

# Trumanites Back Police-State Bill In Senate Body

By John G. Wright

In a sudden move the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee, with only a single dissenting vote, reported out a new Mundt Sedition Bill, a streamlined version of the Mundt-Nixon Bill which died in the Senate in the Eightieth Congress and which aroused a nation-wide storm of protest.

The most sinister feature of the new attempt to impose thought-control, guilt by association and all the other trappings of a police state upon the people of this country is the action of the Trumanite "Fair Dealers" on the committee who voted in its favor and thus cleared the way for jamming it through the Senate in the course of the current session. The lone vote against was cast by Sen. Langer (R, N.D.).

Ostensibly aimed at the Communist Party, the new Mundt Bill would in reality tear to shreds the Bill of Rights and bury the freedom of the press, speech and all other elementary civil liberties.

It would empower the Attorney General to outlaw any organization or group by merely labeling it as "subversive." All such organizations, along with their members, would have to register, and thereby be liable to persecution. Failure to register would automatically render these organizations and their members outside the law, and equally liable to persecution. All mail and material issued by "subversive" organizations must be labeled as "communist." Members of such organizations would be denied government jobs, passports and the like.

## SWEEPING CLAUSE

One section of the Mundt Bill makes it unlawful "for any person knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any person to perform any act which substantially contributes to the establishment within the U. S. of a totalitarian dictatorship." This sweeping clause would not only make thought control and guilt by association the established practice. It would also outlaw "any act" which is arbitrarily designated as "subversive," or connected in any way with the propagation of "subversive" views. Elementary trade union activities and Negro struggles would become easy targets under such a law.

Sen. Kilgore, one of the Trumanites who voted favorably for reporting the bill out of the Judiciary Committee, has since announced that he views the bill as a "dangerous proposal" that might be used "against labor."

Sen. Kefauver, another Trumanite, has issued a statement doubting the bill's constitutionality and conceding that it may "violate guarantees of freedom of the press, speech and individual liberty." The other Trumanites on the committee have remained mum.

But their action speaks much louder than their silence or belated "doubts." The reporting of the Mundt Bill out of the committee, with the approval of the Truman supporters, can only be construed as an action of the Truman administration itself, which is apparently feeling out the ground before giving the go-ahead signal for this all-out assault on civil rights and eventually on the organized labor movement.

The Stalinist daily *Humanite* carried an account of the Dalmas meeting under the provocative caption "Silence the Titoists!" The Trotskyist propagandists for the traitor Tito, fumed *Humanite*, "are deluding themselves if they think they will be able to glorify with impunity the fascist regime now raging in Yugoslavia." Then referring to the Dalmas meeting, the *Humanite* gangsters boasted of the presence of the "partisans of peace" in the hall and concluded with the thinly veiled threat that it would not "take long" before the Trotskyists were made to understand that the "French people have no love for those who sing eulogies to fascism."

During his visit to Yugoslavia Dalmas interviewed Tito. Full text of this interview appears in the Jan.-Feb. issue of *Fourth International*, now on sale.

## TECHNOLOGICAL GAINS SWELL ARMY OF JOBLESS

Another sharp rise in unemployment was reported for February. The Department of Commerce placed the number of jobless at 4,684,000, or 204,000 above the total in the previous month. This estimate did not include the striking coal miners.

Administration spokesmen are beginning to run out of plausible explanations. In January they blamed the weather, the holidays and the "normal lull." This time Secretary of Commerce Sawyer said the rise in jobless "appears to be due mainly to a seasonal increase in the labor force and not to any cutbacks in employment."

A part of the increase in jobless is unquestionably due to the fact that more and more youth, leaving schools and colleges, are unable to find employment. This new disinherited generation of the youth, a replica of the youth in the Thirties, is one of the chronic conditions characteristic of the existing situation. But another and no less important chronic condition is the rise of technological unemployment.

New plants and new equipment plus intensified speed-up have been steeply stepping up production — to the profit of the corporations and at the expense of the workers. In one of the rare recent studies of growing technological unemployment, the conservative weekly *Business Week*, March 4, concludes that the rise in productivity last year was "spectacular."

