

WORK FOR A WORKERS WORLD;
JOIN THE WORKERS PARTY!

JULY 19, 1948

A PAPER IN THE INTEREST OF SOCIALISM



FIVE CENTS

LABOR ACTION

Wallace's Peacemongering Based on Dividing World Into Imperialist Spheres

By JACK BRAD

The new party of Wallace-Stalinism bases its existence upon its foreign policy. There is nothing in its program on national issues to differentiate it definitely from many other liberal and official labor groups. In fact, no other party had been formed in America primarily on questions of foreign policy until the Stalinists initiated their present political adventure with Wallace. The claim is made that the new party is the only party of peace, that its proposals alone can lead to world security, disarmament and strengthening of the United Nations.

Since the new party has no other public program than Wallace's pro-

The accompanying article is, so far as we know, the most up to date and most thorough survey of Wallace's foreign policy.



Jack Brad, organizer of Local New York of the Workers Party, has received wide acclaim for his articles in LABOR ACTION, particularly those on the Wallace-Stalinist party. His articles on Japan have been widely reprinted in the foreign press. His portrait of MacArthur was reprinted in the British Socialist Leader. He aroused particular interest with his exposure of Wallace's stand against lifting the embargo on arms to Israel. The story was picked up in a New Leader editorial two weeks ago, which cited Comrade Brad's article, and last week in the Socialist Call, which limited its identification of the source to "a left wing publication." Comrade Brad will cover the convention of the Wallace Party in Philadelphia for LABOR ACTION.

ouncements, and since Wallace as a public figure is THE party, it is essential to examine what Wallace himself has said and is saying on international questions. There is no question that the hunger for peace is universal, and the terror of the next war casts a black shadow on the lives and aspirations of all peoples. He who claims to be capable of bringing peace does indeed undertake a great deal, especially since Wallace's proposals are immediate: for peace within the present world and social framework, now in 1948.

The famous Madison Square Garden speech by Wallace on September 12, 1946, was the crucial and most complete expression till then of his thoughts on foreign problems. It was this speech which resulted in his resignation from Truman's cabinet.

Wallace said: "Russian ideals of social economic justice are going to govern nearly a third of the world. Our ideas of free enterprise will govern much of the rest. . . . By mutual agreement this competition should be put on a friendly basis, and the Russians should stop conniving against us in certain areas just as we should stop scheming against them in other parts of the world. . . ."

Aside from the question of just what "ideals of social economic justice" the Russians have introduced in Poland, the Baltic states and Czechoslovakia, or what "free enterprise" Standard Oil has introduced in the Near East, Wallace's initial premise is that these two different economic systems, both of which are expansionist and imperialist, can come to agreement by dividing the world between them.

Earlier in this speech Wallace divided the world into spheres as follows: "On our part, we should recognize that we have no more business in the political affairs of Eastern Europe than Russia has in the political affairs of Latin America, Western Europe and in the U. S." Since Latin America has been for many decades a field of American imperialism, the meaning of this sentence is clearly that Russia should have a Monroe Doctrine over Eastern Europe. This is not an attack on imperialism but a program for agreement between imperialisms. The people of Latin America are as little invited to speak up for themselves as are the Eastern Europeans. In fact, this speech aroused a furor in Latin America, where it was denounced as typical Yankee imperialism, which it is.

Driving home his point, Wallace then stated: "Once the fears of Russia and the United States have been allayed by PRACTICAL REGIONAL RESERVATIONS, I am sure that concern over the veto power will be greatly diminished. Then the UN would have a really great power in those areas which are truly international and not regional. In the world-wide, as distinguished from the regional field, the armed might of the UN should be so great as to make opposition useless."

The world, then, is to be divided between Russian rule over "nearly

(Continued on page 2)

TRUMAN NOMINATION PUTS LABOR LEADERS ON SPOT!

Ford Workers Slap T-H Act, Vote Solid for Union Shop

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT—If the results of the election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board at the Ford plants throughout America had been different, the news would have been plastered all over the front pages of the capitalist newspapers.

But the fact that 98 per cent of the Ford workers who turned out to vote approved the union shop was not a pleasant fact for the capitalist press. And the fact that over 90 per cent of the eligible voters participated in the balloting also was something the anti-labor forces didn't like to admit.

The vote for the union shop put the Ford Motor Company right behind the eight-ball in negotiations. John Bugas, personnel director of the Ford company, didn't like it. The whole strategy of the Ford company was collapsing.

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

The UAW-CIO has a real vote of confidence among Ford workers. That is the significance of the terrific vote for the union shop. It is emphasized by the circumstances of the election. Ford would not permit it on company grounds. The voting booths were inconveniently arranged. But the workers poured out in mass to show they want unionism of the kind that the UAW-CIO symbolizes.

Of course, the UAW-CIO leadership rejected the first offer made by Ford, as reported recently in LABOR ACTION. Negotiations are continuing this week with a deadline of Thursday, when a national delegate conference of Ford workers will have the final say on a strike vote.

This week Walter Reuther, UAW-CIO president, personally entered negotiations, right arm in cast, bodyguards around; and he served notice on the company that a satisfactory offer had better be made or Ford would face a walk-out.

The excellent response of the Ford workers to the union campaign reflects the growing confidence that began with the GM and Chrysler settlements.

Another important aspect of the Ford vote on the union shop is that it dealt a blow to the Taft-Hartley law and its anti-union originators. The theory behind this part of the law was that if only workers had a secret ballot they would vote against "union shop and union bosses." The workers in the shop demonstrated by their vote, just as they used to do under the provisions of the Smith-

Connolly wartime law, that they are solidly union-conscious and ready to advance along those lines.

FORD IS UNHAPPY

One little incident that occurred recently shows how the UAW-CIO is seizing the opportunity offered it. Ford company negotiators were late one morning at the conference table. Ken Bannan and the other union negotiators didn't wait for the Ford big-shots to arrive. The union negotiators met the Ford men at the entrance as the unionists were leaving

(Continued on page 2)

Sitdown Strike Protests Westinghouse "Loyalty Purge" Firing of Two Militants

PHILADELPHIA, July 13—In the first action of its kind in the United States, 6,500 workers employed by the Westinghouse Electric Corporation today staged the nation's first major sit-down in ten years in protest against the "loyalty purge" firings of two militant union members on Navy demand as "poor security risks."

At 2:00 p.m. today, 4,500 members of UE Local 107 held a meeting at the Westinghouse South Philadelphia plant to protest the corporation's violation of union contract and civil rights in dismissing Frank Carner, structural engineer, and Herb Lewin, a sheet metal worker. After hearing the local's president, John Schaefer, charge that the two militants had been dismissed "without charges, without evidence and without cause" by "unilateral action on the part of Westinghouse and the Navy," the assembled union members voted to strike.

The men accordingly remained inside the gates until 4 o'clock, when the night shift reported. The 1,500 night shift workers responded unanimously in agreement with the action of the day shift men.

The union voted to sit down in the plant and not to return to work until satisfaction in the way of specific charges and evidence are presented.

WIDE SIGNIFICANCE

Feeling is running high because the men appreciate the broad significance of the case. Carner and Lewin are possibly the first and certainly among the first, in civilian plants to be subjected to the same kind of "loyalty purging" as stratified government employees. Through wide public indig-

BULLETIN: PHILADELPHIA, July 13—After 26 hours, the sitdown strike which halted production in the Westinghouse South Philadelphia plant in protest against the "loyalty purge" firings of two union militants, ended when company officials agreed to meet with union officials in Pittsburgh on Thursday morning.

Local 107 (UE) officials announced that "We have amply demonstrated and called to the attention of the American people the inherent danger in the joint company-Navy Department policy of removing people from their means of livelihood without charges, accusations or evidence."

nation, government employees won some modification of the purge procedure.

No specific charges were leveled against the dismissed militants at Westinghouse, though there has been ample time to correct the "oversight" if such it was. Frank Carner was removed from his job on July 1. Since then he has been trying to get the corporation or the Navy to present charges. With the additional dismissal of Herb Lewin today and with further victimization of union militants anticipated, the union today filed a formal grievance.

The corporation has even exceeded the unwarranted and unsupported demands of the Navy. Where the Navy had officially "only" requested that the men be banned from "restricted areas" and from "classified material," the company today refused,

LEADS DONKEY



Present Sorry Spectacle at Dem's Conclave

By WYATT LEE

As the Democratic convention opened in Philadelphia last week the assembled delegates were deep in gloom. Recalcitrants of all shades of opinion had been whipped into line and incumbent Harry S. Truman seemed certain of the nomination. This reluctant unity brought no joy to the party stalwarts, but only the slight solace of sticking together in a sinking ship.

On the eve of the conclave the revolt in the Democratic ranks that had been simmering ever since a Republican victory became imminent boiled up until Truman's candidacy was in jeopardy. The Eisenhower boom, which had its inception at a CIO convention in 1946, received a vigorous boost from a collection of big city political bosses. Arvey of Chicago, O'Dwyer of New York and senile Hague of Jersey City called for a "stop Truman" caucus.

Over the Fourth of July weekend the boom flared like a roman candle. It fizzled out at mid-week when the general-turned-university-president issued another statement declining the honor.

PEPPER HOPS IN

Briefly the spotlight turned on Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who had been the candidate of the Roosevelt-liberals grouped around Leon Henderson and the Americans for Democratic Action. Douglas had cannily placed himself in a position classic in the American tradition—he was out fishing in the Oregon mountains. But he and his ineffectual followers were astute enough to see that the game was up. Douglas disclaimed any intention of seeking or accepting the nomination.

