

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

LABOR ACTION

APRIL 18, 1949

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM

FIVE CENTS

TRUMAN WAVES A-BOMB; LEADERS PLAN U.S. GARRISON IN EUROPE

23 WEEKS

of Truman's Democratic Congress since labor won its great "victory" at the polls on November 3 by re-electing the president and a Democratic majority—

*The T-H Law
is still on the books!*

CCNY Student Strike Strong Despite Cops

By LEON MANN

NEW YORK, April 11—"Strike Today!" This is the chant that greeted students at City College (CCNY) as they reported for school this morning. "Student Council Calls Strike Today!"—this was the headline in the school paper and on leaflets distributed by the Student Council Strike Committee.

In a referendum last Friday the student body voted to strike against the administration's stand on the Knickerbocker and Davis cases. Knickerbocker, chairman of the Romance Language Department, was charged over four years ago with overt anti-Semitism. Davis was found guilty of Jim Crow practices at the college. The vote for the walkout was 2,797 for and 1,885 against. Of those who voted for the strike, the majority decided for a prolonged walkout as opposed to a one-day stoppage.

POLICE USE FORCE

Picket lines were thrown around the many school entrances at 7:30 a. m. in order to meet the students coming for the first class at 8 o'clock. The picket lines gained strength continuously, dispelling doubts as to the response of the students to the strike. The placards read "Jim Crow Must Go," "Join the Strike," "Anti-Semitism is CCNY's Shame."

The decisive question was the 9 o'clock class since the greatest influx of students takes place at this hour. At 8:40 the police moved in. They demanded that the picket line in front of the main entrance be reduced from 50 to 4. This would have been repeated at the other entrances to the school. There were some 350 pickets all together.

This police demand, if granted, would have been a telling blow as well over 500 students stood in the rectangle, uncertainly and uncommitted to the strike, across from the main building, awaiting developments. The pickets refused to reduce the line. The police thereupon attacked the pickets and carried 25 students into the patrol wagons.

There was some scuffling and protest, but contrary to the report of The Sun and The World-Telegram there was no riot.

As soon as the cops moved in, the 500 students ran over to the patrol wagon to protest the use of the police against peaceful pickets. The chant, "Get The Cops Off The Campus," rose at this point. The police officer in charge told the students that the wagon would come back for more pickets until the line was reduced to four. But the wavering 500 had decided as a result of the police action

Next Week —

**SPECIAL 6-PAGE
MAY DAY ISSUE**

Order an Extra Bundle!

to come over to the strike. The picket lines on the main street alone increased to close to 300.

Twenty minutes later the police wagon rolled on to the campus again. Like an electric spark, the cry ran through the crowd "Get the cops off the campus!" The cops were hissed and booed. At the decisive moment, the officer in charge ordered the wagon off the campus. The militancy,

(Continued on page 4)

Congress Bloc Turns Tame When It Comes to ERP

By SUSAN GREEN

Last week the Senate, 70 to 7, approved President Truman's European Recovery Program bill, authorizing the extension of the Marshall Plan for fifteen months—cost, \$5,580,000,000. The House is expected to meet in special session and to pass virtually the same measure, easily overcoming a flurry of proposed amendments.

There is a sharp contrast to be noted. What has happened to the coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans which enacted an anti-tenant rent bill; which stalls, delays and opposes repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law; which refused to kill the obstructionist practice of filibuster; which serves the Truman Administration in its own fashion as the avowed reason why Democratic election promises are not fulfilled? Why now this overwhelming Truman support?

What has become of that coalition? It suspends itself for what is called the bipartisan foreign policy. That may sound like something good. Actually it means that while both parties are united on what American capitalism must do abroad as the top imperialist power, there is no such concern with questions of raising the living, security and democratic standards at home.

AMENDMENTS BEATEN

And so it was so easy to prevent the passage of such amendments as came from Senators Malone, Republican from Nevada, and Kem, Republican from Missouri. The former wished to substitute three-year loans to the ERP countries in place of the Marshall Plan; the latter, fearful of the spread of "socialism," wanted to withhold funds from nations which "would use the money for nationalization of basic industries." But the senators were not going to let such notions upset the apple cart. As they see it, the industry of Western Europe, nationalized or unnationalized, is being neatly tied to the war plants of America—and that's good enough for Congress.

So bent is Congress on not upsetting the apple cart that the Senate toned down to a whisper the amendment of Senator Brewster to the effect that ERP aid be stopped to any

Official Reports Contradict Justification of A-Bomb Use

By JACK BRAD

Speaking in casual fashion as if passing the time of day, Harry Truman last week delivered one of the most threatening saber-rattling speeches of recent years. Referring to the decision which he made to use the atomic bomb he said: "If it has to be made again for the welfare of the United States, and the democracies of the world are at stake, I wouldn't hesitate to make it again."

To understand their fullest implication we have only to put these words in the mouth of Stalin. Suppose Stalin made a public statement that Russia now had the bomb and "wouldn't hesitate" to use it to defend itself and its satellites!

One can only feel a cold shiver of fear at the very thought of the eventually so casually thrown out by the American head of state. Coming only three days after the signing of the Atlantic military pact, it falls into the framework of the current armaments hysteria.

SAVED LIVES?

Truman used the occasion to repeat what had become the standard rationalization on the initial use of the Bomb. Truman said: "I made that decision to use the Bomb because I thought 200,000 of our young men would be saved by making that decision and some three or four hundred thousands of the enemy would be saved by making that decision."

The frequency with which this official explanation has been given indicates a need to justify the employment of this most inhuman weapon of all times. There is more than one sign of a sense of guilt.

One hundred and twenty thousand were killed by the bombs on Hiro-

shima and Nagasaki. The number of injured and maimed has never been ascertained but must be several times that number. The casual flaunting of its future use by Truman betrays an unbelievable callousness. If it can be shown that use of the atomic bomb was not justified by military expediency in 1945, then the official excuse becomes a myth of horror: at best an unpardonable miscalculation. It would also bring into question use of the Bomb in the future.

The available evidence indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Bomb did not decisively influence the outcome of the recent war, did not bring the war to an end substantially sooner. In other words, it was not the Bomb which prevented or made unnecessary the invasion of Japan, and thus it did not "save lives."

Information on this is available in the reports of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey which investigated the results of all bombing operations over Japan and Germany. This official governmental commission which made the survey was composed of specialists from the army, navy, air force and civilian technicians.

WHY JAPAN GAVE UP?

The survey reports that invasion was not the military alternative to atomic bombing. Bombing of workers' homes which wiped out whole areas of impoverished slum dwellings was the decisive factor, in addition to the blockade.

"Urban area attacks made the cities of Japan virtual battlefields in which the entire economy and life of each area were severely disrupted, causing the population to suffer much, if not more, than would have been the case if Japan had been invaded." (The Japanese Wartime Standard of Living, USSBS, page 109.)

"By destroying his (the workers') dwelling, by causing him and his family to evacuate burned-out cities, by disrupting and overtaxing transportation facilities, by arousing his fear to report to a place of work which he knew was a bombing target, by making his purchase of food and daily necessities more difficult and finally by lowering the workers' morale"—in other words by employing the methods of the Wehrmacht over Coventry, of incendiary indiscriminate bombing, such a condition of general paralysis had been wrought that the economy was grinding to a standstill.

All the survey reports agree that this "lesser" horror was the decisive factor in the American victory. This writer is in a position to confirm this conclusion from the point of view of



"A being darkly wise
and rudely great..."

—Quoted from Alexander Pope by Churchill in Boston speech of March 31.

the Japanese. A few months after the war's end, he had the opportunity to ask a score of Japanese newspapermen what in their opinion turned the tide. The unanimous reply was: the incendiary raids with fire bombs. This writer saw children playing a game they called "B-29" in the ruins of Tokyo.

WAR MACHINE CRIPPLED

If this judgment is correct—and it is the most expert one available—even an invasion of Japan would not have been necessary, since the fire-bombing attacks which began in November 1944, in addition to the extremely effective submarine blockade, had already reduced the country's war machine to a point where it could no longer sustain itself.

"After the Marianas were lost [July 1944]... Tojo had been unseated and peace-makers were introduced into the government as prominent elements. The war economy had already passed its peak, fleet and air forces were critically weakened—and confidence of the people in eventual victory was weakened. By mid-1944 shortages of food and civilian supplies were reflected in reduced living standards. Therefore the actual physical destruction wrought by strategic bombing assumed the role of an accelerator, to assist and expedite forces already in motion." (Japan's Struggle to End the War, USSBS, page 12.)

(Continued on page 4)

By HAL DRAPER

How will the Third World War start?

The Man-in-the-Street is convinced that it will be by Russian aggression against a perfectly innocent West. Let us accept that for the moment, for the sake of argument, and ask the same question again. Russian aggression—against Norway? Against the Duchy of Luxembourg? Even against Western Germany?

There is a campaign going on now to make sure that the first shooting starts against the forces of none of these countries alone or their similar small fry, but that it starts directly with the armed forces of the United States.

This campaign is being carried on publicly by high-level American spokesmen. It reached a high point during the week of the Atlantic Pact signing. It has not yet been officially blessed but its sponsorship leaves no doubt of the source of its inspiration.

