

NEED TO REFORM LAWS ON MARRIAGE, DIVORCE

... See Page 3 ...

Workers of the World, Unite!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY DECEMBER 20, 1948

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

Vol. XII - No. 51

Truman Liberals On Display--The Humphrey Dinner

By Farrell Dobbs

NEW YORK, Dec. 10—Tonight I sweated out the speaking program at a testimonial dinner here in the Roosevelt Hotel in honor of Hubert Humphrey, senator-elect from Minnesota. It was held under the auspices of the Reunion of Old Timers Democracy, an intellectual front organization for the Socialist Party, of which Norman Thomas is a director.

I went there as a reporter for The Militant, not to pay tribute to Humphrey.

When I said over the CBS network on Nov. 2 that "The Socialist Workers Party . . . will not cooperate with the new administration which will be the servant of Big Business just as the old one was," I meant Humphrey, Chester Bowles and their kind, as well as Truman, Rankin and all other political stripes in the Democratic Party.

I arrived just as the guests were finishing their meal—at \$12.50 per plate. But the price presented no problem since most of those present draw fat salaries and usually have swindle sheets



HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

to which such little incidentals may be charged.

The roster of guests was made up primarily of old socialist and social-democratic functionaries and union bureaucrats, such as Abraham Beckerman, Nathaniel Minkoff and the ex-socialist judges, Jacob Panken and Samuel Orr.

There was also a liberal sprinkling of representatives of the younger generation of the same breed—Gus Tyler, Max Delson and others—who dabbled with left-wing socialism for a brief period during the 1930's.

At specially designated tables sat the officials of a long list of New York unions—International Ladies Garment Workers, Cap Makers, etc.—which at one time constituted the union base of a flourishing socialist movement.

William H. Davis, former chairman of the War Labor Board, and Leon Henderson, ex-OPA administrator, were among those on the dais.

In the main the assemblage was a melange of former socialist lawyers, functionaries and union bureaucrats who in the course of their evolution have renounced independent class politics and settled for a place on the liberal fringe of the Democratic Party. They are now going to school to a pair of newly arisen messiahs of liberal capitalism, Hubert Humphrey and Chester Bowles. A. F. Whitney of the Railway Trainmen, David Dubinsky of the ILGWU and Walter White of the NAACP led off with laudatory speeches about the "great statesmen," Humphrey and Bowles, who are leading a "campaign for righteousness."

Bowles followed with a few (Continued on page 2).

Layoffs Reported by Press: Jobless Figures Show Rise

In the wake of the continuing pre-Christmas decline in national retail sales come the first press reports of layoffs from various parts of the country.

The Census Bureau reports that unemployment in November rose to 1,731,000 nationally, 189,000 above October and 210,000 higher than in November 1947. In New York state, unemployment rose 10.2% in November over October.

As yet the reports of layoffs are scattered, but they cover different sections of the country and numerous industries. While it is too early to say whether this is the beginning of a definite "slump," business observers and commentators are taking public note of the fact that November employment figures fell below 60 million for the first time in six months.

The Business Section of the Sunday N. Y. Times, Dec. 12, runs a considerable article on the "wave of layoffs" in the Stamford-Greenwich area of Connecticut "serious enough" to bring a call for a meeting of "community and state leaders, manufacturers and labor chiefs." Other items disclose layoffs at Consolidated Vultee in San Diego, California, and Westinghouse Electric in Lima, Ohio.

John G. Forrest, financial editor of the Times, speaks of "the increasing number of lay-offs now extending into the heart of the industrial Midwest."

Citing the Connecticut community as a "typical industrial area," the Times stated that "conditions there indicate some consumer goods pipelines are being filled up, some deferments of orders are taking place and some permanent readjustment levels are being made by companies whose production has caught up with their back orders."

In short, the typical glut of

U.S. Speeds Global Military Alliance in Secret Sessions



SWP Leaders to Speak At Anniversary Meeting

NEW YORK, Dec. 15—The Twentieth Anniversary of American Trotskyism will be celebrated by members and friends of the Socialist Workers Party in New York City on Sunday evening, Dec. 26.

As speakers the program will feature founders and present leaders of the SWP—National Secretary James P. Cannon, National Labor Secretary Vincent R. Dunne, Arne Swabek, George Clarke and others.

In addition to summing up the significance and effectiveness of the role played by the Trotskyist movement in this country during the last two decades, the speakers will also examine the perspectives of the SWP, the place that it occupies in the class struggle and the relation it has to all the other parties and movements competing for the allegiance of militant workers, Negroes and youth.

Among the topics to be discussed will be the launching of the Trotskyist movement in 1928, when a Left Opposition com-

batting the bureaucratization of the Communist Party was organized and The Militant appeared for the first time; the decision to build an independent revolutionary party after the Stalinist capitulation to Hitler in 1933; the formation of the Socialist Workers Party in 1938; the Roosevelt administration's persecution of the SWP for opposing

the second imperialist war; the inspiring first presidential campaign of the SWP in 1948; and the problems facing the labor movement as a result of the recent elections.

Before the speeches, a tasty buffet dinner will be served. The affair will begin at 6 P.M. on Dec. 26 at the Irving Plaza Hall, Irving Pla, and 15th St.