Into the breach jumped Senator Claude Pepper of Florida. He proclaimed himself a candidate, admittedly with no support worth mentioning, but with the bold intent of stopping Truman single-handed. Pepper hoped to unite both dissident wings of the party. As a Southerner, he could be trusted to stand for no nonsense of the Negro question, but would handle it in the same glib manner that had kept his white constituents at home at ease while he played around with Northerners.

As a liberal, Pepper considered his credentials beyond question. Hadn't he been a Stalinist playfellow all

(Continued on page 3)

Yugoslav Front Is Still Unbroken As Dirt Flies in Tito-Bulgar Fight

The volcanic eruption which shook the Stalinist empire with the Cominform denunciation of Tito has temporarily settled down to a bubble-boil. There has not as yet been the slightest sign of a break in the Yugoslav front against Moscow. The next move is probably up to Stalin.

What the world is waiting to see now is: what steps will the harassed Kremlin boss take to show his other satellites that Tito can't get away with it? Economic sanctions? Military action, direct or indirect? An internal coup in Yugoslavia itself?

The last, of course, seems by far the least likely, unless the solidity of Tito's base is a hundred times weaker than it seems to be from this distance. The first in any case would seem to be the easiest to begin with. By the same token, a drawn-out sub-

surface campaign to sap Tito's position appears likelier than any spectacular frontal assault.

OFFICERS BACK TITO

Perhaps the best evidence of Tito's solid INTERNAL position was given this past week not by any of the standard resolutions of confidence from within the country, but by an event within Russia itself. Yugoslav officers studying at Stalin's leading military schools are reported (by Belgrade) to have sent strong and uncompromising messages of support to the Tito regime—an action absolutely unprecedented since the consolidation of the Stalinist counter-revolution in Russia. The same goes, of course, for the similar messages from Yugoslav students at the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, publicized previously.

This phenomenon raises a couple of questions to which no ready answer is possible. Were these anti-Russian messages sent through legal channels, that is, with the permission of Moscow? through the diplomatic channels of the Yugoslav embassy in Moscow? through secret underground channels, in this case bypassing the not inefficient GPU in such a remarkably short time?

In any of these cases, one has perhaps a right to see an unaccustomed amount of "softness" on the part of the Russian regime, either on the part of the bureaucracy as a whole (in the case of the first two possibilities) or on the part of sections of the bureaucracy (if a speedy smuggling through of the messages is taken as requiring explanation). Certainly, such speculations inevitably arise on the basis of the heavy rumors that the ranks of the Russian bureaucracy itself are not 100 per cent solid on the Tito question.

MACEDONIAN SQUABBLE

Further evidence that the Yugoslav split is the outcome of a NATIONALIST movement of resistance by the satellite bureaucracy against Russian domination—and has little to do with the "theoretical differences" and deviations stressed by the Cominform—is provided by the emergence of a typical Balkan nationalist squabble over territory between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

The possession of Macedonia being the bone of contention, the squabble was aired by the CP of Yugoslav Macedonia, in charges that the Bulgarian and Albanian Stalinists had been plotting to grab their territory. They further charged that the Bulgarian Stalinists during the war

(Continued on page 4)

Sees Beginning of the End of Stalinist Empire

Max Shachtman Discusses Tito Break, Contradictions of Bureaucratic Collectivist Empire

NEW YORK—Two hundred people, attending a meeting called on short notice by the Workers Party of New York for last Friday, July 9, heard Max Shachtman describe the Tito-Stalin break as ending the myth of Stalinist invincibility, and as indicating the beginning of the end for Stalinism.

Referring to the Tito break as an event vying in importance with the Trotsky split and the expulsion of the Left Opposition from the Russian Communist Party in the 1920's, though entirely opposite in content from that historic event, Comrade Shachtman pointed to this break in Stalinist monolithism as proof of the contradictions and difficulties which obstruct the consolidation of the Stalinist empire. This is no longer the epoch of empire building, said Shachtman, whether American capitalist or Russian bureaucratic collectivist.

Surveying the trends in Eastern Europe since 1939, Comrade Shachtman said that the conditions which have existed since then to make Stalinist expansion possible are coming to an end and gradually turning into their opposites, creating a crisis in

Russian imperial policy. Shachtman cited as a contributing factor the unification of capitalism behind the centralized leadership of the United States, which has ended the divisions among the capitalist imperialists and created a united opposition to the Russian empire.

CONTRADICTIONS MOUNT

"The destruction of the bourgeoisie in Eastern Europe—completed by Stalinism since 1939—has placed Stalinism in the position of sole oppressor class. The antagonism between the masses and the bureaucratic class grows daily." The result, said Shachtman, is the growth of disillusionment in the belief that Stalinism would bring socialism. The Stalinists in turn have reacted with increased fear of the masses, in contrast to their earlier manipulations and utilization of the people. Thus the Communist Party avoided the challenge of elections in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Not only is this true of the working class, but the peasants as well are turning to opposition as they see the so-called agrarian reforms that replaced the landlords turn into re-

pression and regimentation under new masters.

Russia, continued Shachtman, is caught in the contradiction of being forced to maintain native rulers since it is cheaper for her to do so than to attempt to maintain power by means of direct conquest. This creates the problem of growing independence of the national bureaucracies.

The conditions inside the national sections of the bureaucracy have changed. Their loyalty to Russia becomes a limitation on their power and economic strength. The Tito break is the culmination of these tendencies in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav bureaucracy was brought to power in the course of a great national struggle rather than on Russian bayonets. This is different from the dependence of the CP of Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc.

Russia takes, but has little to give. Yugoslavia, in its exposed military position on the Mediterranean and its fragile economic conditions, cannot remain in economic and military vassalage without undermining its native Stalinist rulers.

Shachtman claimed that Tito depends on a split in the bureaucracy of Russia. On Stalin's part, he must find ways of eliminating this split because it would be catastrophic. Tito's acts of today foreshadow the desires and trends of all the national bureaucracies of Stalin's empire.

The importance of this great event, in Comrade Shachtman's estimate, is that it ends forever the myths of Stalinist invincibility and that its rule can extend relentlessly without hindrance. Quite the contrary, the seeds of its own destruction are now visible.

Thus, said Shachtman, this fissure in the Stalinist empire is the beginning of the end. The masses of Yugoslavia cannot choose between the national master class or that of Russia. The struggle for socialist freedom must follow the path of resistance to both totalitarian classes, imperial and national.

Turn to page 3 for an excerpt from Shachtman on the Yugoslav crisis.

WP National Committee Hits Marshall Plan in Resolution

The National Committee of the Workers Party met in plenary session last weekend to take up a number of important political and organizational problems before the organization. A full report and summary of its decisions will appear in next week's LABOR ACTION.

One of the most important political issues discussed was the question of socialist policy on the Marshall Plan. Since much of the preliminary discussion took place in the pages of LABOR ACTION, our readers are familiar with the viewpoints presented. The line of the LABOR ACTION editorial on the subject was presented to the meeting by a majority of the resident Political Committee, but was not accepted by the National Committee—three voting in favor. The position advocated by Comrades Hal Draper and Ben Hall was adopted instead, with eight votes in favor. Comrade McKinney presented his own views, similar in many respects to the first.

The full text of the statement on the Marshall Plan adopted by the committee will be found on page 3 of this issue.

BUMPER CROPS WILL NET HOUSEWIVES LITTLE GAIN

Prices, Highest in History Are Going Higher

By SUSAN GREEN

Join any group of housewives and chances are you'll find them talking about prices. Next to the worry as to whether the Berlin situation will explode into war, they worry about prices. And they talk in a rather hopeless and fatalistic way, expecting to dig into savings if they have any, and to cut down their buying. They know from experience what such people as write for the financial page of the New York Herald Tribune learn from statistics, that the housewife "will find the going tough and, consequently, the borrowings from banks, insurance companies and other institutions will increase. Funds will be withdrawn from savings and savings bonds will be cashed in order to make both ends meet."

Prices are now the highest in all history and are scheduled to rise in the months to come. But the Republican Party platform adopted a few weeks ago, absolutely sidetracked the question of stopping inflation. Women are buying much less meat because it costs twice what it did in 1946 when OPA ended. They can't even buy sufficient quantities of fruits and green vegetables because, even with very ample summer supplies, prices are marked up unreasonably. Mothers wonder why the monopolistic Borden and Sheffield companies were permitted to boost milk prices again. But the Republican politicians are quite complacent about these worries of every family.

Their approach to the question, if they can be said to have one, is that an economical administration such as Mr. Dewey promises to give, will do wonders toward reducing taxes; this in turn will enable corporations to lower prices (oh, yeah!) and it will also give people (what people?) more money to spend; presto, the whole difficulty disappears. Who said price control is necessary?

MORE RISES COMING

While politicians evade the issue, it becomes more intense. The United States News & World Report of July 9 predicts that things are going to cost more as the year wears on. The rise will be slow but sure.

The cost of living is expected to increase six or seven per cent more in the year ahead. Meat will be even more expensive, so will milk and butter. Household equipment is being upped. Gas, electricity and telephone may cost more because "utility costs cannot always resist the trend upward." The cost of building inches upward, and rents are going higher. Such is the dire outlook presented in the latest issue of the United States News.