The plan is simple enough: American troops are to be stationed at all the danger points all over the world, ready for the shooting. The excuse is simple enough: "we" can't allow Europe to be overrun, "we" therefore have to guard their borders. The buildup is more than simple—it has been accomplished: the plan is put forward as a necessary consequence of the Atlantic Pact.

It seems this innocently peace-loving Atlantic Pact, which sounds merely like a joint pledge of defense against aggression, has consequences. First, the United States has to arm Europe to the teeth. Second, U. S. troops have to become its border patrols. Let us take a look at this public campaign.

FOUR SPEECHES

It was blared out this past week by four well-publicized speeches: by General Lucius D. Clay, head of the American Military Government in Germany; by General Omar Bradley, army chief of staff; by Secretary of the Army Royal; and by ex-Undersecretary of War William H. Draper. No mean lineup!

The keynote was sounded by General Bradley on April 5. He made a fervent plea to "funnel the great strength of our New World to the ramparts of the Old" and "thus challenge the enemy where we would transgress." (Bradley emphasized in this speech that he was acting at the request of the State Department.) Picking up and quoting this appeal, the editorial columns of the New York Times on April 7 dotted the 'i's: "we must funnel the great strength of our New World to the ramparts of the Old" by stationing in Europe a team of army, navy and air forces strong enough to keep any aggressor in check."

If this had appeared in the Hearst press, one might laugh off as mere puff the phrase about "a team... strong enough to keep any aggressor in check." Because this is quite a



"My education has
been sadly neglected."

—Opening sentence of Truman's speech of April 6.

"Team"! It means the permanent occupation of Western Europe in force, not by token garrisons.

The next day Secretary Royal made a speech in Chicago which "was an obvious sequel to that delivered in New York last night by General Bradley" (says the AP dispatch). "Obvious sequel" puts it mildly; Royal didn't have to read Bradley's speech in the newspapers.

Royal's theme was that it will take more than the ground forces of the European countries themselves to withstand any future attack on the Continent. Like Bradley, Royal did not do it himself. William H. Draper was freer-tongued in St. Louis, since he no longer has official government responsibility. According to the AP, Draper "stressed the prospect that U. S. forces will have to stay in Europe for a long time after the occupation period is over in order to stand guard against any lightning aggression."

TROOPS DEMONSTRATE

And that may certainly be a long time. Anyone who thinks that Draper and the editors of the Times (the latter a notorious channel for officially-unofficial trial balloons) are speaking on their own is self-deceived. The coordination is pretty good.

In Germany General Clay spoke briefly at "the biggest demonstration of United States troops in Europe since the end of the war" in Grafenwoehr. The headlines tell the story: (Continued on page 4)

Truman, Churchill Underline Pact with Bomb

Admit They Can Defend Their System Only by Threatening Atomic Destruction in World Holocaust

By PHILIP COBEN

In all the rash of official speech-making on the Atlantic Pact, there were two that got the headlines. Neither was delivered at the ceremony where the signing took place. Neither was even supposed to be about the Atlantic Pact. Both just "happened" to be delivered in the midst of the oratorical festivities, and both hogged the headlines because—

Both were about the real power behind the pact.

Both brandished the atom bomb in the face of the world. The speakers were Harry S. Truman and Winston Churchill.

In the ceremonial hall, the twelve foreign ministers signed their names with a fountain pen, were given the fountain pen as a souvenir of the occasion, and made their speeches as a souvenir for the audience.

Outside, President Truman gave point to the pointless speeches within by declaring that he would not hesitate to use the atom bomb again—"for the welfare of the United States, and [if] the democracies of the world are at stake," he said. "I wouldn't hesitate..." he said.

Outside, in his speech in Boston at the M.I.T. convocation on science, Winston Churchill had previously informed his audience that only the

atom bomb stood between Western Europe, particularly London, and the fate of being "communized" by Russia. Only the atom bomb...

Asked by a reporter two days later if he wanted to elaborate that statement, Churchill answered: "Don't you think it stands better in its naked simplicity?"

A QUESTION, MR. SPEAKER!

There could have been no more naked admission of the bankruptcy of the present order and its political leaders. There could have been no simpler affirmation of the fact that the capitalist democracies can be preserved only because of their power to destroy or ravage the world, and not, certainly not, because of the "moral force" of their system of ideas (listen to the speechmakers!) or the ability of their democracy to withstand the attack of Stalinism, horrible as that despotism is.

Both the speech by Truman this past week, and the Boston speech by Churchill the week before, immediately raise a thunderous question.

If only the atom bomb stands between "the democratic world" and Russia, and if the president of the United States "wouldn't hesitate" to use it, what happens when Russia gets

the atom bomb too—if it doesn't have it now?

This question has an answer, and a nakedly simple one too. The question will then be: Who has more atom bombs? Whose bomb can devastate a mere 25 square miles and whose has a destructive range of a hundred square miles, or a thousand? Which side has more airplanes to carry them? Which side will need no airplanes at all for the purpose, if it can develop long-range inter-continental self-guided missiles with atomic warheads?

"RESTRAINING FORCE"?

"Five or six atomic bombs, each with twice the destructive power of the weapon that was dropped over Hiroshima, would knock out Detroit, according to Commissioner Donald S. Leonard of the Michigan State Police, who gave the Army General Staff as his source of information." (N. Y. Times, April 8.)

A foreign correspondent wires the French reaction to Truman's speech: "Ever since tension over Berlin reached a high point last summer some of the highest French officials have said privately that the atomic bomb was about all that sustained such peace as there was. It has lately been assumed that for at least a year or so, Europe's rearmament being

slow, the restraining force of the Atlantic Pact would lie mainly in the known power of the new bomb. Mr. Truman's statement [I wouldn't hesitate] was considered a salutary reminder of this power." (Harold Candler, from Paris, Times, April 8.)

We call your attention to one phrase in the above dispatch: "for at least a year or so." And after "a year or so" of European rearmament with the United States' cast-off models (such as the plan for the first "year or so"), will the "restraining force" of the pact be anything else but... only the atom bomb?

In other columns of this and other issues of LABOR ACTION, we discuss the political meaning of the pact and its impact in this world of two imperialist war blocs. The speeches by Truman and Churchill have struck a deeper, more somber note.

The monster-explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, even in the midst of the rejoicing at the end of the war, brought a real moral revulsion into the heart of all thinking men. The most unusual aspect of this was the chain-reaction of revolt, sporadic though it was, on the part of atomic scientists themselves. For the first time—after decades of talk about war meaning the end of civil-

ization—this gloomy prophecy became scientifically meaningful, or so many of the scientists themselves insisted. The first reaction to the news of Hiroshima, even on the part of the most war-minded, was not a cheer, it was a gasp.

THEY DARE DO IT NOW

The moral revulsion to the atom bomb has played itself out now, as a force. The reason we know that is so is because Truman and Churchill made their speeches. Three years ago neither would have dared, so blatantly, so nakedly, to wave the Bomb in the face of the world as if to say—like a corny passage in a thriller: "Go ahead, try to stop me, and I'll drop this stick of dynamite!" And particularly: "I wouldn't hesitate..."

The moral revulsion must be back-stopped with political understanding, or it fades like a passing mood. As we pointed out, Churchill helped to supply that too. The capitalist world, in Churchill's mind, has nothing to counteract the appeal to the European and Asian peoples which is made by Stalin's totalitarianism, nothing except the threat of a plutonium smoke-cloud over their country. The fight for a socialist democracy, to replace both capitalist and Stalinist imperialism, is the real road to peace and world security.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

Jim Crow in Detroit UAW Local

By M. FINCH

Jim Crow is a real issue in at least one local of the Auto Workers Union—and union progressives have to do something about it.

In February, the Reutherite administration of Dodge Local 3, UAW-CIO (Detroit), was embarrassed into taking a positive stand on the issue of Negro workers being served in the restaurants and bars around the plant by the Stalinist "Progressive slate" which, for political purposes, started a restaurant campaign just prior to the recent local election.

The FEPC of the local had sent letters to bar and restaurant owners inviting them to discuss this issue, and a committee of three, including the local president and the FEPC chairman, had visited some of the proprietors, all to no avail.

At a business meeting held on February 27, a motion was passed that all local officers, executive board and plant committee members and candidates for these offices sign another letter to the businessmen in order to prevent the question of anti-Negro discrimination from becoming an issue in the election. At this meeting the Reutherite president, Art Grudzen, took a firm stand and he and various other speakers were enthusiastically applauded.

Subsequently, the entire "left wing" ("Trade Union") slate and three of the Reutherite candidates refused to sign the letter.

The "Trade Unionists" carried on a vicious Negro-baiting campaign in the shop and some of their candidates even went so far as to print anti-Negro leaflets appealing to the most reactionary workers—a fact which undoubtedly contributed to the total defeat suffered by the none-too-strong Reutherites in the election.

UNSAVORY REPUTATION

The "Trade Union" slate had no Negro candidates; the Grudzen-Reuther and Stalinist slates had one each. Twice the Reutherite Negro's picture

was not printed in the local paper along with the others; the Stalinist's Negro candidate's picture was so foggy that he was unrecognizable.