Miners to Demand 30-Hour Week; High Stockpiles Cause Work Loss

Soft coal stockpiles are now so high that the six-day work week has been ended in most mines. A majority of Virginia and Kentucky miners are working only three or four days a week, while surface diggings in these states and Pennsylvania have been shut down for 30 to 60 days.

As a result, the United Mine Workers is expected to demand a basic 30-hour week, six-hour day when new contract negotiations begin in the spring. Under the "willing and able" clause of their present contract, due to expire July 1, the miners may take an extended "holiday," it is reported.

Why Their Silence On Kutcher Case?

The British Daily Worker, discussing the witch-hunt in America, referred to the case of James Kutcher, legless veteran fired from the VA, as an example of the lengths to which the current government purge is going. However, the British Stalinist paper omitted mention of the fact that Kutcher is a Trotskyist and was fired solely because of his membership in the Socialist Workers

Even more despicable is the position of the American Daily Worker. It not only refuses to support Kutcher's fight against the subversive list under which the Stalinists too are being persecuted, but has the distinction of being one of the few papers in the country that has not even mentioned the case.

Firing of Kutcher Unconstitutional, Says Lawyer Guild

NEW YORK, Dec. 15—The National Lawyers Guild considers James Kutcher's discharge from his job in the Veterans Administration a "violation of his constitutional rights," according to Arthur G. Silverman, executive secretary of the Guild's New York City Chapter. At the same time, two prominent members of this chapter have joined the Kutcher Civil Rights Committee. They are Murray Baron, New York City chairman of the Liberal Party, and Paul O'Dwyer, a vice-president of the New York Guild chapter.

The Kutcher defense committee had asked the Lawyers Guild of this city to take a position on the case of the legless veteran who was fired solely because of his membership in the Socialist Workers Party. In reply, Silverman called attention to a resolution on the government purge adopted unanimously by the National Lawyers Guild at its convention in Chicago earlier this year, and added:

"The National Lawyers Guild therefore regards the proceedings instituted against Mr. Kutcher as having been unauthorized and void and his discharge from Government service a violation of his constitutional rights."

The Guild convention resolution takes a forthright stand against the whole loyalty purge system. It declares:

"... The test oath has always been abhorrent in the United States. So the Supreme Court has stated. Yet the Executive Branch of the Federal Government and several States in emulation, have

(Continued on page 2)

Rearming of Japan Implied In Gen. MacArthur's Report

The most far-reaching and ominous military alliance in history is nearing completion in Washington. Meeting in secret under auspices of the U. S. State Department, top diplomatic

trolls, censorship of communications, etc.

Truman approved this militaristic legislative proposal with the remark that "currently almost one-half of the national budget is directly devoted to na-

tional defense and international

programs, and the work of nearly

all the major units of our govern-

ment bears an intimate rela-

tion to mobilization problems."

The Atlantic Pact is the mili-

tary capstone to the Truman

Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

The Truman Doctrine constituted

a declaration of "cold" war on

the Soviet Union. The Marshall

Plan pumped life-saving plasma

into the drained arteries of Wall

Street's capitalist allies in Europe.

Now, with the Atlantic Pact, war

preparations get down to armaments, air bases, recruitment of

armies, disposition of troops and

assignment of definite military

role to the various powers.

(Continued on Page 4)

national defense and international

programs, and the work of nearly

all the major units of our govern-

ment bears an intimate rela-

tion to mobilization problems."

The Atlantic Pact is the mili-

tary capstone to the Truman

Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

The Truman Doctrine constituted

a declaration of "cold" war on

the Soviet Union. The Marshall

Plan pumped life-saving plasma

into the drained arteries of Wall

Street's capitalist allies in Europe.

Now, with the Atlantic Pact, war

preparations get down to armaments, air bases, recruitment of

armies, disposition of troops and

assignment of definite military

role to the various powers.

(Continued on Page 4)

CURRAN WIDENS PURGE OF STALINISTS IN NMU

A by-product of the recent CIO convention was exhibited last week in the National Maritime Union when President Joseph Curran, upon his return

from Portland, initiated a sweeping purge of his Stalinist

opponents in the union.

A list of Stalinists was published

in the union paper with in-

structions to officials not to

accept their dues or accord them

the privileges of members until

their "constitutional position has

been clarified by the union."

The reference to "constitutional

position" refers to the provi-

on in the union constitution defin-

ing the status of members. Members

ashore over ninety days, without

acceptable excuse, are considered

"inactive" and are required to

retitle their union books until

they decide to become "active" again.

It was largely because of their bureaucratic methods that the membership turned against the Stalinists and ousted them from office. The Rank and File Caucus which led the struggle against them had as its main plank the restoration of internal union democracy. The use of Stalinist methods, even when directed immediately at the Stalinists, is a serious threat to the elementary democratic rights of all members.

It is necessary to warn that bureaucratic precedents justified

by the argument of giving the

Stalinists a "dose of their own

medicine," can become a noose

with which to strangle internal

union democracy.

A Hotbed of Jim Crow--Washington, D. C.