In Philadelphia this week, but not in time for LABOR ACTION to report on it in this issue, the Democratic Party will also adopt its campaign platform. President Truman had demanded of the Republican Congress that it pass a law giving him power to institute price control, rationing, allocations and priorities, as and when the president should see fit. It is easy to see how inadequate such a law would be even if passed, for it would create no immediate price controls. And it would not be the plight of the housewife that would determine whether controls are necessary or not, but those having the inside track to the president would make up his mind. Whether the Democratic convention will go farther than Truman or as far remains to be seen. Anyway, who any longer takes seriously a campaign platform plank of the capitalist parties?

Commentators sought to bring a ray of hope into the picture when the Department of Agriculture reported expectation of a bumper crop of grains in the 1948 harvest. The corn crop will be fifteen per cent over the average of the last ten years, the wheat harvest will be the second highest in all history, oats will be 18 per cent more plentiful than the average of the 1936-45 period. In Europe also the harvest of wheat and rye is expected to yield 25 per cent more than last year. This should mean more and cheaper bread and grain products, as well as cheaper meat, dairy products, eggs and poultry because of abundant fodder. However, after the first optimistic comments, the consensus seems to be that the factors making for increased costs outweigh those that might tend to reduce prices, with the conclusion, as stated above, that the over-all cost of living is going up some more.

FEAR LURKS BEHIND BOOM

Those comparatively few workers who have escalator clauses in their contracts, including the recent General Motors contract, will get a little more toward meeting the higher

prices. However, the great body of working people will feel the squeeze in full force. The so-called third round of wage increases was not sufficient to put the workers abreast of price increases already in effect, to say nothing of those still to come. And right behind the workers' worry over meeting living costs, lurks the fear of what will happen to them when the inflation bubble bursts and the bust comes. What will happen to them without a guaranteed annual wage?

These working class problems can be taken up honestly, forthrightly and adequately only by a working class party. As time goes on it becomes ever clearer that the working people must organize their own independent labor party—not a Wallace-Stalinist party—to contest for power against the capitalist parties. This is what housewives should be talking about in connection with the run-away cost of living and the insecurity of life in general.

Ford Vote—

(Continued from page 1)

and the Ford men arriving. "We'll see you at 2:00 p.m. at the regular session. We have things to do now," Bannon informed the Ford men. We understand the company men haven't been late since then.

The Ford Motor Company is also unhappy about the fact that the union won't release joint progress statements with them. And Mr. Bugas almost blew his top when Nathan Weinberg, UAW-CIO research director, made his analysis of Ford's wages and the union's just demands. "Socialist crap," were the words Bugas used in describing Weinberg's factual report.

Things just aren't going according to the Ford Motor Company schedule. Nor are the anti-Reuther cliques within the UAW-CIO finding much good fishing in the troubled waters. The UAW-CIO is determined to get a substantial gain from Ford, and it is off to a good start.

Wallace Proposes U.S. - Russia Split World

(Continued from page 1)

a third" while the U. S. "will govern much of the rest." "Practical regional political reservations" is modern liberal phraseology for "spheres of influence." And the UN—it will rule in those international areas out-

side of the Russian third and the American "much of the rest," presumably in those areas not desired by either, such as Terra del Fuego and the Antarctic icecap.

If Willkie had his One World and Roosevelt and Stalin at Yalta created two, Wallace is ahead of them all with three worlds. It is certainly a strange political world wherein these ideas can be considered liberal, peace-loving and democratic.

STALINIZED LIBERAL

This speech was made at a time when Secretary of State Byrnes, at the Paris Foreign Ministers Conference, began to abandon the Yalta program in favor of "Russian Containment," the cold war. But the change in American policy was by no means complete or clearly defined. For example, Truman himself endorsed Wallace's speech in advance. Most politicians, still thinking in terms of the Roosevelt wartime division of the world at Yalta and Cairo, still supported "Big Three unity" and the UN as the keys to American policy. This is evidenced by the very fact of the Paris conference. But the world situation was changing. Big Three unity was deteriorating under the imperialist aggressions of U. S. and Russia, the division over Germany, the Iran crisis, the Russian domination over all of Eastern Europe, its open threats to Greece and Turkey. The seeds of the Third World War were sprouting rapidly out of just that regional division which Wallace proclaimed as the road to peace.

PICKET FREEDOM TRAIN, PROTEST JIM CROW ARMY

CHICAGO (CORE) — Protesting against the Jim Crow draft and military segregation, members of the Committee of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Young People's Socialist League picketed the Freedom Train on Monday afternoon, the first day of its five-day stay in Chicago.

The twenty-five pickets marched back and forth beside the hundreds waiting to view the documents on display in the Freedom Train. They carried posters pointing out to the public the undemocratic character of the Jim Crow draft and military segregation. Some of the picket signs read: "There Is No Freedom Until All Are Free—End Jim Crow," "There Are No Jim Crow Shells," "The Jim Crow Draft Is the End of Freedom," "Freedom Ends Where Jim Crow Begins," "Segregation Is Not Freedom," "Jim Crow Must Go," and "The Draft Is Bad Enough Without Jim Crow Too."

They passed out a leaflet which in part said:

"American citizens are to be forced to defend rights which are denied them because of the color of their skins. They are to be drafted into an army where they will be isolated under degrading conditions. Where segregation will be enforced even more brutally than in civilian life. Where all the unfair, undemocratic, unjust practices scarring civilian life will be deepened a hundred fold. Told to fight for principles denied them in fact they may well choose the slogan:

"DON'T JOIN THE JIM CROW ARMY."

Most of the pickets wore the buttons reading "Don't Join Jim Crow Army," being distributed on a nationwide scale by the movement for non-violent civil disobedience to military segregation, being led by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Representatives of CORE stated that plans are under way for establishing a Chicago organization to support the national movement headed by Randolph.

In this new international contest, the majority of liberals, as always, remained supporters of their own imperialism. Wallace, however, became in this new context the spokesman for Russian imperialism, for the idea of letting Russia rule its share and for the recognition of its priority in the Near East, China and Eastern Europe.

He went further and gave his blessing to all those reprehensible imperialist acts in which Russia had engaged before. In his latest book, Toward World Peace, published only a few months ago, Wallace brings his ideas up to date: "From the standpoint of Russia's safety, no one can say that Stalin did the wrong thing either in agreeing to the pact with Hitler or in attacking Finland" (page 57). The Stalin-Hitler pact revolted the world by its cynical power politics. It was this pact which permitted Hitler to open World War II and to cut up prostrate Poland between the armies of the two totalitarian dictators. This pact and the Finnish War became the criteria for distinguishing the ordinary confused liberal from the Stalinized liberal. Wallace shows himself to be one of the latter.

Wallace also defends the Moscow Trials, which the world has come to know as a Stalinist lie. "Had not Stalin carried through his ruthless purge of Nazi-Trotskyist conspirators, Adolf Hitler might have found it possible to conquer the world in the years to follow" (page 50). Elaborating on this, he says, "I do not defend Stalin's methods; I merely say that had he failed to apply them, Hitler might be ruling the world today" (page 50).

Max Weiss, Stalinist reviewer, in the Communist Party magazine, Political Affairs (May, 1948, page 402), makes this comment on the above statement: "It is puzzling, to say the least, that methods which saved the world from Hitler should not be defended." And who can deny the justice of this? If Stalin's dictatorship, slave labor camps, GPU, political terrorism, purges and denial of all freedom saved the world from Hitler, then that was the way to defeat totalitarianism—by another totalitarianism.

Let it be remembered that this man pretends to be a liberal. It should Wallace not only condones the brutal also be noted that in these statements Stalin dictatorship, but he gives it the credit for defeating Hitler—a most curious claim and one made

Another Bang-Up NI Issue Going To Press; Features Tito Break

"Tito's Split: The Beginning of the End of Stalinism" is the featured article in the next issue of the New Internationalist, dated August, which will be off the press toward the end of this month. By Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, it is based upon the speech he delivered on July 9 to a public meeting in New York.

Of interest in the same connection, though written before the Yugoslav events, is a short piece on "Rumania: The 'Russification' of Economy," by a new contributor from abroad who is thoroughly familiar with the Balkans, Valentin Toma. The writer proves that Rumanian "nationalization" has been more and more subordinated to Russian economic needs—an insight which will be found relevant to an understanding of the growth of national resistance in the satellite states.

"Roosevelt's Secret War" by Theodore Enright presents and discusses Professor Charles Beard's searching exposé of FDR's hypocritical drive to get into the war prior to Pearl Harbor. Andrzej Rudzinski writes an illuminating article on the Ukrainian national resistance to Stalinist domination since the outbreak of the Second World War.

Albert Gates criticizes the Erber-Garrett-Judd resolution on the Czech coup which appeared last month. Robert Stone dissects the driving forces and origin of "The Jim Crow Pattern in South Africa." The installment from Victor Serge's The Year One of the Russian Revolution deals with "The Dissolution of the Constituent Assembly," one of the most frequently discussed phases of the early history of Lenin's Russia. And, as usual, "Books In Review."

It's another bang-up issue. Watch for it on the newsstands if you don't have a subscription.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BOOKS AT A REASONABLE PRICE

General

ABOUT THE KINSEY REPORT Edited by Donald P. Geddes & Enid Curie 25 cents RELIGION AND RISE OF CAPITALISM by R. H. Tawney 35 cents

Novels

GOOD SOLDIER SCHWEIK by J. Hasek 25 cents MARTIN EDEN by Jack London 25 cents A PASSAGE TO INDIA by E. M. Forster 25 cents YOUNG LONGGAN by James T. Farrell 25 cents

ORDER FROM LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC MEETING

MAX SHACHTMAN

will speak on

Political Forces in Europe Today

Friday, July 23 — 8:30 P. M.