The FEPC committee, which up to this time has occupied itself with writing strong letters of protest, carried out a zero-hour attempt to obtain service for Negroes in a restaurant, which met with failure as the Hamtramck cops refused to enforce the Michigan Digs Civil Rights Law, insulted the members involved, and forcibly removed them from the place.

Dodge Local has long had the unsavory reputation in union circles of being about the most Jim Crow local

in Detroit. Certain departments hold Jim Crow dances; anti-Negro remarks are heard from stewards on up, even in the union hall. During the strike Negroes on some strike committees were segregated into their own working groups. No attempt has been made at education except for news articles in the shop paper and the presentation of a union anti-discrimination play on a weekday night. The FEPC committee contents itself with its correspondence.

A progressive leadership should have attacked this problem long ago, above all during the strike last spring when morale and union solidarity were high.

Negro Sharecroppers Case Won By WDL from Arkansas Jury

HELENA, Ark. (WDL)—The Arkansas landlords, the Cox brothers, and M. C. Nabors, a foreman, must pay \$425 damages to two Negro sharecroppers whom they forcibly ousted from their plantation.

This was the verdict in a damage suit brought by the two Negroes, James Hawkins and William Henderson, with the aid of the Workers Defense League. Ross Robley and Elmer Scoggins, WDL attorneys, represented them when the case was tried in Helena March 14-24.

Of the \$425 awarded, \$375 was for the value of their share of the crop and their possessions which were confiscated after the eviction and \$50 was punitive damages.

The all-white jury which tried them included seven planters. Two Negroes who had been on the panel were rejected after being challenged by the landlords.

"The evidence on behalf of the

sharecroppers was so clear that it would have been difficult for a jury to award no damages at all," Rowland Watts, Workers Defense League national secretary, commented. "While the amount of the award is inadequate, the fact that damages were won at all sets a precedent. Representatives of the National Farm Labor Union say it was the first recovery by sharecroppers which has come to their attention."

Henderson and Hawkins charged that their possessions were confiscated and that they were ousted from the plantation after an unsuccessful attempt by the Cox brothers to chisel an increased share of the crop. Workers Defense League investigators took the men and their families to Chicago for safety and had its attorneys file suit on their behalf. The original suit was for \$3,000. In addition, Hawkins, who was beaten seriously during the eviction, sought \$10,000 in personal damages.

Expand Witch Hunt in New Maryland 'Subversive' Law

BALTIMORE—Maryland's infamous "Subversive Activities Act of 1949," popularly known as the Ober Bill, was signed by Governor Lane on March 27. Two days later the Legislature passed an amendment to put it into effect immediately, without waiting for the June 1 date when other bills go into effect. The purpose of the amendment was to forestall a move for a referendum and so delay the effect of the bill until after the 1950 general elections.

The aim of the act is to outlaw "subversive" organizations, which are defined as organizations which "engage in or advocate, abet, advise or teach" the overthrow of the government by "revolution, force or violence."

The act makes it legal for the state to dissolve "subversive" organizations and take over their records and funds. It will then become a felony for anyone to be a member of such an organization or, as an individual, to teach or advocate the activities described as subversive. A special assistant attorney general will be appointed to administer the act.

The preamble to the act describes the activities of the world Communist Parties and then makes the sweeping statement that "other subversive groups have had similar objectives," thus making it possible to lump with the Stalinists all anti-capitalist organizations seeking to change the present system. (Of course, the act ignores the fact that practically all anti-capitalist groups, particularly the socialists, have opposed the Stalinist Communist Parties consistently, even when the U. S. government was officially working with them during the war.)

The act also requires a loyalty oath of all state, city and county employees, and private educational institutions will not be given any state aid until they have proved that they are also making a loyalty check of their employees.

The Maryland Civil Liberties Committee, in opposing the bill, pointed

out many of the dangers. They say it will shut off the flow of ideas by imposing criminal penalties upon their advocacy, and upon mere association with those who advocate such ideas; that the "power of investigation will become an instrument of oppression," particularly since the act permits state police and department heads in every public office to do their own investigating.

In opposing the interference with academic freedom, the Maryland Civil Liberties Committee asks two pointed questions: "Where does the criticism of domestic policy end and disloyalty begin? At what point does approval of Marxian economic theories become subversive?" The act merely duplicates federal activities against sabotage and espionage, says the Civil Liberties Committee, and communist ideas cannot be defeated by suppression, but only by "education, economic security and the strengthening of democratic institutions."

There was a time when American statesmen had the courage to stand up and say to the world that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, [the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness], it is the right of the people to alter and abolish it, and to institute new government. . . ." But as we all know, our Declaration of Independence was written in the days when our commercial class was revolting against the restrictions of the English commercial class.

Times have changed, but the ruling class still acts in its own interests, and those interests demand that the present government should not be changed. In colonial times the commercial class called it patriotic to "alter and abolish" the English colonial government which limited their rights to expand and profit; today it is called "subversive" for the mass of the people to want to "alter and abolish" the government which puts the rights of the huge industrial profit takers above the human rights of the people.

Liberals Ardor Cooled By Taft-Hartley Stall

By WYATT LEE

The camp meeting is breaking up, the revivalist frenzy has ebbed and the hallelujah shouters are beginning to sing another tune. The glow of that wondrous day, last November 3, when the notorious 80th Congress was swept aside in a Democratic victory that promised a second coming of the New Deal, has worn off.

The Democratic 81st Congress has been in session for over three months and each day it grows closer to the image of its predecessor, the Republican 80th. Not a single Truman campaign promise has been kept, unless one would charitably count the butchered rent control extension.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, conceded by everyone to be a clear mandate of the voters, has not been accomplished, nor does it appear likely. As reported in LABOR ACTION last week a new bill devised by Georgia's Democratic Representative John S. Wood, contains all the provisions of the T-H Act and labor is quite apt to be saddled with the same old law under a Democratic name.

STILL ANOTHER CONGRESS?

The wind of harsh reality is cooling the enthusiasm of the liberal and labor leaders who saw in Truman's election a bright new world. Even Senator Hubert Humphrey, Minnesota's boy wonder and hope of the liberals, concedes defeat.

It will take the election of a new Congress, he is reported to have said, to put over the repeal of the T-H Act.

Another commentator, the columnist Marquis Childs, says in astonishment, "No one could possibly have guessed on November 3 that the present situation would exist."

"If Congress were to act today on labor legislation, the strong likelihood is that the T-H Act restrictions would be tightened rather than re-

laxed. Whether the act will come up in this session is an open question," he adds.

Childs blames the "changed political climate" on the miners' holiday and a newspaper pressmen's strike in Washington, an interpretation characteristic of frightened "friends of labor."

TRUMAN NOT WORRIED

One man, at least, has retained his equanimity in the face of this recalcitrant Congress. Truman, in a letter to the convention of the Americans for Democratic Action, said: "I do not worry over the petty and temporary victories of obstructionists."

Truman does not worry, Humphrey wants a new Congress and Childs complains that labor is "irritating" Congress! No one, except the millions of voters who thought they were getting rid of the Taft-Hartley Act and all laws like it, appears to be unduly alarmed.

What would alarm these people are signs that the American workers are getting fed up with empty campaign promises, double-dealing delay and outright subservience to Washington lobbies. Disillusion with the politics of capitalism is the real danger.

SAME OLD STORY

"I hope that all Americans of whatever political faith will not lose sight of our recent political victory," Truman said with genuine concern in his letter to the ADA. Let no one assay that victory with a test of actions taken since the elections!

The liberals and labor men meeting at the ADA convention could do little more than bewail the treachery of the Congress hailed so recently. With its strategy of a liberal-labor bloc within the Democratic Party, the ADA is prepared to traverse the same old road again.

The revival meeting is over, but the old-time religion still persists.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

Stalinist Strike Leaders Arrested; AFL Union Scabs

By JOE CLARK

A group of 12 Stalinists felt the heavy hand of American "justice" last week in Cleveland when they appeared before Common Pleas Judge James C. Connell. They were charged with a total of 44 acts of contempt against a court order banning violence and mass picketing at the plant of the Fawick Airflex Corp.

The strike has been going on for over a month and was called by Local 735 of the United Electrical Workers, CIO. The local was completely controlled by Stalinists. The strike has been marked by some quite spectacular events, including tough struggles with the police. But the strikers faced a terrific handicap from the start because of the refusal of their officers to sign the non-Communist affidavits. The company used this as an excuse to refuse any dealings with them at all.

The 12 union leaders, members and sympathizers were sent to county jail April 8 in default of a record-breaking total bond of \$2,000,000 set by the judge after he found them guilty. In handing out maximum penalties of 10 days in jail and a \$500 fine for each offense—a total of 440 days and \$22,000 in fines, plus court costs—the judge termed the strike a "phony" and ordered it "judiciously ended" by court decree.

He also banned all picketing of any sort at the plant. Paul Shepard, an organizer for Local 735, drew the top sentence: 80 days in county jail and \$4,000 fine on the eight counts. These sentences are far more severe than any heard of in Cleveland in connection with labor disturbances.

In his summation the judge said: "They marched behind the American

flag but they dragged it in the dirt and used it only as a shield. They had a good time while they were at it, helping another country than ours." No reference was made to communism or communists but the court continually referred to the defendants as "the un-American side" while the company, company attorneys and scab workers were called "the American side."