It reports a midwest manufacturer as having gained 15% to 20% in output per man. "Another ended 1949 with employment 1,600 under 1948 and sales volume \$10-million higher — about a 10% shift each way." Similar reports

# Workers of the World, Unite!

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XIV - No. 11

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

## Lewis Urges "Mutual Aid" Pact for Defense of Strikes



### Chief Lesson of Mine Fight -- Need of Joint Labor Action

AN EDITORIAL

Thanks to their extraordinary discipline, courage and endurance, the coal miners have succeeded in flinging back the combined assault of the mine owners, the Big Business class and its government. We cannot commend the miners too highly for their inspiring fight.

But we are mindful, at the same time, of how much sacrifice and suffering the miners and their families had to go through in their long nine-month struggle and how close they came to defeat because they had to confront a host of enemies alone.

Had the rest of organized labor responded with timely all-out supporting action and material aid, the miners would have won a speedy and even more decisive victory. And what is more, the labor movement could have used the miners' battle as a springboard for a giant counter-offensive against the Taft-Hartley Act.

If this tremendous class battle teaches one lesson above all others, it is the need for all labor unions to join unitedly in defense of any section of labor that is under attack from the common enemy.

### How to Answer Boss Strategy

That is the lesson which John L. Lewis has correctly drawn. In returning a half-million dollar relief check that the CIO Steel Workers had sent the United Mine Workers, but which the UMW could not use because of the terms of Truman's Taft-Hartley injunction, Lewis proposed to Philip Murray that their two organizations negotiate "a mutual aid pact for common defense, wherein the assets of both organizations, or a stipulated part thereof, would be made available, each to the other, under emergent conditions."

He further proposed to consider "the possible admission of certain other unions that might wish to enjoy the advantage of such a protective arrangement."

To justify his proposal, Lewis explained that "the idea seems increasingly prevalent in industrial and financial circles that our great industrial unions should be attacked and crippled one by one. This idea should be knocked in the head." On this, we agree with Lewis 100%.

### A Congress of Labor Is Needed

If we have any criticism of Lewis's proposal to implement this, it is that his plan is too limited as to aims and means. Labor must speedily formulate a program for joint action not only to pool financial resources for mutual aid in strikes, but to combine for militant mass action against the Taft-Hartley Act and on every other vital issue facing the working people.

We hail Lewis's proposal as a forward-looking step. And we urge that he initiate a call for a National Congress of Labor, including all bona-fide unions, to lay the basis for a united defense of the labor movement and an aggressive nation-wide fight against the Taft-Hartley Act.

No doubt, the other top labor officials will hem and haw. They are more anxious to collaborate with the corporations and Truman than to strengthen labor for real battle. But the union ranks everywhere will appreciate the need for unified action in labor's defense. It is up to them to take the initiative in pushing the program for a National Congress of Labor.

## Bridges Trial Informer Got OK of CIO Leaders

Mervyn Rathborne, a chief government stooge against CIO Longshoremen's President Harry Bridges in the latter's perjury-conspiracy trial, testified last week that he was acting as an informer with the blessings of top CIO leaders, including Philip Murray, James Carey and Joseph Curran.

Rathborne related an interview he had had with Clark, now a U.S. Supreme Court justice, and Clark's statement that "they wanted to remove the influence of Mr. Bridges and others from the labor movement." Because the CIO had defended Bridges in the previous frame-up attempts, Rathborne decided to get Murray's views before agreeing to testify.

The government had made repeated unsuccessful attempts to deport the Australian-born Bridges as an alleged member of the Communist Party. He is now being tried on a perjury charge for allegedly falsely swearing he had never belonged to the Communist Party when he received naturalization papers in 1945. The latest move to victimize him arose last year during the Hawaiian dock strike led by his union.

No denial of Rathborne's admissions has come from official CIO sources and the CIO News makes no mention of them. Bridges was a member of the CIO National Executive Board at the time, in October 1948, when Rathborne states he got the OK to rat on Bridges.

Rathborne related an interview he had had with Clark, now a U.S. Supreme Court justice, and Clark's statement that "they wanted to remove the influence of Mr. Bridges and others from the labor movement." Because the CIO had defended Bridges in the previous frame-up attempts, Rathborne decided to get Murray's views before agreeing to testify.

### CAREY'S SIGNAL

He visited the CIO headquarters in Washington and in the absence of Murray discussed the matter with Secretary-Treasurer Carey. "Carey said, as far as he was concerned, if the proceedings were conducted properly, he wouldn't consider it an attack against the CIO," Rathborne said. Later Carey told him on the phone that he took the matter up with Murray, who "expressed no opposition at all, that he wasn't for

it, but didn't oppose it." Carey then told Rathborne that he thought it was "all right to follow Mr. Clark's advice."