At Labor Action Hall 1139 W. Girard Avenue

With the Workers Party

All readers of LABOR ACTION are invited to attend meetings, class lectures and socials sponsored by local branches of the WORKERS PARTY. For information of WORKERS PARTY activities in cities not listed below, write to WORKERS PARTY, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

- AKRON: Write to Box 221. BALTIMORE: International Fellowship House, 21 West Preston St., 2nd floor. Public forums every second Friday of each month. Discussion group on remaining Friday evenings. BUFFALO: 639 Main St., 2nd floor. Office hours, 11 a.m.-2 p.m., Monday through Friday. Open meetings Sunday evenings. Discussion groups Thursday evenings. CHICAGO: 1501 W. Madison Ave., 2nd floor, Chicago 7. Tel.: CHESAPEAKE 5798. Office hours, Tuesdays, 4 to 10 p.m.; Wednesdays, 5 to 10 p.m. CLEVELAND: WP Branch meets Sundays, 8:00 p.m., in Room 4, Slovenian Hall, 6409 St. Clair Ave. Write to Bernard Douglas, Box 1190, Cleveland 3, Ohio. DETROIT: 6341 Gratiot, Room 10. Telephone: PLaza 5553. Open on Tuesdays and Fridays, 1 to 5 p.m. LOS ANGELES: 3114 So. Grand, Los Angeles 7. Tel.: Richmond 7-3230 (if no answer, phone AX 2-9067). Office hours, 2 to 5 p.m. daily. NEWARK: 248 Market St., Newark 2. Open house Friday evenings. NEW YORK CITY: CITY CENTER: 114 West 14th St., 3rd floor. Open every day from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday until 10:30 p.m. Tel.: WATkins 4-4223. HARLEM BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15 p.m., at Workers Party Headquarters, 2143 Seventh Ave. (near 126th St.), Room 2. CENTRAL BRANCH: Wednesday, 8:15

OFF THE PRESS! 1947 BOUND VOLUMES OF LABOR ACTION \$3.00

A permanent record of week-by-week Marxist analysis of the year's outstanding events. Fifty-two copies of LABOR ACTION, including the EXCELLENT special features contained in the eight-page issues. ALSO: Some Bound Volumes still in stock of the years 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946. Order from WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

HAVE YOU READ? THE RUSSIAN ENIGMA by Ciliga \$1.50 THE LEGEND OF HENRY FORD by Keith Sward \$5.00 THE SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF EUGENE V. DEBS \$4.00 TELL THE WEST by Jerzy Glikman \$3.75 A ROOM ON THE ROUTE by Godfrey Blunden \$1.75 LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, New York

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 [] One year (52 issues) at \$1.00 [] Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents

Marshall Plan and Socialist Policy: Statement of WP National Committee

The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the recent plenary session of the Workers Party National Committee:

The National Committee of the Workers Party has taken up and reviewed the position on the Marshall Plan put forward by the LABOR ACTION editorial of May 17, entitled "A Statement of Our Position: Socialist Policy on the Marshall Plan." It is the opinion of the committee that:

(a) The emphasis in the Statement is properly and correctly placed upon opposition to the Marshall Plan as the concretization of American imperialist aims in the present world situation; but

(b) This correct emphasis is partially canceled by, and it is unreconciled with, other views which likewise appear in the Statement, which lessen its value as an adequate statement of a socialist attitude, and which need correction.

The following points briefly express what is, in our opinion, essential for consistent opposition to American imperialism on this question.

(1) It is not correct to view the Marshall Plan as being primarily or essentially a plan for economic aid to Europe. Marshall aid is only a by-product of, and incidental to, the main purpose

and political character of the program: namely, the implementation of the Truman war doctrine for the mobilization of world resources against America's imperialist rival, Russia; and, in the course of doing so, the furtherance of American imperialism's master plan for subordinating the economies of the capitalist world in the interests of Wall Street.

CONSISTENT OPPOSITION

(2) Therefore, the only possible attitude for revolutionary socialists is one of consistent and principled opposition to it. In no way do we identify the interests of the proletariat, American or European, with the Marshall Plan.

On the contrary, we wish our European brothers and socialist workers to know that here in America the Marxist movement stands with them in their distrust, suspicion and hatred of the designs of American capitalism on their autonomy. Any weakening or dilution of this attitude means, in their eyes, and to that extent, an identification with the American bourgeoisie against the interests of the European proletariat.

(3) Although it is essentially an imperialist club held over Europe, the Marshall Plan is put forward in terms of economic aid to the peoples of the continent; but not even the Democratic or

Republican spokesmen for the program pretend that this is its aim or reason for existence.

We, for our part, are in favor of a REAL American Recovery Program such as is NOT an American economic weapon in the cold war against Russia. We are in favor of the fullest outpouring of economic assistance from this wealthy nation to the ravaged lands of the world. But we point out that such a real economic-aid program cannot be expected from an imperialist-controlled America or from a plan controlled, administered and supervised by the agents of Wall Street, the present rulers of this country.

The socialist fight for economic aid to Europe means the fight for a program of relief and industrial reconstruction financed by America's wealth but divorced from its imperialist masters, controlled in every decisive aspect not by the present capitalist government but by the working class through its own independent institutions. The possibility of a real economic-aid program thus is inseparably bound up, for us, with the fight against American imperialism as a whole, and is a part of that fight.

AGAINST STALINIST SABOTAGE

(4) The Stalinists, acting as the agents of Russian expansion, oppose the Marshall Plan not from the point of view of the working-class struggle against all imperialism but from the point of view of that war camp against which the Marshall Plan is directed.

In the United States and Western Europe, they are thus enabled to pose demagogically as the champions of national independence from American control and as spokesmen for the masses' legitimate hatred of Wall Street. Any concessions in favor of "Marshallism" on the part of the revolutionary socialists can only have the effect of further driving the European workers, and also anti-imperialist workers in the United States, into the arms of the Stalinists.

We expose the meaning of the Stalinists' type of opposition to the Marshall Plan just as we exposed the real roots of their "anti-imperialist-war" line during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. We condemn their policy of driving the workers of Europe into adventurist trade-union struggles whose aim is simply to disrupt economy for its own sake, rather than to fight for the masses' legitimate demands and needs.

We denounce such a policy of economic sabotage and disruption carried on under the guise of fighting against the Marshall Plan. The opposition we propose is a part of our general political opposition to imperialism and its policies.

(5) The question has been raised in the discussion of how a socialist congressman should have voted in Congress on the ERP. Of course, this question is of significance now only insofar as the question of a vote is a means of summarizing our views.

We state unequivocally that a socialist congressman had to vote no on the bill, in order to express the position summarized above, in order to register our lack of confidence in principle in the imperialist aims and motivations of the present government and its utilization of the so-called aid program. A socialist congressman must vote no and propose his own socialist program for sending real and adequate economic aid to Europe divorced from imperialist power politics.

The further question that has been injected into the discussion—how a socialist would vote in case of a tie vote among the representatives of American capitalism—is not a meaningful one in the existing national and world situation. Rather it automatically signifies a political situation and relationship of forces with regard to American imperialist policy such as does not exist and can only be imagined speculatively. Such hypothetical posers have usually been raised in the socialist movement not in order to solve a particular tactical problem but in order to open the door to alien considerations, diluted opposition, and capitulation in the actual existing situation. In answer to it we stress, in the light of all that we know now, that our "no" vote does not depend on the existence of speculative and unspecified differences within the capitalist class, but stems from our own anti-imperialist considerations in the real context in which the Marshall Plan is put forward.

HOW NOT TO FIGHT STALINISM

(6) We reject the view that the existence of the Marshall Plan or a similar American "economic-aid" program is a necessity from the point of view of the interests of the European proletariat and the socialist revolution.

These false views have claimed that the Marshall Plan is essential for the "re-establishment of a European proletariat," which presumably does not now exist because of the state of European economy. They have claimed that the existence of the Marshall Plan (and naturally also its successful imposition and accomplishment) is a condition sine qua non for combating Stalinism in Europe, by at least temporarily restabilizing Europe's capitalist economy. They imply that cap-

(Continued on page 4)

Little Noticed, But Vastly Significant

Behind North China's Unification

By STAN GREY

(Continued from last week)

A basic question naturally poses itself at this point. If, in fact, the Stalinists are capable of solving some of the basic tasks of the bourgeois revolution in China, why is not this progressive? Why should we not support the Stalinists in their civil war against the utterly corrupt and bankrupt Kuomintang? To accept such a position in China would be to fall into the basic pitfall in any analysis of Stalinism.

Let us remember that it is not only in China that the Stalinists have carried out what appear to be the solutions to the problems of society. Modern European capitalism is totally bankrupt, utterly incapable of restoring even the elements of a productive society. Any revolutionary solution must involve nationalization and state-wide planning. The Stalinists are the most consistent advocates of nationalization and planning. Where they have power they have carried it out.

Does it mean therefore that this is a revolutionary solution? We have more than once pointed out that this Stalinist nationalized planning, appearing to be progressive, is in fact reactionary. It is carried out at the expense of the socialist revolution; it entrenches a regime which destroys utterly the independence of the labor movement and exterminates any genuine socialists within its grasp; it aborts the potential of the new economic measures by total bureaucratization; it leads to a society which, while not capitalist, exceeds capitalism in its imposition of barbaric social discipline.