Marie Reed, one of the strike leaders, was the first to be sentenced. Said the judge: "It is too bad that with her mental attainments [she is a Vassar graduate] she gets men on her side into so much trouble. She thinks she is some kind of Joan of Arc, but Joan of Arc suffered for her country while this lady makes her country suffer." The sentence: 50 days in jail and \$2,500 fine. Bond was set at \$250,000.

At its meeting of April 6 the Cleveland Federation of Labor (AFL) voted full support to the organizing activities of its affiliated United Automobile Workers (AFL) at the strikebound plant, though three of the delegates assailed the action as "strikebreaking." William Finegan, executive secretary of the CFL, advised the delegates that "support of the UAW did not conflict with the federation's announced policy of not participating in organizing activities against unions engaged in legitimate strikes against employers for improved working conditions or increased wages." Two of the striking CIO unionists asked for and were refused permission to present their views of the strike and its issues to the delegates. Every day the AFL members go to work at the strike-bound plant with police protection.

Anna L. Strong Reveals Russian GPU Police Terror, But Remains Stalinist Apologist

By JACK BRAD

Anna Louise Strong, who was expelled from Russia as a "spy" last month after 27 years of apologizing for everything Stalinist, has just published a series of articles on her arrest and jailing in Moscow.

These articles received wide attention because of the importance of the incident in which she was the key figure and because many of its aspects remain shrouded in obscurity. These articles were printed in the New York Herald Tribune and syndicated to scores of daily papers throughout the country.

People who expected a "confession" à la Budenz or Kravchenko were disappointed. She is disheartened, severely shocked, but disillusionment is too strong a term for her present state of mind; disenchantment is closer to it.

She writes that she wants: "a quick start again somewhere, with a still energetic body and a much enlightened brain. Not to waste any more of my few years left." But there is more of pathos than reality in this. For, at the age of 63, like many another who has become housebroken by Stalinism, she lacks the habit of independence of thought. Her thought patterns are in disarray as a result of her adventure but they are still held to the central axis of Stalinism. After all, at the end of this love affair with Stalinism that has lasted almost three decades, it is she who is spurned; the rejected are seldom aggressively independent.

"TRY TO EXPLAIN . . ."

In 1921 Anna Strong arrived in Russia. She was attracted by the golden promise of the revolution. She imagined herself to be following in the footsteps of John Reed, whom she admired immensely. She was an idealist in those days. "I have met Trotsky and he is a most fascinating man," she wrote then. And now she comments: "In 1922, to green foreigners, Trotsky was the Soviet state embodied." And the difference between then and now appears in her very next sentence: "Try to explain that now to any Russian."

When the revolutionary wave subsided and gave way to reaction, Anna Strong did not perceive the change. She became part of the Stalin apparatus. She continued to pour out paeans of praise, but it was now praise for the counter-revolution. For this task her idealism became an obstacle. So she trained herself to overlook the truth, to omit unpleasant-tries, to reject all criticism as "attacks by enemies of the Soviet Union."

When the commissar drags out her records for signature she understands she is witnessing the fabrication of a confession. There was her letter

praising Trotsky written in 1922; a letter to her husband, wondering if a particularly brutal piece of injustice was really necessary; a notebook of production statistics taken from the Moscow Daily News of 1932, which she herself had edited; a bunch of letters from Wall Street in 1925, when she had acted as an agent for the Russian state NEP "to see whether American capitalists might be interested in investments"—imagine what a Vishinsky could do with that!—correspondence with the North American Newspaper Alliance for opening radio communication with Stalinist China.

Her knowing comment on this mass of material is: "I knew what this man could do with this."

REMAINS BLIND

All these she signed, as well as carefully selected excerpts from hundreds of other articles which could properly be misinterpreted by the MVD when taken out of context. She realized that a dossier was being prepared so that "the commissar would prove his case to the satisfaction of every Russian" by her very own signed "confession." The term reveals that she had an inkling of the truth about the Moscow Trials of the middle 30s which she had defended vehemently.

To an objective observer this incident is full of insights on the callous disregard for any vestige of truth by the ruthless ruling bureaucracy. But Anna Strong rises to the defense of her tormentors. She explains that this is all a product of the cold war, out of which has come widespread fear, and that this is why she is treated in this fashion. By the trick of raising her experience to another plane she tries to explain it away. She remains tragically blind.

What she reveals, however, is more than she could possibly have intended. "I was awakened from bed in Warsaw, taken to jail by three armed men, kept there five days under frequent questioning and then put over the Polish border at a lonely river on a broken bridge." She was never told the charges against her, never given an opportunity to defend herself.

"I was awakened from bed" is the phrase of terror with which she opens her articles. For the MVD works at night. This is true even inside the prison. She is questioned at night. Almost all the business is conducted at night.

TECHNIQUE OF TERROR

Perhaps most interesting are the things that did not happen but which she constantly expects—things which Strong would reject as outright calumny if she saw them printed elsewhere, and things she has specifically

denied in the past. When she was taken to a physical examination she "wondered in panic if she [the nurse] was deciding how much I could stand." Later, when her examination is over, she thinks: "they're not going to be brutes, not yet anyway." She was not beaten or tortured but she expected to be, because it has happened before—it is customary.

She notes the technique of terror: "No prisoner must be allowed to see another." Through fear and deliberately created uncertainty her personality is weakened: "They pointed and I went. I began to think I must be a docile prisoner. Nobody had ever called me docile before. I was scared stiff and dazed." The warden asks her about her health, and she thinks: "for hard labor in the woods." These things did not happen to Anna Strong but she fully expected them, thereby revealing the truth.

Why was she arrested and expelled? Her answer is as speculative as anyone else's since she was not presented with specific charges. She does believe, however, that it was her quest to go to China which caused her predicament.

From this she constructed a theory about the closed Manchurian frontier and the fear on the part of the Russians that if she were given a visa it would become known that pro-Stalinists were passing over the border and this might in some manner antagonize the Kuomintang government in Nanking. Russia is supposedly interested in maintaining these relations intact and friendly "maybe to get concessions in Sinkiang from Chiang's collapsing gang and so keep out an American air base that might atom-bomb their interior."

These explanations are arrant nonsense. Moscow has had a 100 per cent monopoly of air-landing rights in Sinkiang since 1936. Current rumor has it that this monopoly has just been renewed in a secret treaty with Nanking. In addition, five hsien (counties) in North Sinkiang have split off of form a pro-Russian satellite state. The U. S. has never expressed any desire for bases there, and understandably so. From a military viewpoint nothing would be more preposterous. Such a base would not only be extremely expensive but would also be lost at the first shot, since it would be located some 10,000 miles from the U. S., right on the Russian border.

Strong's "explanation" only raises the question instead of answering it. Why do the Russians maintain cordial relations with Nanking at this time? Specifically, as to Sinkiang, does Strong mean to imply that the Russians find it easier to deal with Nanking than with Mao Tze-tung on concessions there?

As for the closed border, elsewhere in her articles she points out that this road was never closed to "special" visitors. It is difficult indeed to see what Nanking could do about people crossing from the Russian side of the border. What is important is that the Russians do maintain such very close vigilance and do strictly restrict travelers. Indicative of the degree to which her mind is poisoned is her acceptance of such border control.

Throughout her articles she points up her intimate connections with the Chinese CP. She was returning to China at the express invitation of the party there. In Europe and Russia she constantly met with and became identified with Chinese Stalinists. Since 1937 her arena of activities had shifted from Moscow to China. On the very day before her arrest she had made contact with the Chinese CP delegate to the World Federation of Trade Unions and had asked his intervention on her behalf with the Russians.

This is the source of the trouble—but why? On this crucial matter we are still left to speculation. The only plausible answer that covers the known facts is that there is disagreement between the Kremlin and Mao Tze-tung over basic Chinese policy and Anna Louise Strong fell victim to this dispute, as a symbol of Kremlin displeasure with her transfer of allegiance to the Chinese party and as a warning to them.

In previous articles in LABOR ACTION this idea has been elaborated. It holds up under the additional information contained in Strong's articles. Incidentally, "after a considerable passage of time the Chinese CP has also pronounced her "a notorious spy."

FELLOW TRAVELER TRAGEDY

Anna Strong has been torn bodily from her past. The deeply-grooved thought patterns of her mind have been violated. People with whom she was on closest terms of friendship for decades are now cut off from her not only by her expulsion but also by the anathema that has been pronounced against her. She is cut away from pro-Russian circles everywhere. Her tragedy lies in her inability to break out of these now useless patterns.

She remains, in these articles, a Stalinist apologist. Thus she can say at a lecture in New York last week that "freedom is not a major issue in the world today, but peace is." Having discarded freedom, she points to the U. S. as the threat to peace. Russia is absolved by a trick of verbal legerdemain which Stalinism employs increasingly to catch the unwary: Russian is a "socialist" state. Lenin pointed out that only capital-

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

"Packages Abroad"

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

THE HISTORICAL MEANING OF CHINESE COMMUNISM

Thursday, May 12
ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER, JR.
Author of "The Age of Jackson"
TRUMAN—HEIR OR EPIGONE OF THE NEW DEAL?