The national capital itself, Washington, D. C., is one of the "worst examples" of racial discrimination and segregation in this Jim-Crow country, states a sensational report, based on a two-year survey, released Dec. 10, by the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital.

Setting the pattern for what the report calls "shocking" conditions and a "blot on the nation," are the federal government itself, the business interests and the churches, both Protestant and Catholic.

"GOOD BUSINESS"

Although the conditions cited in the report have long been known, its special significance lies in its findings that Jim Crow in Washington — and by implication, everywhere else in the United States — is deliberately fostered and "planned as a matter of good business."

The report, sponsored by a com-

mittee of 90 prominent liberals headed by Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, New York, charges "dominant real estate interests, commercial and financial interests" with "planning the segregation of Negroes in housing, jobs, theatres, restaurants, parks and playgrounds."

Racial difficulties arise in Washington, says the report, not in the "field of spontaneous relations," but "on a high policy level where the segregation of the Negro is planned as a matter of good business, and investments are made in the denial of his equal right to own property."

HOW PATTERN IS SET

"It is not the poor whites who set the pattern, but men of acknowledged culture and refinement, the leaders of the community."

Racial discrimination and segregation have grown steadily worse in Washington over the past 50 years and have reached their culminating point in the past 16 years of

the Democratic Administration, the facts of the report demonstrate.

Dissecting the "anatomy of discrimination in the Federal Government," the survey discloses that racial abuses prevail in all government departments "as a matter of accepted practice." While "Jim Crow seems to have been first recognized" in the Republican administration of William Howard Taft, it became "general government policy" under the "New Freedom" administration of Democrat Woodrow Wilson, when the government "set about putting the Negro in his place."

Can Liberals Be Trusted in Civil Rights Fight?

By Albert Parker

The struggle to win democratic rights for the Negro people will enter new climactic stage when the 81st Congress meets next month. In order to gain victory in this struggle, the enemies of Jim Crow must have a clear understanding of the strategy that will be employed against us.

The struggle for Negro equality is no longer a problem restricted only to the Negro community and the radical movement. One evidence of its new position was the prominence of the civil rights issue in the recent election campaign. Another evidence is the stream of documents on various aspects of the problem — the most famous being the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, the latest being the report on segregation in Washington. (See details on Page 1.)

These documents testify to the rising strength, militancy and stubborn effectiveness of the Negro struggle as well as to the dynamic, economic and social changes in the Negro's status made by the unionization of the mass industries and the continued Negro urbanization during the last decade and a half.

TALK AND ACTION

But there is another aspect of these reports — a dangerous aspect — to which insufficient attention has been paid. And that is the prestige which they create for their sponsors and signers as "progressives" who can be looked to for leadership in the fight against Jim Crow.

If talk is cheap, then signing reports is cheap too. Put your name to some document on the Negro question and overnight you can become a champion of Negro rights, hailed for your courage and liberalism. The more radical the document sounds and the more insistently it repeats charges that have been made a thousand times, the more heroic you are.

Many an enviable reputation has been built in this way by people who never lifted a finger to abolish the Jim Crow system. Hubert Humphrey, the Senator-elect from Minnesota, who got national fame for pushing the civil rights plank at the Democratic convention, is a case in point. And there are many labor leaders whose progressive reputations on the Negro question are not always justified by their actions as distinguished from their talk. For an example, (see the item about Philip Murray in Notes from the News on Page 4.)

This does not mean that the Trumanite liberals and labor leaders are going to confine themselves to talk on the Negro question when Congress meets. If they did, their progressive reputations would wither away as fast as they grew up, and they know it. They know that the time for mere talk and declarations and reports is reaching its end because the Negro people have had enough of such tricks, see through them and will not be satisfied unless action is taken. The liberal-labor coalition leaders know also that the Negro struggle acts as a ferment, stirring the working class into struggle, and they want, if possible, to quiet it down. For all these reasons we can expect that they will carry on a noisy campaign for certain reforms, and that changes will be made.

Yes, changes will be made. Negroes will be appointed to additional posts in the government. Truman may set up a few interracial units in the armed forces. Congress may pass some watered-down version of an anti-lynching or FEPC bill. Some action will

probably be taken to ease up on the pattern of strict segregation in the nation's capital, which embarrasses the government in its international relations.

The purpose of these moves will be to convince the Negro people that a real change in race relations is being undertaken, that the way to achieve equality is through the "gradual" process of parliamentary reform, that Negroes can and must rely on the Democratic politicians, and especially the Trumanite liberals, to lead them to the promised land. All this is false to the core. Negroes who fall for this deception will experience the effects that follow the eating of soft-soap.

It is false because all of the changes envisioned by the liberals remain within the Jim Crow framework. Like unscrupulous landlords, they will replace some of the broken windows and lay on a new coat of paint, but the rotten Jim Crow structure itself will remain standing. They don't want and are incapable of making fundamental changes, no matter how radical their talk becomes.

The report on segregation in Washington is as radical as such documents can ever be. "It is not the poor whites who set the pattern, but men of acknowledged culture and refinement, the leaders of the community," says the report. Furthermore, the "dominant real estate, commercial and financial interests" are responsible for planning segregation "as a matter of good business," and the government for practicing discrimination in all departments.