The same general considerations hold true for China:

1) Stalinism in China is almost exclusively an agrarian movement. This fact alone prevents the Stalinists from solving even those tasks of the

Chinese revolution which its measures seem to grapple with.

There is a large and class-conscious proletariat in the big cities of China. The experience with the Stalinists in 1925-27, when they betrayed the revolution, is etched in its memory and the Stalinists have made no real progress among them. Yet it is precisely under the leadership of the proletariat that the problem of China has to be solved. You may say to the peasants "enrich yourselves" and many of them will do just as was done in Russia. But it is impossible to build a stable and expanding economy, even in agriculture, without so organizing industry that it can provide cheap industrial goods for the countryside. The expansion of agriculture hinges upon its organization and mechanization which in turn has the proletariat for its key. The failure to organize and plan industry in Russia proved to be a major factor in the collapse of the agricultural policy and forced the subsequent brutal and widespread collectivizations.

The emergence of China as a modern state depends fundamentally on the proletariat, a class in which the Stalinists have little power and to which it is not oriented. This leaves the Stalinists with a policy which can lead not to the socialist organization of China, but to the submission of large agrarian areas under its influence to the dominance of Russia.

A PROXY WAR

2) The only two genuinely independent states in the world today are the U. S. and Russia. In every degree and manner the rest of the world is subject to the influence of one or the other and can carry out no policy of its own without the approval of either. The civil war in China is a proxy war between Russia and the U. S. A victory for either side will not win China its independence and set it on the road to in-

dependent expansion; rather, will it lead to the integration of China in the general Stalinist orbit if the Stalinists win or keep it in the old colonial status of anarchy and chaos if the Kuomintang wins. In either case, China gets in line for the war which is now being prepared. In that direction there is no hope for the Chinese people.

3) Finally, let us remember that Stalinism retains its essential bureaucratic, anti-democratic, barbaric essence even when written in Chinese. To be sure, the Stalinists warn the people against "bureaucratization of government functionaries" in the new government and urge them to oppose and prevent it. But that too is an essential requisite in any program designed to win support in China, in a China ridden and infested by the corrupted bureaucracy of the government for so many years. To take these words at face value is to believe that "real democracy" exists in Russia.

And even if it were the genuine intention to carry them out, it would be impossible in a backward country, with little industry and above all with no program which will attract the proletariat and make it possible to truly lift China out of its backward state.

The unification of North China and its program suggest that what is true in Europe applies to Asia as well. The strength of Stalinism is a strength by default. In the absence of a genuinely revolutionary movement and with a feeble capitalism incapable of sustaining itself, or a totally rotten and corrupted comprador bourgeoisie as in China, Stalinism presents the only real force which comes out with some kind of plausible solution.

The masses above all want a way out and the Stalinists appear to give it to them. This is perhaps truer of China than it is of Europe.

Truman and Labor Leaders—

(Continued from page 1)

during the war. He had been hailed as the herald of the coming capitalist liberal age by no less a prophet than Earl Browder. If he were nominated, Pepper inferred, Wallace would retire from the race in confusion.

It is small wonder that no one of political consequence wanted to run for Vice-President on a ticket headed by a man considered a liability by his own party leaders. Douglas, who had been coyly silent on the presidential nomination for many weeks, immediately wired his regrets when Truman proposed that he take the second-place spot. Only a few party hacks, who would like a raise in salary during their declining years, such as Senators Barkley and O'Mahoney, were at all eager for the post.

The ADA liberals, confronted with the unpalatable prospect of voting for a man they have been denouncing for more than a year, urgently asked Douglas to accept. They hoped to give a "liberal" coloration to a campaign that promises to be as drearily conservative as that of the Republicans.

With apathy of foreseen defeat hanging over the convention, any genuine debate over the platform appeared unlikely. Truman's civil rights paper program, which raised the ire of Southern Democrats, was slated to be watered down to the meaningless plank of Roosevelt's 1944 platform.

LABOR LEADERS' ROLE

The CIO sent its secretary-treasurer, J. B. Carey, to appear before the resolutions committee, where he demanded a "Roosevelt platform." Couched in typical FDR style, the proposed resolution spoke of the "rights" of labor, the farmer and the businessman and sounded as an echo from the grave of the New Deal—a grave, incidentally, whose tombstone considerably antedates the shrine at Hyde Park.

The officialdom of the trade unions was conspicuous by its absence at the convention. Philip Murray could not find time to accept an invitation to attend. David Dubinsky sailed for Europe. Daniel Tobin, a Democratic chieftain for decades, has only kind words for Dewey these days. The CIO's Political Action leaders were in Philadelphia, prepared once more to lead their followers down the blind alley of capitalist politics, but without enthusiasm or hope of success.

So-called labor leaders and so-called liberals have made a spectacle of themselves by their pre-convention maneuvers. This time it is so apparent that they themselves are aware of their sorry role. Committed in advance to their traditional path of tail-ending a capitalist party, they could only make frenzied efforts to find a capitalist politician more acceptable than Truman, who so strikingly epitomized the bankruptcy of the Democratic Party.

First they tried to swing the nomination to Eisenhower, a man who has steadfastly refused to make a public statement on a single controversial political issue. Eisenhower is a militarist who supports peacetime conscription, which the CIO officially

opposes. Eisenhower was in command of a Jim Crow army, and the CIO is officially against discrimination. As head of the European forces, Eisenhower was responsible for the false charges of munitions shortages that stirred up a lynch spirit against the unions during the closing days of the war.

All this and more was forgotten. As a candidate for President, Eisenhower might beat Dewey and thus justify once more labor's support of the Democrats.

With Eisenhower's definitive withdrawal, these people switched to Douglas, a man with no stomach for a political fight who long ago retired to the security of the Supreme Court.

With this political degradation al-

ready on the record and with even worse to come between now and November, it is a wonder how the labor movement can survive with such leadership on the political front. The need for genuine independent political action on the part of labor has never been more apparent. The deep dissatisfaction of the rank and file is making itself evident in many ways and even union bureaucrats are becoming uneasy.

The political questions that confront the working class will find no solution in either the words or the actions of the Democrats or the Republicans. Perhaps the Murrys and the Hendersons and the Krolls will never learn this, but if they do not they will one day find themselves leaders without an army.

BEGINNING OF THE END

The following is an excerpt from a speech by Max Shachtman on the Tito-Stalin break, the full text of which will appear in the next issue of The New Internationalist.

Immediately, any one of many outcomes is possible. The situation is at its beginning and not at its end. I would exclude one variant out of hand: any possibility that Tito will make his peace with Western capitalism by capitulation to the extent of liquidating the bureaucratic-collectivist state established in the image of the Russian regime, by moving toward the restoration of capitalism. That is excluded because it is the conscious road to suicide for the bureaucracy, which has nothing whatsoever to gain by restoring economic and therefore political power to the capitalist class—a foreign capitalist class at that, since there is nothing left of Yugoslav capitalism except the insignificant "lumpenbourgeoisie."

What measures and pressures Stalin can apply on Yugoslavia are yet to be seen. Certainly Stalin cannot possibly allow the status quo to continue there except through impotence. Tito's example is infectious, and if he survives after his defiance the whole process of disintegration within the Stalinist empire will only be speeded up. Moscow must try to cut him down.

The biggest crisis in its history is now faced by Stalinism. The mutiny of Tito has become a sort of symbol of rebellion against Russian slavery on the part of millions of people who do not necessarily have any illusions about the character of Tito's own totalitarianism. It is enough to record the upsurge of enthusiasm for the mutiny on the part of the Yugoslav people. It is enough to mention the defiant demonstration of tens of thousands of Czechs which took place in connection with the Sokol parade in Prague—marching men and women who, though having nothing in common with Ti-

to's Stalinism, yet shouted his name as a challenge to the Gottwalds, Slansky and Zapotockys, the quislings who usurped power in their land. It is enough to add the rout of the Stalinists in the Finnish and Dutch elections which followed on the heels of the Yugoslav events and which was undoubtedly heavily influenced by them.

We do not know, I repeat, what the immediate outcome of this particular conflict will be. But we can already say with the utmost confidence: the road of the consolidation of Stalinism is beset with obstacles which are insurmountable!

The wider the spread of Stalinism the closer it has come to convulsing crises which bring down upon it not only greater discredit but also the sharp edge of the sword that has always dangled over its bloody head. The yearning of the peoples for freedom, for independence, for self-government—which is, in the last analysis, their yearning for socialist liberty—is incompatible with Stalinist tyranny and will come into ever more deadly conflict with it.

In the darkest days of Stalinist power, as in the darkest days of Hitlerism, we insisted that this is not the era for the consolidation of a new slave empire, that it will not be able to immunize itself against upheavals and crises, that it will not be able to withstand the murderous process of the development of its own contradictions:

Now this seemingly monolithic bureaucracy has broken wide open, and the people once again have the opportunity to move. To both sides of the rival tyrants we say:

Go to it, bandits! Deepen the rift between you! The people will surge through the opening which you create because you have to create it. And when they do, your knell will have sounded—the knell of all of you—and the hour of the people will begin to strike its challenging, liberating note!

British Imperialism, Stalinism Vie to Control Southeast Asia

By ROBERT STONE

(Continued from Last Week)

BURMA

The main fact to be noted in Burma is that there exists no established or sharply defined native capitalist class. British capital controlled the oil, timber and transport segments of the economy; Indian Chettyar (money-lender's holdings) predominates on the land.