Rathborne also consulted Joseph Curran, head of the CIO National Maritime Union. "Well, what did Joe Curran do, tell you to do all you could to get him (Bridges)?" the defense lawyer asked. Rathborne denied this. "In any event, he gave the undertaking his blessing?" was the next question. Rathborne testified: "Yes, he did."

### FITS INTO CIO PURGE

Rathborne's testimony is the first direct evidence that the CIO leaders have aided and encouraged the witch-hunt prosecution of Bridges. This fits into their own campaign to purge the Stalinists and other opponents of Murray's political policies from the CIO.

Murray had defended Bridges during the war, when the U.S. State Department and the Kremlin were in their honeymoon. That was when the main activity of the Stalinists in the unions was breaking strikes and pushing the speed-up. The Stalinists were no better then than now. But the State Department's line has changed, and so has Murray's.

## Lilienthal Rants at Scientists Telling Truth

By Ruth Johnson

David E. Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission and widely touted as a liberal, has joined the pack of reactionary hounds baying at the scientists who dare to tell the truth about the Hell-Bomb.

On March 1 Lilienthal publicly assailed four world famous atomic physicists who had warned that the hydrogen bomb may wipe out all life on earth. These men, Dr. Leo Szilard and Dr. Harrison Brown of the University of Chicago, Dr. Frederick Seitz of the University of Illinois, and Dr. Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University, are no fanciful alarmists. All played a key role in developing the atomic bomb. Their warning to day grows out of the bitter realization that no one can win an H-Bomb war.

Leaving all the other factors aside, the permanent army of unemployed is now being expanded on the one side by the inability of American capitalism to lift production enough to absorb the growing labor force, leaving millions of youth with no prospect of jobs; and on the other side, by the constant rationalization of production which requires fewer and fewer workers to achieve the same and even bigger output, driving workers by the hundreds of thousands into the streets. And this, under conditions of "prosperity,"

he accuses them of "wallowing in the hazards of atomic warfare," and finally of playing into the hands of the Kremlin.

Only a few weeks ago, it was white-supremacist Rankin who howled against Albert Einstein, defaming him as an "old faker," as a man "simply carrying out the Communist line," when Einstein warned that the Hell-Bomb could mean total annihilation. Now it is clear why the liberals made no outcry against Rankin's slanderous filth. They were waiting only to throw the second stone at the honest men of science.

Flagrantly distorting the statements of the four scientists, Lilienthal accuses them of "speculating on how to wipe out the earth." Sarcastically he continues, "These fine minds came up with this fine contribution — to transplant thirty to sixty million people . . . this is lot of high intellectual nonsense. It can't be done. It won't be done."

Actually, however, the four experts in atomic physics held out no hope that even such a vast movement of peoples would be effective. "The dispersal would be of no help at all against the effects of radioactivity" when more powerful H-Bombs are built, they emphasized.

THEY FEAR THE TRUTH

Why should a liberal capitalist like Lilienthal froth at the mouth when such plain truths are told? Why should he label this sober warning as "the extravagant and

sensational picturing of the horrors of atomic warfare?"

The reason is that Lilienthal is completely devoted to capitalism, which can only exist by world domination.

"What good comes from the extravagant and sensational picturing of the horrors of atom warfare?" he asked. "No good at all, he answers, because it does not serve the purpose of scaring the rulers of Russia," who are not "frightened by word pictures."

And since he believes that telling the truth does not serve this purpose, he wants it suppressed and those who try to tell it vilified.

The capitalist class — from the foul-mouthed Rankin to slandering liberals like Lilienthal — wants to minimize the terrible fate which they have prepared for the whole world. They are afraid that when the people learn the full truth about this fate, they will act to put an end to the capitalist misrule of society.

### MINERS WIN VICTORY BY MILITANCY

By Art Preis

The militant soft coal miners once more have proved there is no substitute for fighting mass action to win gains for labor. By reliance on their own organized strength against the combined powers of the strike-breaking government and the coal operators, the miners have won one of American labor's greatest victories.