Hubert Humphrey, Philip Murray, Eleanor Roosevelt and Walter Reuther, among others, sponsored this report. The question that must now be put to them is this: Do they propose to deprive the "dominant real estate, commercial and financial interests" of the political and economic power that these interests are able to use against the Negroes? The answer is obviously No, as we can observe from their political behavior during the 1948 campaign when they worked to preserve the capitalist two-party system and to return to office the Democratic administration under which these evils have continued

or grown worse during the last 16 years.

NO HALF-WAY THING

Naturally, it is necessary to fight for minor changes while engaging in the battle for the basic changes. But never forget this: Equality cannot be a half-way thing. Either you have it in all spheres or you don't really have it at all. And if you don't have it in all spheres, then whatever gains you may make in any sphere, far from being secure and lasting, will be subject to sudden loss at the hands of the ruling class. That was the bitter story of the Jewish people in Germany, and the danger exists, if we don't abolish the capitalist cause of race oppression, that it will be repeated on a larger and bloodier scale with regard to Negroes in the U. S.

The reformist theory of "gradual" gains, which the liberals want substituted for the fight for full equality, is not a new one. It has a long and instructive history, beginning with Booker T. Washington, and has had ample opportunity for over half a century to prove its value in action. And yet the report on Washington admits that segregation there is worse today than it was 50 years ago. If Negroes continue to follow such a program, the grandchildren of the present Humphreys and Murays will undoubtedly sponsor another report in 1998, saying substantially the same thing.

Full economic, political and social equality in our time — not in some far distant future — must remain the unswerving demand of militant Negroes and white workers. We can accept the support of liberals for specific measures in line with our main objective (FEPC, antilynching, antipoll tax bills, etc.). But we dare not yield the leadership of the Negro struggle to these liberals, or to place an ounce of political credit in them, because their final objective is quite different from ours and because we will have to fight them as well as the conservative supporters of capitalism when we launch upon the establishment of a Workers and Farmers Government which alone can institute true equality for all races and colors.



A contingent of Int'l Longshoremen's Ass'n (ILA) members led by Pres. Joseph P. Ryan (c., wearing hat) was on hand when the British liner Queen Elizabeth docked in N. Y., to greet crew members and thank them for their support in the recent east coast dockers' strike. The Queen's sailing was delayed 14 days when the crew refused to ship to a strikebound port. (Federated Pix)

CLEVELAND AFL EDITOR DISCUSSES CASE OF LEGLESS VET OVER RADIO

CLEVELAND — The Kutcher case is "a dramatic symbol of the way in which certain interests can institute witch hunts in America," said A. I. Davey Jr., editor of the weekly AFL paper, Cleveland Citizen, in his recent radio talk for the program, Labor News and Views, which is heard every Sunday over Station WSRS. Most of this program was devoted to a discussion of the issues in the Kutcher case.

Davey began his talk by recalling that when the loyalty purge system was initiated, he had stated over the radio that "there was serious question in my mind whether anything in the hands of a political group, no matter what party affiliations it might have, could be completely devoid of the machinations of a party

"Here is a dramatic symbol of the way in which certain interests can institute witch hunts in America. If a man or woman can be hounded as 'disloyal' by government officials and fired from his job solely because of his political beliefs, who is safe from persecution? How do we know but that the next step would not be a barrel of them."

Davey then referred to the purge in the Cleveland Post Office, where many employees, particularly Negroes, have been suspended or fired for alleged communist associations:

"I don't know enough about it to speak intelligently on the overall picture. Yet I do know some of the individuals concerned and all I can say is that if they are Communists, then I am queen of the May. They may not agree with the Postmaster or even with the President of the United States — I know that some of them certainly do not agree with me — but believe me, that is no crime, for they are certainly not in select company."

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world conquest for the price of a few paltry concessions on the domestic front. They don't care what happens to the peoples of the world. When they say "the people" they really mean themselves.

They are placing themselves and they seek to place the working people at the service of American imperialism in its program of world

Subscriptions: \$1 per year;
50¢ for 6 months. Foreign:
\$2 per year; \$1 for 6 months.
Entered as second class
matter Mar. 7, 1944 at the
Post Office at New York,
N. Y., under the act of Mar.
2, 1929.

THE MILITANT
Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. (Phone: AL 4-9330)
FARRELL DOBBS, Editor

Vol. XII—No. 51

Monday, December 20, 1948



TROTSKY



LENIN

"All talk to the effect that historical conditions have not yet 'ripened' for socialism is the product of ignorance or conscious deception. The objective prerequisites for the proletarian revolution have not only 'ripened'; they have begun to get somewhat rotten. Without a socialist revolution, in the next historical period at that, a catastrophe threatens the whole culture of mankind. The turn is now to the proletariat, i.e., chiefly to its revolutionary vanguard. The historical crisis is reduced to the crisis of the revolutionary leadership."

—Leon Trotsky, *The Death Agony of Capitalism*, 1938.

What the Vote Tabulation Shows

The final tabulation of last month's presidential vote, as published by the Associated Press, reveals several significant facts obscured and ignored by the Trumanite labor leaders in their hurrahs for the Truman "landslide."