The quasi-independence pact signed in London was a precarious alliance between the British Labor government—protectors of British finance capital—and the local Social Democratic organizations representing the nascent capitalist groupings in Burma. The present Burmese government is based on a coalition of parties known as AFPFL (Anti-Fascist Peoples Freedom League). The two main constituent elements of this coalition are the Socialists and the Peoples Volunteer Party.

The Constitution passed by the Burmese parliament authorizes the carrying out of large scale nationalizations with adequate compensation to British concessionaires, forbids the use of private property "to the detriment of the general public" and advocates the nationalizing of land and the abolition of all large-scale holdings. (Economist, November 8, 1947.)

Bevin said in parliament, in reply to Conservative questions: "They (the Burmese-R. S.) made it perfectly clear that they were going to nationalize industries. They agreed to compensation." But it is one thing to agree to compensation, and quite another matter to dish out compensation to placate the large palates of British investors. For the limited financial and economic resources cannot provide both for "adequate and fair" compensation and for the indigenous industrialization measures that the present Burmese government wants to carry out. The powerful, instinctive anti-imperialist and national revolutionary sentiments fermenting among the broad masses of the population gives to the present regime elbow room in which to maneuver against the foreign imperialists' interests and to achieve a certain limited independence with relation to them. Compensation in cash or sterling to British owners would for years eat up the proceeds of export surpluses whereby Burma might purchase the machinery and other capital equipment needed for her further development of industry.

NATURE OF NATIONALIZATION

The Burmese government consequently proposes that British firms in Burma nationalize their businesses by substituting in employment Burmans for foreigners and by their retaining within the country the large part of the profits that formerly went abroad.

In this way the Burmese government hopes to use nationalization to cut into the super-profits formerly siphoned off abroad, to industrialize the country and to create in the process a distinct and independent native capitalist class based on extensive state-owned industries, who could maneuver against and rest upon the dominant foreign interests.

For example: a bill has been passed through parliament nationalizing the British owned Irrawaddy Flotilla, as from June 1, and some one-third of the foreign owned teak forests. I have not yet seen any information on the terms of compensation, but according to Bevin "they were open to considerable objection." Pressed by the Conservatives to take strong action and demand immediate and strict fulfillment of the treaty obligations, Bevin replied that he preferred to wait and see and use more delicate methods of persuasion. How successful the Burmese government will be in its bargaining with the superior forces of British imperialism remains to be seen.

But the present government and British imperialist interests alike are faced with a more formidable threat to their economic and political existence. The Communist Party, formerly one of the parties in the AFPFL coalition, which led its own military formations in the underground struggle against the Japanese, was expelled from the AFPFL before the treaty negotiations began. The party was illegalized and took up arms against the government. Central Burma and Arakan are today dominated by their guerrilla bands.

Appealing to the peasants and workers with their pseudo-radical agrarian and anti-British imperialist program, they are entrenching in the countryside. Within the framework of rigid authoritarian control they are blending the struggle for their own bureaucratic domination with the general methods of peasant warfare which the Stalinists of China have so successfully mastered.

Faced with this Stalinist pressure Thakin Nu is playing the double game seeming to appear more conciliatory to the Stalinist line while increasing the repressive forces to destroy the Stalinist rebellion in the hills.

FOOTNOTE COMMENT ON HYDERABAD

According to "New Spark" of May 15 (organ of the Bolshevik-Leninist party of India) the Stalinist party is reported to have come to an agreement with the Nizam whereby they combine with this fabulously wealthy and barbaric autocrat in opposition to the accession of Hyderabad to the Indian Union. In payment for this open Stalinist prostitution to the Nizam, the ban on the party has been lifted and warrants against its leaders withdrawn.

In Hyderabad the Stalinists have an organized peasant army which they now use brazenly and cynically to further Russian diplomacy. Their line today is one of all-out fifth-column opposition to the bourgeois Nehru government. Unable to play an independent role against the Delhi government they seek to blackmail it.

"The line of Azad Hyderabad is a tactic of pressure designed to force the Indian Union Government to come to terms, if not with the menials of Stalin in India, at least with their revered master in the Kremlin." (New Spark.)

SOME CONCLUSIONS

What conclusions and what policy can socialists draw from the various situations described?

1. The mass of colonial toilers have had their belly-full of imperialism and cannot, under any circumstances, be found to tolerate or support its barbaric rule.

2. The pressing problems of Southeast Asia for a revolutionary solution to its poverty, backwardness, landlessness, lack of democratic and national rights, lack of industrialization, colonial status, cannot be fulfilled by any party which relies on half-measures, or on compromises with imperialism (Thakin Nu). The masses reject these attempts.

3. The lack of a concrete, democratic socialist revolutionary alternative drives the masses into the arms of the Stalinist totalitarians, who are quite ready to subvert, distort and frustrate the mass discontent and to blackmail, sell-out or revolt in armed uprisings in order to place themselves in bureaucratic power and serve the grandiose designs of Russian imperialism. Their aim is to convert the masses of Southeast Asia to the same slave conditions as prevail for the workers and peasants of Russia.

4. A revolutionary party, independent of London, Washington or Moscow is the only hope for the realization of the aspirations of the Southeast Asian masses. This party must establish itself as the champion of the fullest democracy. Stalinism cannot be defeated by imperialist repression. It can only be broken by an attack from the Left. Fighting for both the day-to-day and the long term interests of the masses, for a redivision of the land, expropriation of imperialist enterprises, the withdrawal of its military forces, and for a social revolution in its own interests, a revolutionary party, free from either imperialist contentor is the only force able to achieve for the masses the socialist reality.

WORKERS PARTY INFORMATION BLANK

I am interested in joining the Workers Party of the United States. Will you please send me all information as to your Program and how I can become a member.

Name

Address

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the
Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
General Offices: 4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y. Tel. 1R0nsides 6-5117
Vol. 12, No. 29 July 19, 1948
Emanuel Garrett Gelfand,
Editor
Editorial Board:
Hal Draper, Henry Judd
Business Manager: Paul Bern
Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a year; 50¢ for 6 Mos.
(\$1.25 and 65¢ for Canada and Foreign)
Re-entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24,
1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

**LEON TROTSKY'S
"THE NEW COURSE"**

Get this historic essay on Russia, together with Max Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism.

NOW ON SALE: \$1.00
(paper bound) 265 pages
Originally \$1.50

Order from:
Workers Party Publications
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Max Shachtman Reports on Four Months in France and England

Tug-of-War in Europe — An Eyewitness Picture

Ten years have intervened between the last two visits I have been able to make to Europe. I was there in 1938, at the very moment of the Munich Conference when the overture was played to the grim symphony of destruction that followed a year later. I was there again for almost four months this year—1948, leaving the continent a fortnight ago. It goes without saying that the changes have been sweeping and profound.

It is impossible for cold print to convey the picture of devastation which meets even the casual traveler's eye, even though accounts of the destruction have become commonplace in the United States—and that which I saw in France and England was far, far from the worst signs of it. It nevertheless I mention it first, it is because there is nothing else which so vividly conveys an idea of the barbarous depths to which our decadent society has already brought us and the even lower depths into which it is now preparing to hurl us. For an American—no matter who he is—the sight must be viewed with the living eye in order to be understood.

But the picture of physical devastation is only the surface appearance of the changes that have taken place, like the gruesome façades opposite the famous Paddington Station in London. Here is a long row of what used to be hotels and rooming houses, one right after the other, for hundreds of yards. By a grotesque accident, every single building front remains standing. But one look past the glassless window frames and you see that everything behind them has been blasted and burned to blackened rubble.

So too, the war has wrought deep changes not only in the physical front of Europe but also in its social structure, among the classes in conflict, in the political alignments and perspectives.

The first thing that is evident is the crushing moral defeat of fascism that came with its military defeat in the war. So thoroughgoing has been the discrediting of fascism, above all of Hitlerism, that I consider it nonsensical to think of a rehabilitation of any powerful fascist mass movement in Europe in the coming years—no revival, that is, of the fascist movements as they were. The ignominious collapse of the whole edifice of fascism in Germany, Italy and all over Europe, the ludicrous contrast with its former boasts of durability and even permanence—this might well serve as a lesson to all those who lightly dream of imposing an iron dictatorship over a modern world and modern people.

DE GAULLE AND STALINISM BASED ON RESISTANCE

In no country of Europe today is it possible for a political movement or a political personality that was tainted by fascism or even by collaboration with it to make any significant step forward, to find a sympathetic audience among the people. That is true even in Germany, where fascism struck its deepest roots in the social structure.

By the same token, only those are able to hold their head above the political waters who are able to point to a record of active participation in one of the movements of national resistance that arose during the war against the rule of the Nazis. In France, for example, if de Gaulle enjoys any popular support, it is because he is able to speak out against the Stalinists and get an attentive audience, it is due almost entirely to his prominent association with the resistance

movement against Nazism. And it is only because of this that he has been able to rally around him a considerable number of young people who, unlike him, are not reactionaries but who see in the struggle against Stalinism (that is, Russian domination) the continuation of their wartime struggle against Nazi rule.

In a different way the same holds true, especially in France, for the Stalinists. Just before the war and in the first year or two of the war, the Stalinist party was probably the most discredited political organization in France. If it succeeded, as it undoubtedly did, in retrieving and surpassing to an unprecedented degree its former political prestige and strength, that was due above all to the exceptional militancy it displayed in the underground national resistance movement which it helped develop—for reasons of its own which are now so obvious to all.