Thursday, May 19
DWIGHT MACDONALD
Editor of "Politics"
GOODBYE TO UTOPIA

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

May Day Greetings

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

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

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

Editorials

Will There Be "Peace" In Two Years?

Will the Atlantic Pact bring peace, as per Truman's promise? The president not only promises peace, but also sets his own deadline—two years.

By "peace," of course, he (and we) mean the end of the threat of war.

In view of this brash prediction on Truman's part, we might as well say the following now, in foresight, rather than two years from now, in hindsight.

Two years from now, it is quite possible that Washington will be able to point to an apparent lull in the cold war, to a less openly tense world situation, to an illusory softening in the imperialist rivalry between West and East which now rages so publicly.

We are not under the illusion that either Washington or Moscow want war immediately or soon. We have said before and repeat again that the Third World War for which both are preparing so feverishly may not come for five, ten, or fifteen years. And it is unlikely that the nerve-taut tug-of-war between them can be continued at its present pitch for many more years.

The Washington administration is banking on the hope that the show of toughness in the Atlantic Pact, the arming of Europe to the teeth, the garrisoning of Europe with U. S. divisions—that all this will force the Kremlin to "back down," "play ball," talk more softly, "make concessions," etc., thereby easing the world atmosphere.

And so it may.

Truman, of course, will then hail the success of his "peace policy" and write himself down in the history books as the president who brought peace to a troubled world. There will be a different president in the White House when the harvest of the Atlantic Pact is reaped.

But that lull in the cold war, if and when it comes, will not be "peace." The road of imperialist war alliances, seemingly overwhelming to begin with, plus feverish armament, plus tough talk, is rather the inevitable precursor of the eventual war. Both sides prepare, both sides arm, both sides jockey for alliances and influence, until the time is ripe.

The process of overawing each other—"Scare Stalin!" or "Bluff the U. S.!"—which sounds to many ears like a "peace policy," and which can in fact last for a certain number of years as long as either side is really overawed, is only one of the channels through which the eventuality of war is ensured.

We suggest you remember that if and when Truman makes his "I-told-you-so" speech in 1951.

A Note on Progress And Civilization

Elsewhere in this issue we present an important summary of the official report of the U. S. Strategic Bombing Survey, in connection with Truman's atom-bomb statement.

One point that emerges has to be underlined. At the beginning of the war the general conception of military aviation strategy was the principle of selective bombing with the object of destroying certain specific targets, particularly military and economic concentrations. That is why the biggest secrets were the bomb-sights. The aviation men of all countries held to this idea.

During the war it became apparent that this was no longer an adequate working principle. Total war and modern technique had found means of reducing the effects of target bombing.

The Nazis were the first to employ bombing as a weapon of mass terror in the last war, as at Coventry. Based on the lessons of Nazi bombing over England and air surveys of the results of selective bombing by Allied planes, the air strategists concluded, toward the end of the war, that the most effective results were achieved by indiscriminate attacks on the whole population.

Air strategy became the strategy of mass terror. The war was brought directly to the whole people, not at their place of work but in their homes. Japan was the laboratory where these conceptions were tried out.

For this purpose the type of bomb and the type of aircraft had to be changed. The dive bomber or medium bomber of high maneuverability was replaced by the B-29 superfortress in which the size of the load was decisive. The explosive bomb was replaced by the incendiary.

The atomic bomb was the next step, in the technological sense, in the fulfillment of this conception of total war against urban populations.

The atomic bomb is not an aberration of military technology but fits into the pattern of military ideas. In this larger sense the atomic bomb is a preview of the next war.

Military principle has discovered in the people themselves the primary object of destruction!

WORLD POLITICS

British RR Workers' Poll Reveals Demand for Workers' Control

How do the British workers in nationalized industry feel about the new setup?

An interesting investigation in one such industry has been conducted by the weekly of the National Union of Railwaymen, *Railway Review*, and the results were analyzed in its columns by James Jary. The following is condensed from an article by J. Haston in the *British Socialist Appeal* for March.

A sampling of nearly 500 workers was used. To the first question: "Did you support the nationalization of the railways?" the replies were overwhelmingly Yes. Only 5.9 per cent said No, as against 88.7 per cent Yes. (The rest were doubtful or "no reply.")

The second question was: "After a year of national ownership, did you find your job: (a) Encouraging—more, less, about the same? (b) Frustrating: more, less, about the same?" The answers broke down as follows:

More encouraging 9.7%
About the same 45.5%
More frustrating 44.8%

Jary comments that these figures are "evidence that mere change of ownership has not created a change in the human relations within the industry. As a body, railwaymen are a patient lot, seldom hasty in their decisions, but the picture here revealed provides food for thought for those who bear the burden of organization and administration."

WORKERS WANT CONTROL

The third question: "Do you feel you have a share in running the railways?" Only a small percentage answered that they did—14.4 per cent. Answering No were 75.3 per cent.

"Are you satisfied with the way your Local Departmental Committee handles questions about working methods?" To this, 38.8 per cent said Yes, and 53.2 per cent No.

"Do you think you ought to be consulted before changed methods are introduced of working?"—96.9 per cent Yes, and 2.3 per cent No.

Summing up, Jary concludes: "The fundamental conclusion from this small survey is that railwaymen at the moment are in poor heart. They feel very disappointed that they have not been called on to exercise more influence in the shaping of a national transport service. They are not so much concerned about such material things as wages and hours as they might have been. But they do want to feel that they are a living part of this great enterprise."

"They know that they are intelligent and educated. They have a wealth of practical experience without which the theoreticians are inarticulate. All they ask is that they be given just a small opportunity consciously to participate in the management and direction of the service . . ."

On the background of the mood and aspirations of the railwaymen as revealed by this material, the speeches of the general secretary of the NUR, J. Figgins, at the last Labor Party conference and at the Trade Union Congress can be readily understood.

Figgins stated that the present setup was alien to the needs of the industry and the workers in it. He demanded that the unions be given the right to fully participate from top to bottom in the management and running of the industry. At the present moment only one of the members of the leading board can be said to be drawn from the workers' side of the industry, although even his connection with the union is now broken.

PROGRAM FOR SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

If the railway unions' demands for full participation are to have full effect, it is essential that nationally and in various divisions, they must develop a program, not only for the technical development of the industry, but for its social reconstruction. For this purpose, special conferences should be called throughout the country where the rank and file of railway workers of all grades and in the various unions would get down to examining all the problems of reorganization.

The editors of the *Railway Review* have consistently demanded that the present machinery be replaced by industrial organization based on each large unit, through the meetings of all the workers in the unit and its dependent sub-units. Each of the huge terminal units in the London area, sending delegates to a council covering the area as a whole, and so on for the rest of the country.

Representative industrial organs of this type are needed, with the legal right of access to all plans, documents and other data affecting operating and working conditions, and as the workers almost unanimously demand, with the equal right to be consulted before any changes in working conditions.

Such a reorganization would reveal a hitherto deep and untapped well of knowledge and resourcefulness, without which the forward drive to socialism is not possible.

A British Socialist View

Of all the European lands subjected, via the Marshall Plan, to the hegemony of Wall Street over the capitalist world, Britain is, today, the most dependent and is, in fact, no longer an independent nation. Few people in this country, in fact, seem to realize how far British enslavement to the USA has gone. For, over and above her obligations under the plan, which she shares with the other European debtor states, Britain is now actually an "occupied country," a military colony of the USA, to which the British ruling class and its political instrument, the Foreign Office (using Ernest Bevin as a convenient rubber stamp), have sold out as completely as the French bourgeoisie did to Hitler in 1940.

Not only is the United Kingdom now America's front trench in the only-too-probable event of war with Russia; but she is now actually already America's "floating aircraft carrier" and is already occupied by the armed forces of the American Republic—even before war has broken out. And, if and when it should eventually come, America will, no doubt, fight to the last Briton!

In a recent broadcast on the BBC on the subject of the recent Stalin-Tito correspondence, the Oxford historian A. J. P. Taylor, ended by expressing the hope that Britain would become America's "Tito"—that is, would display a similar independence toward America as Tito's Yugoslavia is now doing toward Russia!

A courageous hope! One may remark in passing that it is a disgrace to the British socialist movement that it should be left to an academic, "non-political" historian to say it.

We hope that Britain will, indeed, soon become America's "Tito." The sooner a nation-wide agitation for this end, and for the withdrawal of the American "occupying forces" from this country gets going, the better for everybody.

F. A. Ridley

(Socialist Leader, London, March 26)

MOVIE REVIEW

'Quiet One,' Picture of Twisted Childhood, Is Great Achievement

By HOWARD JAY

"The Quiet One" is a documentary study of a Harlem slum child and his partial recovery in a rehabilitation camp. It is a film deserving of the highest praise. However, lest the reader assume that only a social conscience requires him to see this picture, it should be stated at the outset that "The Quiet One" ranks, in my opinion, near the greatest work of the American cinema.

This superiority is not merely a matter of sincerity of purpose and honesty of treatment; one can recall any number of movies which equally boasted these virtues and yet failed to move the spectator as this short film does. Rather, it is precisely where "The Quiet One" differs from the usual commercial superproduction in the technical means employed to communicate such honest insight that its excellence is most apparent.