First, the total vote for state, county and local candidates was higher than the total for president. 688,382 who balledot for other candidates did not vote for president.

Second, only 51.2% of eligible voters cast presidential ballots this year, compared to 59.5% in 1940 and 56.4% in 1944. Thus, 14% less people, in proportion to population, voted for president in 1948 than eight years ago.

Third, for the first time since 1912 a president was elected by less than a majority of all votes cast. Truman received only 49.5% of the popular vote. He had merely a plurality; the combined votes of his opponents were 50.5% of the total.

These facts, taken together, are very revealing. They show that nearly 700,000 people who took the trouble to go to the polls did not find either Truman or Dewey worthy of support. To these must be added the eight million voters who should have voted—but didn't—if the normal proportion of voters had turned out last Nov. 2.

Here is a huge block of voters and potential

voters so disgusted with the politics of both major parties of the capitalist class, Democratic and Republican, that they either stayed home or refrained from voting for either Truman or Dewey. And Truman won not by a "popular outpouring" or "landslide" but with a majority of the popular vote against him.

All these facts reveal a vast reservoir of protest against the dominant political machines. Had this reservoir been tapped by a new aggressive party of labor, together with the millions of workers who were corralled by the union leaders into unenthusiastic support once more for the "lesser evil" candidate, a tremendous new political force would have been set in motion.

But this potential political force remains. The Truman Administration, with its program of militarism and war preparations, in the next years will discredit itself utterly with the popular masses and prove to new millions the folly and fallacy of the politics of the "lesser evil."

The people are going to demand a new broom that will really sweep clean. The pressure from the workers for a party of their own will become overwhelming. Those labor militants who advocate a labor party will not lack for a responsive audience in the days to come.

When professional ring of lawyers and detectives who arrange adulterous scenes was recently exposed, New York's scandalous divorce laws made headlines and Hogan started his probe into the divorce proceedings of the past five years.

The liberals have taken the occasion to press for reform of New York's divorce laws. They point to the evil effects of universal hypocrisy and the collusion of the courts in getting around unworkable legislation. They decry the sordidness of forcing honest people to bear the stigma of adultery. They point out that the law does not lessen divorce or save marriages. They propose widening the grounds for divorce.

None of them, however, suggest recognizing the fundamental right of a person to a divorce on the grounds of personal desire.

The Catholic hierarchy has thrown its weight into the controversy. Msgr. Robert E. McCormick, presiding judge of the Archdiocesan Tribunal of New York issued a blast Dec. 11, demanding that the legislature "correct the present sad condition by banning divorce entirely."

It is solely in deference to this ultra-reactionary view that the divorce laws of New York still remain among the most backward in the country.

The Stalinist reaction to the current public interest in this important social question is a curious one. At first they tried to link the detective involved in the divorce mill with the detective accused of making an illegal entry into the home of Stalinist State Chairman Robert Thomson. They would give the capitalists a clean bill of health, just as they will do at the end of the present hearings in Washington.

The corporation books must be investigated by committees of industrial workers, white collar workers, veterans, farmers, professional people—those whose standard of living is being undermined and whose economic security is gravely threatened by the profit hogs. They won't cover up for monopoly capitalism. They want to know the true facts.

Later, The Worker printed a perfunctory article that hoped the scandal might stimulate a demand to transform the New York divorce law "from the most backward to the most advanced in the 48 states." But the Stalinists did not say what kind of law they considered the "most advanced." Perhaps this is because they are vulnerable on the question.

When the Soviet Union was founded, the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky re-wrote Russian marriage legislation. Here's a sample clause: "The mutual consent of the husband and wife or the desire of either of them to obtain a divorce shall be considered a ground for divorce."

All the legislation on marriage was written in this spirit. Two big objectives were in mind: to protect the children and to safeguard the right of people to happiness in their personal lives.

The Bolsheviks did not consider these laws the final word. They held that these laws were only transitional in character, and that they contained concessions, necessary at the time, to capitalist marriage institutions. Eventually, the Bolsheviks hoped, marriage and divorce would become completely voluntary with no interference from the state.

The marriage laws have changed in the Soviet Union since then, but in precisely the opposite direction from that hoped by the Bolsheviks. Under Stalin, the general degeneration affected this

Mass unemployment is no remote or academic issue. The employers are already using the threat of cutbacks and layoffs to counter fourth-round wage demands. Foresight dictates that labor must meet the coming challenge with a militant, united, nationwide campaign for the 30-Hour Week, Six-Hour Day with No Reduction in Take-Home Pay.

While no one can say, absolutely we are now heading into the "bust," it is equally true that no can say with certainty that this is not the beginning, or that it won't come in six months or a year. What is most important for the workers to remember is that it would

Probe of New York Divorce Racket Stirs Public Interest in Model Law

By Paul Abbott

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the 48 states. In fact, most laws are designed to compel married people to continue living together whether they like it or not.