Their triumph is two-fold. They smashed through the wage-freeze "pattern" which Truman attempted to impose on the basis of the formula cooked-up by his steel "fact-finding" board last September and which was accepted by Philip Murray and Walter Reuther for the CIO steel and auto workers. And they dealt a damaging blow to the Taft-Hartley Act with their bold and successful defiance of Truman's injunction.

### EFFECT ON LABOR

The miners' example may well inspire a new upsurge in the class struggle, after the almost steady succession of retreats led by the top union leaders since passage of the Taft-Hartley Law in June 1947. It will undoubtedly hearten the Chrysler strikers and spur the General Motors workers to a more aggressive fight for their new demands. The miners have shown the kind of methods that will win and the kind of demands that can be won.

The capitalist press, naturally, is trying to belittle the real scope of the miners' triumph. The mouthpieces of Big Business are playing up the great sacrifices which the miners had to make in their long struggle, particularly their loss in wages. But these losses — large as they undoubtedly were — do not compare with what the miners would have lost if the Truman administration and the operators had succeeded in their conspiracy to break the United Mine Workers.

Moreover, as the March 5 N. Y. Times grudgingly concedes, "a good bit of the lost time will be made up" and "a coal strike is different from almost every other kind of strike because much of the elapsed time would have been lost anyway" since the miners normally average only about 200 days' work a year.

### SUBSTANTIAL GAINS

But the miners won substantial gains — in fact, about three times as much as Murray accepted for the steel workers last fall and Reuther agreed to in the Ford settlement. First of all, the miners got 70-cent a day wage increase, despite Truman's steel "fact-finding" wage-freeze. They got another 10-cent a ton increase in their welfare and pension fund, bringing it to 30 cents total. The "package" raise totals between 18 and 20 cents an hour — higher than the CIO unions won even in their "first-round" settlements of 1946.

Moreover, the United Mine Workers has retained the substance of most of the contract clauses which the operators — aided by the "unfair labor practices" injunction secured by Truman's NLRB General Counsel

### N. Y. Witch-Hunt Law Revalidated

Further proof that the courts cannot be depended on to defend civil rights was given on March 8 when the Appellate Division, Third Department, of the New York state courts reversed a previous finding of State Supreme Court Justice Harry E. Schirck and upheld the "constitutionality" of the Feinberg Law. This law, enacted last year by the state legislature, provides for a purge of "subversive" school teachers.

## European Notebook

## Stalinism and Its New 'Third Period'

By Ernest Germain

"The third period of blunders of the Communist International"—that was how Leon Trotsky characterized twenty years ago the ultra-leftist and adventurist line adopted by the 10th plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. A third period of post-war crimes by the Stalinist leadership—that is how we can today characterize the adventurist line adopted by the Communist Parties of Western Europe following the defeat of the broad mass movements of 1948 (general miners' strike in France, general strike in Italy on July 14, 1948).

In 1944-45, when the mass movements in Western Europe had reached their peak; when the bourgeoisie was stripped of all repressive police powers and economic strength; when state power was within reach of armed workers in many countries—Thorez and Togliatti explained that conditions were not ripe for revolutionary struggle. It was first necessary to "liberate" (the bourgeois) state, to resume production (for the capitalists), to defend (bourgeois) democracy.

Today, thanks to the Stalinist betrayal, the bourgeoisie of Western Europe again have a solid state apparatus at their command. As a result of the aid received from their American uncle, their coffers are once again filled with huge profits. The workers are disoriented, divided, discouraged. The petty bourgeoisie, again disappointed by the labor movement, follows demagogues like de Gaulle or parties directly tied to the strings of Big Business, such as the Catholic parties. Democratic rights, above all the right to strike, are in serious danger.

## THE "ZHDANOV LINE"

Such is the moment chosen by the master-strategists of the Cominform to proclaim political strikes, to throw the vanguard workers in small units against motorized police armed to the teeth, to put on the agenda a policy of "permanent offensive!" It is any wonder that in these circumstances many Communist militants are opening their eyes to the absurdity of such tactics, and that for the first time in a long while there again exist organized opposition groups inside many CP's?

The third period of post-war crimes by the Stalinist leadership has its theoretical basis in the "Zhdanov line." In his main report to the first conference of the Cominform, Zhdanov characterized our epoch as an epoch of continuous struggle between "the camp of the forces of peace, led by the Soviet Union" and the "camp of the imperialist warmongers." He concluded that the warmongers would lose out as the camp of the forces of peace grew continually stronger. This idea was never absent from a single issue of the bizarre journal of the Cominform, which has succeeded in distilling the quintessence of the monotonous Stalinist style.

