensions now!" "What is more important

> think-this-strike-will-last-long?" type

of shaky talk. The fact that 22,000

workers showed up at this rally to

-machines or men?" and others. "TELL 'EM ABOUT BENNY!"

Philip Murray was introduced as the "great champion of the American working people." Murray's speech began with some remarks about the monument at Homestead dedicated to the men who were slaughtered in the 1892 strike.

He then continued with fiery blasts at the steel industry for not yielding to the Truman fact-finding committee and for "deliberately and premeditatedly conspiring to cast this nation into national catastrophe by saying no on four different occasions."

There was mixed reaction to this "national catastrophe" yarn. A few applauded, most sat and listened.

But there was wild applause when Murray told how the union achieved collective bargaining, boosted wages and developed grievance machinery during the past 13 years by "wringing it out of the industry."

The audience was with Murray all the way when he asked Andrew Griasek, a 68-year-old retired steel worker, to stand up. Griasek worked for U. S. Steel for 44 years and was retired in 1946 with a "pension" of 29 cents a month. When Murray said: "He is broken down, depreciated, in need of repairs. He has given blood and sinews to build up this so-called magnificent institution," it was a good thing for Benjamin Fairless, president

of U. S. Steel, that he was not around. By this time many of the workers seemed more sold on the pension fight than they were when they had arrived at the meeting. Someone in the stands called out to Murray: "Tell 'em what Benny gets!" Murray told the audience about Benjamin Fairless' salary of \$206,000 a year and the \$76,537 a year non-contributory pension Fairless will get when he retires. On the following Sunday at Bethlehem, Pa., Murray brought out the figures on ten top Bethlehem Steel officials who have received a total of \$16,090,000 in salaries in the past ten years and who will retire on non-contributory pensions that average more than \$100,000 a year each.

New York Symposium—

The International Significance

Author of Stalin and German Communism, well-known lecturer and writer, recently returned from Europe, includ-

Editor of Labor Action, former editor of The New International, author of many articles analyzing the Tito-Stalin fight.

Auspices: Independent Socialist League