Between them, the de Gaullists and Stalinists today represent the big majority of the French people. By any standard the Schuman government rules as a minority. Schuman's Catholic Party plus the party of Leon Blum plus the odds and ends they manage to get in the Chamber of Deputies for their scanty majorities—all represent not only a minority of the working class but a minority of the population as a whole.

How is it possible for such a government to continue in power? In actuality it does not satisfy any of the classes, least of all the working class. It has not succeeded in resolving the most acute economic problems, the first of which is the problem of the cost of living in relation to wages.

The answer is not simple but is not impossible to find.

France is the outstanding "defeated victor" in the war. Even before the war it was in the process of becoming an economically backward country as compared with the U. S. or Germany or even Russia. Even before the war, its equipment was antiquated; today it is practically obsolete, because it has never been replaced. The workers are indifferent to the needs of production because they have not the slightest incentive to increase productivity.

BURDENS ON FRANCE'S CHAOTIC ECONOMY

Economically speaking, the bourgeoisie is almost completely disorganized. In France the disintegration of capitalism has reached the point where there are (so to speak) three economies existing side by side; and their coexistence makes for a fabulous chaos. There is the private industry of the private capitalists. There is the nationalized industry, which is a mass of inefficiency and even corruption. And there is the widespread black market, in which—for the price—one can buy virtually everything. If you wish, there is in addition the supplementation from the American economy, the so-called Marshall Plan aid.

Incapable of reconciling itself to the fact that it is at best a third-rate power, France continues to act the way it did at the end of the First World War. Its empire is falling apart and it seeks desperately to hold it together. In Indo-China it has for more than two years had to fight a full-scale imperialist colonial war to deprive the country of its independence. The same is true for the lesser known war it has been carrying on in Madagascar. In both of these cases French imperialism has the loyal support of Leon Blum's Socialist Party.

While its economy is in the most disorganized condition, the state tries to maintain a military budget which is impossible from any point of view and which is an unendurable burden

upon the economy and upon the people. It costs France a quarter of a million francs a year to train and maintain a single soldier; the average wage of the French worker is a little more than half of that. The military budget is officially about a third of the total; actually it is about half the total budget. Wages have been fixed at about 12,000 francs a month—less than \$10 a week. The cost of living rises persistently and is higher than the official figures because these do not take into account the prices on the black market. But the production index rises hardly at all.

The French bourgeoisie and the government wait impatiently and in terror until Marshall Plan aid shall begin to flow into the country. The conditions of the peasants, especially those in the North, are comparatively good because they devote their production to the black market—and are cordially hated, as a consequence, by the workers.

The conditions of the workers are extremely bad. Only the poorest cuts of meat are ever found on the family table, and then very seldom. Butter is the greatest luxury imaginable, found almost only on the black market at impossible prices. Coffee is adulterated. French wine, traditionally among the finest, has become so bad that this is revealed in the declining figures on wine exports. Clothing is of the worst quality. Only rent is low—by our standards, not those of the French workers.

STALINISTS IN DECLINE OFFER NO PERSPECTIVE

The effect of this situation on the working class is very interesting, and has both its heartening and discouraging aspects. The French worker feels that he fought the Nazis not only for liberation from foreign rule but from any rule. The most popular meetings, still today, are those which sound the note of continuing "our revolution": the one that was begun against the Nazis and collaborators and which must be concluded by the socialist power of the people. The masses did not want and do not want to return to anything like the pre-war France.

That is why, by and large, the workers followed the Communist Party. From the purely physical point of view, the CP could easily have taken power in France after the liberation.

Everyone in France knows that. There was absolutely nobody to offer resistance. Even in the last November strikes there was a situation where the CP could have had the upper hand. The police and the Republican Guard were frightened to death. But the CP did not even try to take power, and hundreds of thousands, even millions, are learning the reason.

The CP could not take power without precipitating war between the U. S. and Russia. All it could do was to try to disrupt production, nullify the effects of the coming Marshall Plan and force the government into a more favorable attitude toward the Kremlin. In other words, while the CP could not rule it refused to let anyone else rule.

It is impossible to maintain a high morale among the followers of an insurrectionary party in such conditions. That is why the morale of the CP has fallen catastrophically. Its strength today is purely negative and its membership for the most part purely formal. The mood of its members, and of the members of the General Confederation of Labor (CGT) which it controls, is passive in the extreme. The big majority of its official seven to eight hundred thousand members never even come to meetings of their nuclei or branches.

The party has nothing to offer

them. It cannot speak of taking over the government, tied as it is to Russia's diplomatic plans. It cannot even speak realistically of a coalition with the SP, since everybody knows that is out of the question. It has no perspective whatsoever, except opposition to American imperialism. It is held together by an iron guard, a nucleus of about 10,000 tough, hardened, cynical Stalinists who staff the party and its ubiquitous multiplicity of front organizations.

Why, then, does not the party member leave it? There are two associated reasons.

In the first place, the French worker in the mass has learned the importance of organization—learned it the hard way. It is difficult for him to conceive of any kind of political



Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Workers Party, recently returned from a stay of several months in Europe. Several days after his return, on June 25, he reported on his observations at a very well attended public meeting in New York's Hotel Diplomat. On this page, we print the major part of his speech.

or social existence without belonging to an organization. In this respect he has become much more like the traditional German worker, in the best sense, than he ever was before.

WHY WORKERS STAY IN CP—NO ALTERNATIVE IN SIGHT

In the second place, he sees no alternative. What else is there in France for him?

De Gaulle? I do not believe that Gaullism can be considered a serious movement in France right now—not yet, though it is possible that it may become one. It does not have the confidence of the French bourgeoisie; it does not have the confidence of the middle classes. They vote for him—those who do—as a protest against the Communist Party (that is, against Russia) and as blackmail against the Americans in a sense; but no one wants the civil war which would inescapably come with De Gaulle's accession to power. If he could come to terms with the Stalinists—in other words, with their Russian masters—on the basis of a deal in foreign policy, this obstacle would be eliminated. That is why it can be said that De Gaulle can come to power today only with the tacit agreement of the CP. Naturally, it is also possible for him to enter a coalition government.

The MRP—the "Popular Republican Movement," Schuman's Catholic Party? It is helpless to solve the situation it confronts and holds no appeal for the working-class movement. As an instrument of American imperialism, it holds out only one perspective: Marshall Plan aid.

The Socialist Party? It is completely discredited and without a working-class base: "Marshallism" has compromised it thoroughly; its colonial policy is even worse. Its vote has fallen catastrophically, its paper *Le Populaire* is not read, its members number only 70,000 and poor ones at that.

Its boner in organizing the so-called Force Ouvrière has not helped it: this trade-union splittoff from the Stalinist-controlled CGT was indeed precipitated by the demand of anti-Stalinist militants in the ranks, and under sufficient provocation in the form of CP terrorism, bureaucratic hooliganism and physical assaults upon opponents of the Stalinist trade-union apparatus; but it has not succeeded in tearing any substantial numbers of worker away from the CGT. If anything there is a flow back into the old organization, largely because of the dominant feeling that a unified trade-union struggle is necessary if the wage demands necessary for life are to be conquered.

And so the CP member remains more or less attached to the party, without having any faith in it.

This was graphically evidenced at the Stalinist May Day demonstration which I attended in Paris. By our American standards this was, to be sure, a gigantic outpouring of demonstrators: the marching ranks seemed endless, one could not see to the end of the immense crowd. And yet everyone agreed that for the CP this apparently huge demonstration was a sensational and catastrophic disaster. It numbered a quarter of a million—no small number!—but on May Days not long before the CP could have brought out and did bring out no less than a million.

What was even more obvious, however, besides its diminished size, was something else: it was lackluster. There was not more than a bare spark of enthusiasm, there was no spirit. There were scarcely even any slogans held aloft, and what there were bore nothing but the most general of generalizations—"peace," "prosperity," etc.

The CP had nothing to say to the workers on May Day, and the workers felt no drive emanating from it. They were there because there was nowhere else to go.

Like the people of Europe in general, the French worker as yet sees no way out of the vise whose two jaws are Russian and American imperialism. Illusions about Russia are declining, but are still very strong; the fear of criticizing Russia is still evident, even in the bourgeois press. Illusions about America are declining more rapidly.

Very few fail to understand the significance of the Marshall Plan. Very few fail to understand that its food and industrial reconstruction are simply by-products of its main purpose which is the mobilization of European economy and Europe's nations and peoples for war with Russia.

NO OUTSPOKEN SUPPORTERS OF MARSHALL PLAN IN EUROPE

No one can hope to speak to the workers of Europe, or of France in particular, as any kind of champion of the Marshall Plan. Still less is there any kind of hearing among the workers for any kind of champion of the idea of smashing the Stalinist terror by means of an atom bomb to be dropped by American imperialism. Only Americans can talk or think in such terms.

Yet, in the midst of all this helplessness and chaos, there is still flowing strongly the irresistible passion of the people for peace, abundance and brotherhood—above all, for peace, the yearning for which surpasses every other aspiration and hope! It was apparent in France; it was apparent in England; I am convinced that it exists everywhere else.

Those who support or tolerate De Gaulle or Schuman or Bevin do so not because they are thus subjectively lining up with one of the war camps but because they hope against hope that these forces ARE trying to maneuver for an independent position between the war camps; because they hope that thus there may be a longer period of the uneasy peace now in the world—that perhaps, by a miracle, the war may be postponed to an indefinite future. In Europe no one but irresponsible madmen and isolated reactionaries dares to speak about war, or war with Russia, in the free and easy terms of our militarists and imperialists here in the United States.