## RIDICULOUS CLAIMS

"The peace front grows stronger from day to day"—the CP of Norway, having lost all its 13 seats in Parliament, split in two

men on Feb. 17 involved less than 50% of the workers in the venture.

## READY TO STRUGGLE

Yet the workers of Western Europe are prepared to struggle whenever they feel that the actions involved serve their own interests. "The forces of peace make steady progress," the Danish CP shouts from the rooftops at the very moment when it has lost for the first time in decades the leadership of the Sailors' Union, key union in the country. "We march from victory to victory," the Belgian CP affirms no less resolutely at a time when its organization, reduced to skeleton size, sees its trade union influence, which immediately following the "liberation" was preponderant in the country, reduced to zero.

De Gasperi's police can get away with murdering workers and poor peasants. Togliatti explains that this merely proves how increasingly fearful the war mongers are of the growing power of the masses. The Paris stock market succeeds again, as in the good old days of the Third Republic, in making and breaking governments, even in forcing the reformists out of power. "The Cabinet crises," proclaims Humanite, perfectly satisfied with the situation, "translate the ever-growing pressure of the popular masses."

"Since this pressure is always growing stronger, the struggle can be lifted to a still higher level. The immediate demands must be linked to the struggle for peace and for a government of democratic unity." (That is, economic strikes are to be transformed into semi-insurrectionary political strikes.) Here we have the current Stalinist line in Western Europe. Its logic is impeccable, it is the logic of blindness and betrayal. The one of broadest interest concerned his attitude toward the formation of an independent labor party in this country.

## LEWIS' ANSWER

Krock asked Lewis: "With the British example in mind, do you still oppose the formation of American labor into a political party?" Lewis replied:

"Let us begin with the example of Great Britain. The population there is sitting on a coal deposit which, if taken from the earth by modern methods, would solve the economic problem of the British. But first British management made the mistake of letting obsolescence weaken the industry. And then British labor made the mistake of becoming a political party and using the political in-

strument of the employers' offensive, to the lockouts and unemployment.

## DISASTROUS EFFECTS

It thus becomes each day a little more difficult to reforge the unity of the proletarian front, even in the struggle for immediate economic demands. To launch political struggles at such a stage is the surest way to isolate the vanguard from the masses, the organized workers from those workers who turn their back on all organizations. And to launch such battles in ultimatum fashion, around slogans reflecting solely the needs of the Kremlin and not the immediate concerns of the workers is to sow confusion and disorder even among those workers who still follow the CP, constantly increasing the number of those dropping out of activity. That is what explains the pitiful failure of "the battle of the ports," unleashed several months ago by the Stalinists in Western Europe. Longshoremen and seamen, even though they comprise the trade union organizations most firmly controlled by the Stalinist machine, did not obey the order to strike against unloading of North Atlantic Pact arms. In Belgium, the Stalinists handed the miners the slogan to "boycott" the elections for shop committees (that is, not to vote for union candidates, against the employers' agents). And so on and so forth.

The sectarianism, adventurism and ultra-leftism, that characterize the present line of the Stalinist leaders is occasionally combined with remnants of opportunism, always spiced with the nationalism that has become an indispensable ingredient in all Stalinist dishes. Thus, in Western Germany the new heroes of the third period denounced the reformist leader Schumacher as a "Nazi-American agent."

At the same time, they appeal to the real Nazis to join with them in the "National Front" and they make agreements from time to time, on a local level, for electoral deals with the Social Democrats, deals which are the worst examples of a "united front exclusively from above." Here even the logic of betrayal is lacking. But that does not make this policy any the less harmful to the European labor movement.

## THE WORLD REPORT

In the latest issue of *Fourth International*, the theoretical magazine of American Trotskyism, just off the press:

**CHINA** — C. L. Liu, veteran Chinese Trotskyist, reports from Macao, the Portuguese island colony off the south coast of China, on recent developments in the Chinese peasant revolution. Bitter opposition to the Stalinists has already appeared, he declares. Having driven the hated Kuomintang regime off the mainland, the peasants now want to harvest the full fruits of their great victory. But the Stalinists, dedicated to protecting and preserving capitalist property relations, are doing their utmost to halt the revolution. Liu analyzes the character of the Stalinist coalition government and shows why it is headed for a new stormy crisis.