When a married couple decides that their love for each other has gone and they can no longer live happily together, it would seem that no fair-minded person could challenge their right to a divorce, whether by mutual agreement or the wish of either one. Yet this basic human right is not recognized in the marriage laws of the

'Hire' Learning in America

By Art Preis

America's colleges and universities are often called institutions of "hire" education. Most of them are controlled by boards of trustees who are largely wealthy businessmen and corporation executives. They govern the funds—which means they dictate salaries, promotions, selection of personnel, hiring and firing. It is their views on matters economic, social and political that are pumped into the heads of students.

In recent years the ties of higher education to the capitalist profit system have been greatly strengthened. A large number of leading colleges and universities are investing endowment funds in private businesses—ranging from Rockefeller Center to a spaghetti factory—whose profits are used to maintain these educational institutions.

A nation-wide study reported by Benjamin Fine in the Dec. 13 N. Y. Times reveals that of the \$2½ billion of endowments held by the country's colleges and universities "about \$1 billion, or 40 per cent, is invested in real property, business or commodities. Before the war less than 20 per cent was so invested, the rest being in government bonds or gilt-edged securities."

Last year 455 colleges and universities, including such giants as Columbia and New York University, reported they owned or operated private-profit enterprises whose products were sold to outside persons. The profits from this billion-dollar investment totalled \$150,492,583—all tax-exempt.

A large part of this investment is in speculative real estate "which then usually is leased to the original owner or operated by the institution itself." Another financial device is "establishment by alumni and friends of holding companies, organized to own and operate businesses, the in-

come of which goes to the university." An important source of profit is the "creation of research and patent-holding companies."

New York University has acquired in the last few years four different types of businesses, namely, the C. F. Mueller spaghetti company; the Ramsey Corp., making pistons; American Limoges China, Inc.; and Howes Leather Co., a \$35 million outfit that nets two to three millions profit yearly. The tax savings on profits of these four firms—since they are used for "educational purposes"—amounts to \$1½ million a year.

The country's largest university, Columbia, in addition to \$16,471,685 invested in apartment houses and similar real estate, owns a \$28,230,311 slice of Rockefeller Center—which indicates how much say Standard Oil and Chase National Bank have in the directing of "hire" learning in the United States.

Many businessmen and corporations are eager to encourage this method of financing universities, because it provides a means of dodging the 38% corporate Profits tax. "Almost all the major institutions," reports Fine, "are besieged by offers from business organizations to 'buy out' their buildings and then lease them back."

Dr. Carter Davidson, president of Union College a year ago acquired the real estate, store building and warehouse of Abraham Straus & Co., Brooklyn department store, conceded that "some institutions have abused their privilege somewhat in buying factories and then claiming tax exemption for these corporations."

At any rate, it's easy to see why higher education in America is devoted to "shielding" the youth from the ideas of Marxian socialism.

New Leads in Tresca Case

NEW YORK CITY — Fresh hope of a solution of the 1943 murder of Carlo Tresca, Italian journal editor, was voiced today by Norman Thomas, chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee, in view of new leads now being investigated by the office of District Attorney Frank S. Hogan and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"Recently," Thomas said, "we wrote to Mr. Hogan concerning statements about the Tresca killing and the Juliet Stuart Poyntz disappearance, made in a new book by Benjamin Gitlow, former secretary-general of the Communist Party of America. We suggested that those statements would justify his [Gitlow] being asked to appear before the county Grand Jury, to discover what tangible evidence exists to support his story about both cases."

"Mr. Gitlow, in his book, *The Whole of Their Lives*, tells of a feud between Tresca and Enea Sorrenti, now said to be head of the Cominform in Trieste, which ended with Tresca's murder. He ascribes that slaying to two factors: that Tresca 'dared to buck the IGPU [Stalinist secret police] on the Poyntz case'; and that Tresca 'tried to foil Stalin's plans in Italy by keeping the Communists out of the Italian-American Victory Council.'

"Tresca testified before a federal Grand Jury here in 1938, accusing the Communists of kidnapping and murdering Miss Poyntz. At that time, Mr. Gitlow avers, 'there was open talk sponsored by the Tresca Memorial Committee in the Communist circles that Tresca would pay with his life for his treachery.'

"The feud with Sorrenti began, the Gitlow book says, after a close friend of Tresca was murdered in Spain. We know that Tresca devoted the whole front page of his journal *Il Martello* (The Hammer) in May, 1942, to an attack on Sorrenti, assailing him as a 'commandant of spies, thieves, and assassins' during the Spanish Civil War."

"Mr. Gitlow records that Tresca told him, shortly before he was killed, that he knew Sorrenti was in New York. It was then that he also told several other friends about seeing Sorrenti here, and remarked: 'Where he is I smell murder. I wonder who will be the next victim?'

"In writing Mr. Hogan I pointed out that Mr. Gitlow's statements about the two cases appeared to have much more solidity than those of Louis F. Budenz, ex-editor of the Communist Daily Worker, in his autobiography last year. From the manner of Mr. Gitlow's writing (the manner of one with information from sources close to the facts) I feel that there was good reason to hope that he could be more helpful in solving both the Tresca and Poyntz cases than was Mr. Budenz."

"Our committee, however, has always kept an open mind about the guilty in the Tresca case. From the start fingers of suspicion have pointed toward both Fascists and Communists."