In Europe there are no outspoken supporters of American imperialism or of the Marshall Plan. There are only apologists for it—and there is a significant difference between the two.

The most that anyone dares say on behalf of American capitalism or the American government or the Marshall Plan is: After all, we are going to get food and economic assistance from the U. S. And even such apologists find it imperative to add that whatever aid is coming will be absolutely under the control of their own respective governments.

Even in England, which is less dependent on the U. S. than any other European country, there is not a political figure who does not find himself obliged to take a vigorous and

forthright position against the slightest signs of political intervention by the U. S. Thus, for example, there was the denunciation of Hoffman for his remarks about nationalization in England; there is denunciation for any hint from the U. S. that Marshall Plan aid will depend on the devaluation of the British pound.

WORKERS YEARN FOR PEACE, INDEPENDENCE FROM BLOCS

The striving for independence from Russia and from the U. S. expresses, so far as the masses are concerned, the striving for peace, for evasion of the war they fear, and for a socialist future over which they themselves can freely preside. Nowhere have these feelings acquired free, clear and full expression in any organized movement. That is the tragedy of Europe today. The working class is heavily oppressed by the ideological as well as physical burdens of yesterday. Its daily life is such that politics is its second or even its third preoccupation; but in a certain kind of cynicism which has spread in its midst, it expresses in elementary form its contempt for the politicians and political parties that exist.

This can even be generalized into the following statement: Nowhere in Europe does any working-class party or any party which appeals to the workers enjoy the enthusiastic or convinced support of its followers—nowhere. At the most, these parties can console themselves with the thought that they are tolerated in an irritated way by their own members, supporters and followers.

We have already spoken of France. At bottom the same story can be told of England.

The differences, of course, are important. The Labor Party has an absolute majority in Parliament for the first time. There too the workers do not want to go back to the old ways, and despite their dissatisfaction they are not at all going back to Churchill and the Tories, to say nothing of the completely disintegrated Liberal Party. In every election the workers—but not the middle classes—have continued to vote solidly for the Labor Party.

The hardships of the English worker are almost as great as those of the French, with the difference that there is practically no black market in England. There is another difference: the British workers want socialism but not totalitarianism in any form, however disguised. They want a continuation of the program of nationalization, and there is a growing dissatisfaction with the bureaucratic method of administration of the nationalized industries, a growing demand for workers' control. But the so-called left-wing Laborites are not a serious force because they are heavily compromised by their contact with the Stalinists, who are more or less marking time in England and have not become anything like an important political factor.

The Labor Party, it must be said, is going through an experience that requires the closest and most interested attention of every revolutionist.

Nobody expected it to go as far as it did with the nationalization of basic industries. Some twenty years ago, Trotsky spoke of such steps as meaning the beginning of the socialist revolution by parliamentary methods, and scouted their possibility on that ground. In the intervening years the rapid advance of capitalist stratification has radically changed the picture, in England and elsewhere.

How far can the Labor Party go without encountering the organized resistance of the bourgeoisie? To what extent is the bourgeoisie capable of offering resistance? To what extent will the working class endure the so-called "austerity" program while waiting for the nationalization program to yield an abundant life?

To answer such questions dogmatically without taking into account the new forces engendered by the disintegration of European capitalism would be, I think, a grave mistake and open the door to unexpected and disconcerting developments. In any case an attitude of head-on, blind antagonism to the Labor government is the height of absurdity. The British revolutionists who hold such an attitude are playing into the hands of either a bourgeois reactionary movement or the Stalinists. The militant workers' feelings that the immediate key is the struggle for expanding workers' control and participation in the nationalized industries is a more important guide to the immediate tasks.

Yet, for all the advances made by the Labor Party government in the field of nationalization, it has not been able to bring the workers back even to the height of enthusiasm marked by the general election which brought the party to power. In England too there is a widespread passivity among the workers; their support of the Labor Party government is more toleration than active support. Their main hope is that the government will be able to steer an independent road between Moscow and Washington.

In Europe today, the Social-Democratic and Communist Parties have reached numerical heights that they almost never had before. Yet both movements are patently bankrupt. For the first time, the workers—even those inside these parties—are for the most part without enthusiasm for their organizations. They do not really believe in them, they are not passionately devoted to them; there are exceptions, but this is the rule. The workers stay with them only because there is not yet a serious alternative offered to them by a serious movement.

Not the least important of the views held by our own Workers Party that I found confirmed in Europe was this one: that all hope of progress for the working class and for the reconstruction of the Marxist movement lies in the ability of the now scattered, disoriented and diminished ranks of the Marxists to offer a democratic alternative to Stalinism and a revolutionary alternative to reformism and its patron, American imperialism.

Yugoslav Feud —

(Continued from page 1)

"were in complete accord with the Bulgarian fascist occupation of Macedonia," and added: "We are being accused of nationalism by that same leadership in the Bulgarian Communist Party which in 1941 usurped our party organization, separated it from the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and added it to the Bulgarian party." (N. Y. Herald Tribune, July 13.)

In their bureaucratic-collectivist imperialism, the new satellites ape

the Russian mother country as in all else.

So also, in the capitalist world, Japan imitated the imperialist development of that country which opened it up to Western "civilization," the United States. The eventual clash between American imperialism and its offspring flowed from the inherent contradictions of capitalism. The bureaucratic-collectivist Stalinist empire is showing its seams likewise.

Socialist Policy and Marshall Plan —

(Continued from page 3)

italism's present throes can redound only to the strengthening of Stalinism and no one else, and that by staving off the worst economic difficulties the Marshall Plan provides an indispensable "breathing spell" during which the forces of socialism can regroup themselves. To this reasoning, which represents the methodology of social-patriotism, it must be said:

In the first place, if the working class challenges the imperialist plans of the American bourgeoisie, an impetus is thereby given to the socialist movement everywhere; if it remains an appendage of American foreign policy, however "critical," a weight will press on Europe for which no material aid can compensate.

In the second place, it is not true that the re-stabilization of European capitalism strengthens only or mainly the socialist movement; it is not the role of socialists to act as doctors for a sick capitalism but to take the road toward ending it. A program for capitalist restoration is a false substitute for a program to defeat Stalinism—on the contrary, it can only drive all revolutionary elements among the proletariat into the arms of Stalinism more firmly.

The alternatives are not capitalist recovery or Stalinist victory; to decide that this is so is to end any perspective for socialism in our epoch. In the past (in the First World War, for example) imperialist war has had the objective effect of creating the situation in which the imperialists could be overthrown by revolution; but this could be done only on the condition that the revolutionists opposed and fought against precisely that war which, in a sense, gave them their opportu-

nity. So also, Marshall aid may have, as one of its objective results, the weakening of Stalinist influence in Europe; but his weakening of Stalinism can redound to the interests of socialism, rather than solely to the interests of the bourgeoisie, only on the condition that the socialists fight against and denounce the Marshall Plan in common with the anti-imperialist workers.

Otherwise, the inevitable continuation of capitalist breakdown and disillusionment with "Marshallism" will only strengthen the Stalinists in the long run, while weakening the possibility of counterposing to them a democratic socialist alternative.

OPPOSE MARSHALL PLAN TREATIES

(7) Finally, another question has been raised in connection with the Marshall Plan in the following form: Shall the European workers accept or reject the economic aid which comes to them through the Marshall Plan?

A moment's reflection shows that this question, as stated, is either trivial or meaningless: the real question is a different one. Marshall aid will not be sent to Europe in a package which is to be merely signed for or rejected like a collect telegram. There is no question of the European workers agitating that the goods, food, bread or machinery which is sent to their country be sent back to the U. S. in indignation or protest.

The real question is posed by the necessity which the recipient countries are under to sign a bilateral treaty with Washington which makes them economic dependencies of American imperialism, not to speak of any other obligations which the capitalist governments will be forced to assume

which are not made public or which are imposed without treaties in the process of administering the plan.

Shall European socialists support their governments in accepting such economic-political pacts with American imperialism as a necessary evil in payment for the aid? Our answer is a categorical no. This is not a question of "accepting aid" but rather of approving the imperialist deal whereby the recipient bourgeoisie allies itself with the American master.

(8) In summary: the question of a socialist policy with respect to the Marshall Plan cannot be divorced from the more basic question of the socialist attitude toward the third imperialist world war now being prepared.

It is understandable that those who have decided to plump for the defense in war of American imperialism as the desperate lesser evil in comparison with Russian totalitarianism should also see in the Marshall Plan the only effective means of beating back the advance of Stalinism. It is understandable that those who are vacillating on this question should also vacillate or equivocate on the Marshall Plan. At bottom, the questions are the same in both cases.

But the consistent revolutionary socialist policy of the Third Camp, of supporting neither Washington nor Moscow in the pre-war maneuvers now making up the decisive elements of world politics—this likewise demands, as a corollary, consistent and unwavering opposition to the Marshall Plan in the meaning described.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE of the WORKERS PARTY

The BOOK SERVICE Now Has These Hard To Get Items:

- By Leon Trotsky
 - THE BOLSHEVIKI AND WORLD PEACE \$2.00
 - WHAT HITLER WANTS 50c
 - LESSONS OF OCTOBER (cloth) 1.50
 - THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION 3.50

- By G. M. Stekloff
 - HISTORY OF THE 1ST INTERNATIONAL 7.50

- By Francis Heisler
 - THE FIRST TWO MOSCOW TRIALS 75c

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, New York

Name

Address

City Zone State