NATURAL TYPES

The typical superior Hollywood or French product is based upon the star system and the scenario—that is, upon the ascendancy of the actor and the spoken word over the image. "The Quiet One" employs only natural types right off the streets to fill the roles, and the scenario is reduced mainly to the commentator's text; consequently, instead of presenting a concept by means of verbal explanation as do the theater and the majority of bad pictures, the makers of this film translate all ideas into images.

All this is the natural resort of the low-budget movie, but it is also something more. The producers of "The Quiet One" have not only achieved greater realism, but, most important, have returned to the real basis of the art—to "let you see."

Even where the spoken word is employed in "The Quiet One," it is presented in counterpoint to the image—not in synchronization with the picture of the actor's moving lips. Again, this technique is necessary because untrained natural types cannot be expected unaided to put across a desired emotion by artificial gestures and subtle changes in expression.

But, once more, necessity proves a boon: this counterpoint of word and image makes for a range and richness not otherwise obtainable. There is, for example, the scene where the boy, fleeing from his foster home, returns to his mother. He is shown toying wistfully with the cheap knickknacks in the parlor which represent to him the comfort and love for which he yearns. But the sound track points up the futility of his search by reproducing the flat tired retorts of the mother and her man quarreling inside the other room.

THE PROBLEM IS POVERTY

"The Quiet One" merits consideration on two other counts: First, its relationship to the future of serious film production. It certainly makes it clear that the film as an art form is not necessarily dependent upon the concentrated wealth of large producers.

Second, the social impact of the film. Although all of the main characters are Negro, "The Quiet One" does not deal with the "Negro problem" as this problem is popularly understood. The only significance of the child's race in reference to his personality problem lies in the lower economic status of the Negro and his natural exposure to greater emotional insecurity arising from such poverty.

This mode of presentation is a wise one. The overwhelming fact in the Negro's life is not only the formal relations with the majority race—this does not, by itself, shape the psyche of an oppressed folk. And books or films which attempt to make of segregation and white intolerance the central pivot of Negro life often end by manufacturing puppets instead of breathing human beings.

Does "The Quiet One" offer any solution to this basic problem of poverty and degradation? Although the film succeeds in moving us by the primitive emotional appeal of an individual emerging from total darkness into partial sunlight, the mind is troubled by afterthoughts. To what "normal" world is he being restored? And how can this problem be even partially solved in the mass? The rehabilitation camp is not introduced into the film as any sort of adequate solution to the mass problem of broken slum children. Rather the camp serves merely as the simple narrational means of presenting one particular case history.

The film was produced by a new group known as Film Documents, headed by Janice Loeb. Directed by Sidney Meyers and photographed by Helen Levitt and Miss Loeb, the working script was prepared by all three. James Agee wrote the spoken commentary.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents
 One year (52 issues) at \$1.00

NAME.....
CITY..... (PLEASE PRINT) STATE.....

ADDRESS..... ZONE..... APT.....

Bill me Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

Science and War

SCIENTISTS WONDER IF MODERN KNOWLEDGE IS BOON OR CURSE

By JUSTIN GRAHAM

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology's mid-century convocation on scientific progress, now being held in Boston, is attracting world-wide interest. Not only is it one of the largest bodies of renowned scientific minds ever assembled in this country, but the purpose of the conference is more than a mere review of the scientific advances made in the 20th century.

It is evident from the addresses given there that the scientists are no longer content with painting an academic picture of their accomplishments. They are attempting a social appraisal of science.

That science will continue to progress, that new inventions and basic principles will be discovered and that these will come in ever greater numbers is taken for granted. What cannot be assumed, at least not any more, is that scientific progress is synonymous with human progress.

There has been a split in the development of science. On the one hand it has produced things of enormous benefit to mankind. Medicine has gone far in the conquest of infectious diseases, agriculturalists have developed new plants, chemists have discovered new fibers, drugs and flavors, engineers have given us electric lights, motors, automobiles and airplanes.

These are the instruments of life. But modern science has also given us instruments of death.

Two world wars, the most destructive in history, were fought with the aid of science and technology. Weighed against the blessings of science, the submarine, the high-explosive rocket and the atom bomb make questionable indeed the role of science in today's world. The development and production of ever more horrible instruments of destruction has become the specialty of 20th century technology.

It is not so much a question of the outcome of 20th century science as it is one of the misuse of science. Capitalism makes use of the good only incidentally; its use of the evil is overwhelming.

Science has made possible man's complete domination over nature. It has given us the machines and techniques to produce in abundance all the things needed for a full life. New houses can be built and automobiles for everyone, plenty of clothing, modern transportation developed (vacations in stratosphere). So great are the accomplishments of 20th century science that the working day can substantially be shortened! All that is required is the same use of what science has given us: the production of the essentials of peace in the same planned way that capitalism produces the essentials of war.

In a word—the scientific use of science. In another word—socialism.

These are the possibilities. But capitalism cannot realize them. The rise in productive capacity has resulted in an increase of monopolies rather than living standards. New machines bring layoffs instead of shorter hours. Man has split the atom and threatens to conquer space, but capitalism shows no signs that it can save from starvation an already impoverished world population that is growing at the rate of 200,000,000 every decade.

The development of science during the early years of the century inspired an attitude of naive faith. The idea arose that, given time, science, simply by a continuous succession of inventions and discoveries, would build a better world. The scientists themselves were caught up in this dream.

But, as often happens when dreams weigh too heavily upon us, they overslept. The mobilization of science for World War II, which culminated in the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima, brought about a rude awakening.

Practically everyone who had participated in the production of the bomb became horrified at their handiwork. A huge outcry rose from scientific quarters warning the world of the implications of the split atom. Many of the scientists swore to abstain from such work in the future. A feeling of responsibility weighed heavily upon them.

From what has been said at the M.I.T. convocation so far, this feeling remains. But apparently the effects of political pressure are greater than those of the A-bomb. The assembled scientists, who have discussed the problem from many angles (including the need for a spiritual development in man), realize that essentially it is a political problem.

CHURCHILL GIVES AN ANSWER

Since a political problem requires a political answer, Winston Churchill (the political man) was trotted out to give it.

Said Churchill: "It is certain that Europe would have been communized and London under bombardment some time ago but for the deterrent of the atom bomb in the hands of the United States." This is an answer which refuses to believe that there ever was a problem. What Churchill says in effect is: do not worry about the dangers of atomic destruction since the atom bomb is the greatest force for peace in the world.

Those who remember the periods preceding World Wars I and II will recognize an old friend here. It is the argument that preparation can avert war. Churchill himself unwittingly ridiculed this argument in an earlier part of his speech when he referred in passing to World War I. "But in the first decade of the 20th century with new patterns of wars, naval rivalries became acute and fierce. Civilized governments began to think in dreadnaughts. It was in such a setting very difficult to prevent the First World War."

Churchill's answer appears to have been satisfactory. Two days later it was echoed by Dr. James R. Killian. Upon his inauguration as the tenth president of M.I.T., he declared, "... we must be prepared with the men who can outwit any enemy in the design of weapons and countermeasures, and be able again to beat an enemy to the draw as we did in developing the atom bomb."

Dr. Killian will waste little time, no doubt, in joining Dr. Karl T. Compton, his predecessor, on the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment.

We do not know whether those assembled at M.I.T. understand the implications of Churchill's answer, but it is imperative that the masses of people do. Scientific developments progress geometrically. The more there are, the faster they come. The consequences of future discoveries, wrongly used, will be even more forbidding than the consequences of the atom bomb.

Reports to the M.I.T. convocation indicated that the early conquest of space is probable, that large-scale biological controls are possible. It was even said that ability to control man's thoughts with precision is by no means out of the question. Any of these is more awful in its implications than was the mushroom cloud of 1945.

It was the development of modern science, under capitalism, which evoked the idea of socialism and which makes it possible. It is the development of modern science, under capitalism, which also makes it necessary.

NEW YORK—MAY FIRST

May Day Meeting

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

Speakers: MAX SHACHTMAN, EMANUEL GARRETT, NATHAN GOULD

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

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. 16

April 18, 1949

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

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

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

Plan Permanent Garrison in Europe —

(Continued from page 1)
"Clay Tells Our Troops They'd Fight Attack," and "Clay Terms Pact a Pledge to Fight."

"General Clay stressed the fact that six months ago American arms in Europe were light. Today, he said, the constabulary was heavily armed and still highly mobile." (N. Y. Times, April 7.)

The real story from Europe in this connection, however, was not what Clay said; it was what he was looking at.

"Hundreds of guns, tanks and armored vehicles passed before Clay, who stood on a reviewing stand from which the flags of Britain, France and the United States waved. The Russian flag was conspicuous by its absence . . .

"The displays were in sharp contrast to the 1948 observance of Army Day when there was no attempt to make a show of U. S. military strength." (AP, N. Y. Post, April 7.)

"At more than twenty other cities in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, Austria and the Free Territory of Trieste, American arms and equipment also were displayed in ceremonies marking Army Day. The biggest parade was here [Grafenwoehr]. Some 3,500 men participated in formations . . ." (N. Y. Times, April 7.)

Writing in advance, the Times dispatch of April 4 stressed the political aspects more heavily:

"Most of the estimated 93,000 [U. S.] troops in Europe will take part in displays of military equipment, including new guns and tanks, that have been brought over here recently for the reorganized constab-

ulary. This force is now a crack combat outfit with its strength reinforced by a tank division. . . .