Tresca was shot down in the dim-out at Fifth Avenue and 15th Street in 1943. Friends will honor him on the sixth anniversary of his death, Tuesday, Jan. 11, at 8 p. m., at a meeting sponsored by the Tresca Memorial Committee in the Labor Temple, 242 East 14th St.

Forrestal's Dictatorship Plan

"The policies declared by Defense Secretary Forrestal, if followed, would place the nation in the fascist orbit with control in the hands of the military," warns Ray Martin, informed columnist of *Labor Herald*, oldest independent weekly in Maryland and the District of Columbia.

In two recent articles, Martin charged that James Forrestal, "former president of the international banking house known as Dillon, Read and Company," is "promoting schemes to control everything in the nation under the guise of security. Complete control would be lodged with the military; this is the very essence of a military fascist dictatorship."

Among the proposals which Forrestal, just re-named Secretary of Defense by Truman, has put forward in the past three months are:

"Universal Military Training: A national service law compelling workers to work in specified plants; a secret police force operated by the Army, in lieu of the FBI; to have local police supplanted by the Military Police in time of emergency; news censorship by the Army; an official government newspaper controlled by the

Army; and the complete control of commerce and industry by the Army.

"To add to these aims the Defense Department has made public a civil defense program against enemy attack — a program that will bridge the gap by providing the link that is missing in our defense structure."

This "missing link," reports Martin, "calls for the establishment of a civil defense agency with some 15,000,000 persons" under the complete control of the Defense Department, that is, the military machine. "Provision for 'loyalty oaths' of the civilian defense workers is included in the proposal."

In assailing the plans for military dictatorship being prepared by Forrestal, representing the Wall Street-Big Brass interests, Martin pointedly quotes from the Declaration of Independence signed 172 years ago: "He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil Power." The statement referred to the King of England. It was but one of many tyrannical subjugations that we sought to free ourselves of."

Notes from the News

MURRAY ON BIAS — George F. McCray of the Associated Negro Press reports that at the recent CIO convention Philip Murray "talked in prudish language about the strong anti-discrimination which the steel workers had just put into operation. Few delegates knew, and perhaps President Murray himself did not know, that the steel workers anti-discrimination committee, which was appointed as far back as June, has not even organized itself for work."

CIO CRACKDOWN PROCEEDS — The national CIO has continued the way for its crackdown on Stalinist-dominated CIO internationals by taking jurisdiction in the retail clerks field away from the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Workers and giving it to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Meanwhile, leaders of the Farm Equipment Workers have refused to act on the demand that they dissolve into the United Auto Workers until the FEW convention in February.

D. C. REPORT AVAILABLE — The report of the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, entitled "Segregation in Washington," may be obtained from the committee's headquarters at 4901 Ellis Ave., Chicago.

JAPAN WAGE CURB — MacArthur has told the Japanese government to put a ceiling on wages if it wants "maximum American financial help."

OLD-AGE SLIDING SCALE — M. Moran Weston, labor columnist of the N. Y. Amsterdam News, advocates a sliding scale of benefits for old age insurance: "A provision should be included to require adjustment of payments, up or down, whenever changes in the cost of living as computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics went up or down more than a specified number of points."

DANGEROUS BALLYHOO — The so-called "reform" of court-martial procedure is subjected to justified criticism by the committee on military justice of the New York County Lawyers Association. The ballyhoo about the value of the surface changes made so far is dangerous, says the committee, because it reduces "the possibility of further Congressional action to effect the real reforms which are still lacking."

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS — to Jimmy Kutter of Newark, who will be 36 the day after Christmas. Return of his civil rights and recovery of his job would be the best present of all. We can't promise them for his birthday but we'll do our best to help him win the battle against the bi-partisan witch-hunters.

Way back before the war, the

THE MILITANT

VOLUME XII

MONDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1948

NUMBER 51

G. L. K. Smith Hard Pressed To Keep Fascist Party Going

Lynch Victim's Widow Accuses Klansmen



Mrs. Amy Mallard swears out a warrant identifying Wm. L. Howell (r) as one of the mob of hooded white men who shot and killed her husband on a dark Georgia road Nov. 20. The lynchers halted the Mallard car, in which Mrs. Mallard and two young cousins were riding. Georgia police took no action following Mrs. Mallard's charges until the day of her husband's funeral, when they arrested the widow and charged her with the murder. While protests forced the dropping of this absurd charge, the two teen-age cousins are being held in jail as material witnesses. (Federated Pix)

WHY STALINIST MACHINE IN TWU WAS CRUSHED AFTER 14-YEAR RULE

Last March the Stalinists held an iron grip on the CIO Transport Workers Union. For 14 years they had ruled almost undisputed. Long-standing members or supporters of the Communist Party held all posts, from president on down.

Today, the Stalinist machine in the TWU is smashed. One section of the machine, under President Michael Quill, has deserted to the official CIO bureaucracy headed by Philip Murray. The other, which continued to serve the Stalinist line, has been driven out of all posts and offices.

STALINIST ALIBI

The CP leaders try to attribute their latest debacle in the CIO solely to the general red-baiting drive, the "treachery" and bureaucratic methods of Quill, the "backwardness" of the TWU members, the intervention of the Catholic hierarchy, etc. These factors exist, no doubt.