"The political overtones will be more marked in Trieste. Against a background of decorated U. S. navy ships anchored in the bay, the U. S. naval and marine contingents will join the infantry and tanks in full field equipment. . . .

"The chief difference between this year's Army Day celebration in Europe and that of last year is the decision to hold major formations. Last year while all the troop centers participated, the parades were only a token display of military strength."

Last year the Atlantic Pact, which "ensures peace," had not yet been signed. These speeches, these American troops marching over the face of Europe—what does it add up to? For fear that the reader will ascribe a summary in our own words to "propaganda," we quote the editorial of the N. Y. Times again, keeping in mind its inspired character:

"The fundamental strategic concept underlying all these pronouncements . . . is clear and unanimously agreed upon. It is that we must at all cost prevent Western Europe from being overrun by a new conqueror, and that in consequence our military frontiers are not, as some Europeans have feared, on the Atlantic, or in Britain, or at the Pyrenees, or even at the Rhine, but at the Iron Curtain itself, which means Berlin, the Elbe, the Danube, and Trieste.

"They are there, for one reason, because that is where our occupation troops stand today."

The hardheadedness of this imperialist strategy cannot be denied. Rather one should wonder at the

softpates who think that Germany is under occupation in order to "teach the Germans self-government," or something of that sort. For one thing, it is clear, from the viewpoint of the "strategic concept" outlined, that the occupation of Germany is today only a part of the whole. It is Western Europe which is under American occupation.

THE "STRATEGIC CONCEPT"

But the hardheadedness of this strategy does not lie in purely military considerations. A case for this could be made out only if the Times demand for an occupation army "strong enough to keep any aggressor in check" at the moment of the aggression, could really be realized. But it would take the major part of the whole U. S. armed establishment even to make a show of such a promise, considering the size of the Russian land forces!

We venture a different answer. Frankly it is not much of a venture since its role in Washington policy has already been documented to the hilt with regard to Roosevelt's strategy for getting the country into the Second World War (in the devastating exposé by Professor Charles Beard, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War*).

The problem before the Washington war planners is in the first instance political and not military: how to make sure that the U. S. jumps into the war on the first day. Atlantic Pact or no, the start of hostilities between Russia and Norway is not going to stampede Congress into declaring war, at least not easily. As Professor Beard proved, Roosevelt deliberately set about drawing blood. The "sneak attack" at Pearl Harbor (that is, some attack on U. S. forces) was a political necessity for him in order to accomplish what he had already decided:

throwing the country into the war. There were no U. S. troops in Europe then to be attacked.

The U. S. troops peppered along the borders of the Iron Curtain will not be there to "keep any aggressor in check." They are a stake-out—the fat calf tied to the tree to draw out the bear!

Such is the "fundamental strategic concept" of the occupation of Western Europe. This is how the Third World War is planned to start.

VICIOUS CIRCLE

The United States frontier is at the Iron Curtain, says the Times, "because that is where our occupation troops stand today." And why, in turn, do the occupation troops stand there today? Because, forsooth, our frontier is at the Iron Curtain. And so on, round the circle.

The vicious circle has got to be broken. The "strategic concept" makes sure that any and every "incident" on the Iron Curtain frontier automatically becomes the war between the U. S. and Russia—if indeed it does not sooner ensure the possibility of the provocation of such an incident! The occupation of Western Europe by American troops ensures that justified hatred of the Stalinist tyranny by the occupied peoples will tend to be shadowed by equally justified hatred of the foreign "cold invader" whose "crack divisions" and tanks march and countermarch over their lands.

The "strategic concept" of Washington is no longer built on the now-familiar "cold war." It is for a "cold invasion" of Western Europe.

As General Clay boasted, this cold invasion has already gotten under way. Opposition to the Third World War now means: Demand the withdrawal of the armed forces of the United States from Europe!

Chicken Feed

In the recently published biography of J. P. Morgan by Frederick Lewis Allen, according to Newsweek, the author tells about "Morgan's intervention in the second Cleveland administration when the United States was drained of its gold specie and faced financial disaster. Morgan formed a syndicate to obtain gold from abroad. Like two plenipotentiaries of an independent state of more ample resources than the government, Morgan and August Belmont privately stemmed the tide of escaping gold.

"There were screams. Morgan was accused of making a huge profit by his actions. . . .

"The truth is, says Allen, the total profit was \$1,534,516.72, and he thinks that a small fee for the long and complex and risky operations involved in the unprecedented undertaking."

It's strange how people WILL make a fuss about trifles. They just don't understand patriotism when they see it.

Maverick Capitalist

Multi-millionaire Joseph E. Uihlein, 73, who made his millions from Schlitz beer, has decided to devote the rest of his life to helping white-collar workers organize into unions. His popularity among friends in Milwaukee has waned since he came out with the statement:

"I've been thinking about this for years. I began to discover that a lot of these people of wealth are not deserving of what they possess. I found something was wrong with the wealthy class. I think a whole lot of them would be better off if they had to work."

As a capitalist, Uihlein is something of a freak, but he's latched onto something there. It also makes us feel better about abolishing capitalism when we know that the Sixty Families and their scions will be a lot better off working for a living, for a change.

Congress Bloc Tame —

(Continued from page 1)

The Senate: "We are delighted with the result, particularly that the vote was 70 to 7. We think when the news strikes Europe it will mean a great deal to the morale of the people of those countries."

"What 'people' do men like Hoffman have in mind? Whose morale is being fortified? Governments, as governments and as owners of industry, are strengthened by ERP, as are private capitalists, both willingly tying their interests to the war plans of the colossus of the West. But there is proof that the workers and peasants of the ERP countries are not the direct beneficiaries of ERP aid.

Many people think of the Marshall Plan as a great charity to alleviate the sufferings of the gaunt, starved, sick, unclothed and unhoused millions almost buried in post-war ruins. It is true that the edge has been taken off this extreme suffering. But the misery of the masses is still overwhelming. Low wages, high prices, black markets, lack of consumer goods and housing combine to make a miserable standard of living. Today the Marshall Plan is not directed toward raising that standard of living, but toward strengthening heavy industry of Western Europe for war production and toward increasing production for an export market.

Not one of the senators of the great American democracy rose to offer an amendment to the ERP renewal bill requiring a reallocation of funds to increase personal consumption and raise the standard of living of the European people. Less personal consumption and more military expenditures is okay with Congress.

kilograms per capita in 1947-48, against a pre-war average of 192; consumption of fats and oils was 17, against a pre-war level of 24. These figures apply to ERP countries as a whole.

In Great Britain, we find, the percentage of national income spent on personal consumption was 78 in 1938, in 1947 it was 70, and under ERP planning for 1948 it was reduced to 69. The latest "austerity budget" for Great Britain takes away 45 per cent of a worker's pay in income tax, imposes sales taxes amounting to 33-1/3 per cent on clothing and 100 per cent on what are designated as luxuries. At the same time this austerity budget increases military expenditures 10 per cent over the preceding year.

Let us develop further the picture of how ERP works. A New York Times report from Norway, an ERP country, reads: [Norway] has reduced her living standards to the point of diminishing returns. . . . The actuality is that the combination of high taxes and low consumption is depriving workers of the incentive to produce. The workers are losing interest in overtime pay since there is very little on which to spend extra money."

HOW ERP WORKS

Further, we read in the Winter issue of the magazine Politics that the first six months of 1948 the net increase in productive plant in France was four times greater than it was during the whole of 1938. In contrast, here's an example of workers' wages: Paris street railway workers earn 20 to 28 cents an hour; in other cities the rate is 5 to 25 per cent less.

Martin French relates in Politics the visit of American and French journalists to a factory at Epinal, France, where ERP-aid cotton was going into production. The owners served champagne for the occasion. But working at the machines were young girls—minimum legal age is fourteen—who slave 48 hours a week for not quite \$4.00 pay. Mr. French points out that in this ERP transaction, the American cotton grower gains, the French government gains and the French capitalist gains through having a sure supply of raw material of better quality at reasonable (not black market) prices. But certainly the young girls earning not quite \$4.00 a week can't buy the products they help produce.

Sharply contrasted with the rise in industrial production to well above pre-war levels is the status of per-capita consumption. To illustrate, consumption of bread grains was 159

CONSUMPTION LOW

In line with this objective, while for most Western European countries the end of 1947 saw industrial output exceeding that of pre-war levels, agriculture was still 11 per cent below pre-war levels. Production of food in general lags behind in ERP countries.

Sharply contrasted with the rise in industrial production to well above pre-war levels is the status of per-capita consumption. To illustrate, consumption of bread grains was 159

N.Y. Cabbies Lose; Lewis Men Did Bad Job

NEW YORK—The Taxi Workers Organizing Committee of the United Mine Workers District 50 called off the New York City cabbies' strike last Saturday. This was a mere recognition of the outcome, as most of the strikers had already gone back to work.

This defeat was from all indications not a result of the lack of militancy of the taxi drivers. They were thwarted by a combination of the tactics of the cab owners and the cooperating city administration, the opposition of many of the independent driver-owners, and the extremely poor organization of the much-vaunted United Mine Workers' representatives.

The men were out solid the first few days; then while the strike was still officially on, more and more slipped back to work until midtown Manhattan traffic again resembled the usual snarl. Scabs were given police escort. Threats of loss of licenses and delays in rehiring were spread. The largest organization of driver-owners openly opposed the strike.

But worst of all was the poor prepara-

tion of the men who had established such a great reputation as organizers in the coal fields and in the early drives of the CIO. Not a single mass meeting was reported held. Strike bulletins were few. Strike relief was not forthcoming. The lack of enthusiasm of the striking drivers was a result.

The basic point at issue was the union's demand for recognition, and the owners' insistence that a State Labor Relations Board election come first. On the heels of its defeat, the union is now petitioning for such an election.

Repercussions of the strike are still being felt. The union has filed fifty charges of unfair labor practices with the SLRB, most of them accusations of firings and blacklisting of strikers. On the other hand, the League of Mutual Taxi-Owners, an organization of driver-owners, has filed a \$3,000,000 damage suit against John L. Lewis and the Mine Workers Union for attempting to set up a "monopoly in restraint of trade" in the New York taxi industry.

Palestine Armistice Signed By Israel and Transjordan

By AL FINDLEY

An armistice between Israel and Transjordan was signed on Monday, April 4, after only a month of negotiations. The actual signing of this, the most important single agreement in the series of armistices between Israel and its neighbors, came almost as an anticlimax and did not make big headlines.

The armistice between Israel and Transjordan leaves only an agreement with Syria to be concluded. Concurrently with the signing of this armistice, Dr. Ralph Bunche announced that formal negotiations with Syria, which had been delayed as a result of the coup in that country, would begin soon.

The armistice with Transjordan follows the same pattern as the previous agreements. In essence, all that it does is to codify the existing military lines. It is declared to have been worked out in accordance with UN resolutions and "to facilitate transition from the present truce to a permanent peace."

Each party agrees that no aggressive action will be taken, and that neither is to gain military or political advantage from the truce. Jerusalem is in fact partitioned, with the old city going to Abdullah and the new city to Israel. In addition, Abdullah is permitted formally to take over the sector of the front held by the Iraqi army. Many details of the working-out of the armistice have been left to a mixed committee.

While it is specifically stated that none of the armistice demarcation lines should be allowed to prejudice "future territorial settlement," there are few so naive as to believe that they will vary much from the present lines. Thus this agreement covers the boundaries over the "greater part of Palestine."

INTERESTING POINTS

In general, it can be said that both

(Continued from page 1)

The last year of the war, in Japanese politics, is a story of secret intrigue as different factions sought formulas to end the war on terms most advantageous to themselves.

The story that military strategy presented the U. S. with the alternatives of invasion or atom-bombing does not hold up under examination. By the time invasion had become a practical possibility, important sections of the ruling group in Japan had already decided on a peace policy.

"Testimony before the survey shows that the expected 'violation of the sacred homeland' raised new fears which expedited the decision to surrender beforehand. The responsible leaders in power read correctly the true situation and embraced surrender well before invasion was expected." (Page 12, *ibid.*)

The fall of Tojo in November 1944 actually signified the fall of the war-to-the-bitter-end party and the beginning of a policy of adjustment to the prospects of defeat. By "early 1945 . . . the enemy's principal problem was to give expression to its political decision to end the war." A clear decision for surrender had been taken with the emperor's consent. Admiral Suzuki, who became premier on April 8, 1945, stated that "it was the emperor's desire to make every effort to bring the war to a conclusion as quickly as possible, and that was my purpose." A sort of palace coup had been engineered at the emperor's behest and the party of surrender had taken political control.

ALLIES REFUSED PEACE
By the middle of May this policy had proceeded so far that indirect overtures for peace were made. Suzuki sent a representative to the Russian ambassador in Tokyo to sound out "the Russian attitude toward interfering with America." Simultaneously the Japanese ambassador in Moscow was instructed to prepare the way for discussions for "Russian intervention to end the war." Whether or not Russia communicated these advances to Washington is not known. We must presume they did.

The Russians refused in both instances to accept the Japanese proposal. It is of crucial importance to understand the reason for this rejection. For here was an opportunity to end the war four months before the atomic bombs killed one hundred and twenty thousand people.

The Russians were not yet in the war. Even though at Yalta the secret agreement with Roosevelt and Churchill had already made her the heir to the Japanese empire on the Asiatic continent, Russia could never be sure of these vast territories unless she actually entered the war and occupied them with her armies. In protracted peace negotiations, before such a Russian entry, a new balance of forces might emerge. Such negotiations could only take place, of course, between the warring powers—of which Russia was then not one. Peace presented the danger that the

Russians would be unable to take the conquests they had been granted. For the American government to carry out its part of the Yalta bargain it was also necessary that Russia fulfill her secret pledge to go to war against Japan.

The Japanese peace overtures of May 1945 were rejected because continued war was essential to Russia and America in order to carry out their planned division of Asia. This is the sordid inner history which is the background for the Bomb.

CATEGORIC ANSWER

Was use of the Bomb "justifiable" under these circumstances? Did the Bomb prevent an invasion and thereby shorten the war? The survey is categorical:

"The Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombs did not defeat Japan, nor by the testimony of the enemy leaders who ended the war did they persuade Japan to accept unconditional surrender. The emperor, the lord privy seal, the prime minister, the foreign minister and the navy minister had decided as early as May of 1945 that the war should be ended even if it meant acceptance of defeat on Allied terms." (Page 12, *ibid.*)

"It seems clear, however, that in extremis the peacemakers would have peace and peace on any terms." (Page 13, *ibid.*) The most the survey grants is that the Bomb "did forestall the war and expedite the peace." However, no evidence what-

soever is presented to prove even this secondary claim, by contrast with the volumes of evidence to the contrary.

Indeed, the final verdict of the survey takes up precisely this question. How long could Japan have held out without the Bomb and without invasion, that is, by how much did the Bomb "foreshorten" the war?

"Based on a detailed investigation of all the facts and supported by the testimony of the surviving Japanese leaders involved, it is the survey's opinion that certainly prior to 31 December 1945, and in all probability prior to November 1, 1945, Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated." (Page 13, *ibid.*)

IGNORANT?

Therefore, when Truman postures as the savior of half a million people through the use of the Bomb one can only wonder whether he speaks out of hypocrisy or ignorance. He takes full responsibility for unleashing this weapon. Whatever the original

motive was, according to the evidence of the USSBS, it was not a "necessary" blow in a military sense. It did not play the overwhelmingly decisive role Truman now assigns to it in order to justify it.

It may be argued—and to certain extent justifiably—that the survey reports were made after the war and are based on hindsight. But that does not set aside the Japanese pleas to Russia in early 1945, the rejection of which has never been explained. Also, the army recently made public a report on the Sorge spy ring, describing the ring as the most successful in all history with approaches to the innermost circles in Tokyo. Surely some intelligence must have been received from that quarter! It is difficult to believe that the U. S. had such poor sources of information as not to know approximately the state of affairs.

Whatever the real reasons for using the Bomb, the verdict of history is that they were released after the real military decision was already in.

It is time to make these facts public. It is time to destroy the myth which attempts to justify one of the greatest horrors of all time.

CCNY Students Strike —

(Continued from page 1)
solidarity and courage of the student body carried.

PICKET LINES GOING

After that large and well-managed picket lines were formed. The Student Council Strike Committee kept things well in hand. Students were relieved at regular intervals for lunch. A large number of students volunteered to give their blood for sale to raise strike funds. At four o'clock the picket lines were reduced to token forces in order to give the students plenty of rest for an early start the next day.

The evening session students will vote Monday night for a strike starting Tuesday.

The demand of the strikers, as voted in the referendum, is that the strike is to continue until action on the Knickerbocker and Davis cases is taken by the administration. "Action" was defined as suspension of both men pending open trials by the Board of Higher Education. The enthusiasm of the students seems strong enough to keep the strike going for another two days until Thursday when the Easter vacation begins.

The administration does not wish to have its vested authority impaired by yielding to the democratic voice of the student body. It has ordered all tests to continue and all absences recorded. The outcome will depend upon the solidarity of the students.

BACKGROUND OF STRIKE

A detailed report on the Knickerbocker-Davis case has already appeared in LABOR ACTION (Youth and Student Corner). The affair was opened up again by the resignation of Judge Hubert T. Delaney from the alumni investigating committee on the ground that President Wright of CCNY was not assisting the in-

Gobbledygook

"If a period of lower productivity is ahead for some lines as the result of working off of backlogs built up during the war, the tendency may be to give employment priority, where possible, to the most efficient workers, with a new resultant lowering of unit production costs."—The Bidle Survey, April 1949.

Now, if they'd merely said: "Unemployment and speedup ahead," somebody might get the idea.

IN THE MARCH NEW INTERNATIONAL

Profile of Eisenhower by J. M. Fenwick DON'T MISS IT!

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

NEW YORK LABOR ACTION FORUM

April 24—ISAAC ROSENFELD War and the Novelist SUNDAY, 8 p.m., at 114 West 14th St., N. Y. C. 50 Cents (SYL: 25 Cents)

1947 BOUND VOLUMES OF LABOR ACTION \$3.00

Order from WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.