They might explain why a minority opposition fighting the entrenched leadership of a union, or the leadership of a local union bucking the international, could suffer defeat. But they don't explain how a long-entrenched professionally "progressive" leadership of an international union can be wiped out almost overnight by red-baiting opponents.

It speaks volumes that the Stalinist leaders who "educated" the TWU members over 14 years could become the victims of a crude red-baiting campaign, with a majority of the membership either applauding the red-baiting attacks or indifferent to the methods used in ousting their long-time leaders.

QUILL'S SCHOOL

Quill introduced nothing new into the TWU in running roughshod over the Stalinists or in using the most reactionary red-baiting against them. For more than a decade he'd been doing the very same thing, in the same post, against TWU militants and opponents of the Stalinist machine.

The Stalinist leaders crushed every voice of opposition or even mild criticism for 14 years. They red-baited militant workers as "Trotskyites." They, with Quill as their chief instrument, ruled with bureaucratic terror.

In the last stages of their desperate fight to hold onto their posts, the Stalinist leaders demagogically accused Quill of selling out the New York workers to the city bondholders by agreeing to a doubling of the subway fare in order to get a wage concession for the subway workers. But Quill was simply continuing the policy originally advanced by the Stalinist machine itself.

Fascist Spain, in one way or another, will be integrated into the gigantic coalition. As Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (S.C.) put it, "We must help people we know we can trust."

AXIS POWERS TOO

The former Axis powers rate as allies. Washington is said to be insisting on open inclusion of Italy in the pact. Chief of Staff Omar Bradley sent his plane to bring Italian Chief of Staff Gen. Elio Marras to Washington to discuss Italy's role.

As for Western Germany, Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royal gave substance to widespread speculation about German remilitarization by admitting

By Joseph Hansen

In 1946 the Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith, who hopes some day to be fascist dictator of America, made a national tour to speed the growth of his sinister "Christian Nationalist" movement. It will be recalled that he ran into more than he had bargained for.

Crowds of working people, angered over Smith's efforts to bring fascism to power in this country, picketed his meetings in city after city. Demonstrators in many places expressed their indignation over Smith's "Crusade" in such militant fashion that police had difficulty protecting the demagogue.

Credit for ringing the alarm that aroused the militants in such places as Los Angeles, San Francisco, Detroit and Minneapolis belongs to the Socialist Workers Party. It was the SWP that called for action to stop this American imitator of Hitler before his movement could gain momentum.

Smith decided that the picket-line response to his campaign was doing him no good. He discreetly moved out of the spotlight. Since then, to judge from his latest "confidential" circulars, he has taken over the conduct of foreign policy.

In these circumstances, the would-be fascist dictators find the going none too easy. Their followers lose heart. The morale of Smith's crew, for instance, appears very low. To pick up their spirits just before election with hope of better days to come, the Reverend outlined the fascist perspective. After a "terrific crash" in 1949 or 1950, "Unemployment will sweep the Nation, distress and chaos will prevail. Murder, bloodshed, rioting, street fighting will be on every hand."

Then will come the day of victory for the fascist Christian Nationalists if they are "ready with a strong, thoroughly disciplined, air-tight organization."

AFTER THE ELECTION

The election results added to Smith's woes. He interpreted the evidence of labor's political power as an ill omen. "The Darkness Falls—Only the Courageous Can Survive," he titled his "confidential" post-election circular.

The ousting of Taft-Hartleyites from Congress deeply depressed the Christian Nationalist leaders. The defeat of certain constructive-minded men in Congress who were sucked down into defeat by a weak Dewey creates our greatest crisis. You . . . had better pray before . . . the left wing elements have tasted blood. . . You can expect to see terrible times. . . You can expect to see a flood of left-wing Jews move into Washington unless an alert public mind moves to correct such a situation. . . We must salvage our resources in Washington and prepare for what lies ahead . . .

The election results did not raise Smith's hopes of solving his financial problem. "This is a crisis letter," he confessed pleading for a contribution from the "small giver." "I beg of you to stand with us. We approach the holidays when it will be easy for the weaker ones to forget and to neglect us. I must depend on the stronger ones to sustain us, to stand by us and to support us."



GERALD L. K. SMITH

Since a bleak perspective of continued setbacks and defeats will scarcely loosen fascist purse strings, Smith tried to find some cheer in the outcome of the election for American fascism:

"I believe . . . that our Cause will grow more rapidly than ever. We can accomplish this victory. We can fulfill our destiny. With the Republican Party wrecked and the Truman administration about to expose its dereliction, we can be ready for the beginning of triumphal victories in 1949, 1950 and 1952."

Whether or not American fascism scores "triumphal victories" in the days to come depends in the main on what the labor movement does with its political power. If continued support is given the two-party system, then the soil can become favorable for the swift growth of fascism. If the trade unions break from the Democratic and Republican Parties, however, and set out on the road of independent political action leading to establishment of a Workers and Farmers Government, then the Christian Nationalist movement and similar native fascist formations will find the going exceedingly difficult even though Wall Street begins pumping unlimited funds into their treasuries.