**INDONESIA** — Is Indonesia really independent? T. Van Der Kolk, writing from Amsterdam, Holland, discusses the role of Dutch and American imperialism in strife-torn Java. The Hague agreement, recognizing the "independence" of Indonesia, bears the trademark, *Made in USA*, Van Der Kolk demonstrates. In his opinion, the application of this

agreement "will not be smooth... Violent social and political struggles are on the order of the day in Indonesia."

**ITALY** — Ernest Germain reports on a new stage of the class struggle in Italy. Both the Communist Party and the Social Democratic movement are hard hit by acute crises that open up favorable opportunities for the development of a mass revolutionary socialist party. In the countryside peasants are staking out squatters' claims on big estates. In the cities workers answer mass lay-offs by taking over factories and trying to continue production. What is needed to make such progressive moves a full success? Under the heading, "The Art of the General Strike," Germain suggests some effective measures that would speed the Italian working people along the road to victory over capitalist reaction.

**4th INTERNATIONAL** — An illuminating letter by Leon Trotsky on the peasant war in China makes timely reading 18 years after it was sent to the Chinese Trotskyists. Trotsky's great foresight once again has been confirmed by events of the day that seem almost modelled to illustrate his profound explanations of the course of the class struggle.

**FRANCE** — Pierre Frank probes the deepening political crisis in post-war France. Will the capitalists succeed in imposing de Gaulle on the French people without de Gaulle? What powerful are the Stalinists? What is the meaning of the secret faction in the

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_

Send me a copy of *Fourth International* featuring "World Report." Enclosed is 25 cents.

# Lewis' Weak Point -- Politics

By Joseph Keller

John L. Lewis shows his strong side in the conduct of union struggles for miners' wages and working conditions. He is aggressive, fearless and a master strike tactician. In this sphere, he stands head and shoulders above all other top labor leaders in America today.

But when it comes to more fundamental problems of the miners and American labor generally — the problems of unemployment and insecurity — he displays a fatal weakness. He has no real grasp of the nature of capitalist economy and hence no effective program for solution of the long-range problems it poses.

This is expressed in his attitude toward politics and the question of labor's political activity. Here Lewis reveals a backwardness, an actual ignorance, that is truly astounding in a man of his capacities and long experience in the labor movement.

This grave limitation is emphasized in his interview with Arthur Krock, political columnist of the *N. Y. Times*, published in the March 3 issue. Lewis answered a number of questions relating to the miners and American labor. The one of broadest interest concerned his attitude toward the methods employed in the industry and its modern equipment.

It is difficult to find a path through this jungle of reasoning.

If it means anything at all, it means that British labor has not

benefited by building its own party and that there is some connection between the fact that

British labor built a class party and that British capitalism ran

the coal industry into the ground.

And on the other hand, because

American labor has not built a

party of its own, the American

mines are turning out three

times more production than the

British, with little more than half

the workers. Lewis' premises are

as confused as his conclusions.

This may be an argument for

making the coal operators in

America richer by cutting down

the cost of production, but it surely is not an argument for safeguarding the jobs of American miners. Least of all is it an argument for limiting the American labor struggle to the strictly economic sphere.

## WHAT EFFECTS?

How have the American miners been made more secure, how have they benefited in any fundamental way by the fact that since 1929 the rationalization and mechanization introduced by the coal operators, particularly the subsidiaries of the big steel corporations, have cut the number of employed soft coal miners from more than 700,000 to 370,000? And what permanent security and decent living standards do these 370,000 now have, in spite of higher wage rates and other benefits won by their great strikes?

Lewis himself indicated this in answer to another question asked by Krock. He said that the miners laugh when they read editorials about how much Lewis has

cost them through strikes. "They laugh because they know these things: That about 200 work-days

per year is maximum in the industry and that the time spent in

strikes would be idle time anyway. That is history, and it will be the same in 1949-1950 when this strike is settled."

This is the crux of the question. Under capitalism, in the boom year 1948, the American miners earning an average of \$14.05 a day could not get enough days of work to make a decent living. They piled up coal so high even on this short work schedule that it took them nine months of bitter struggle to reduce it to a point where they could make the operators come to terms. The operators, however, increased their profits per miner employed from \$34 in 1939 to \$73 in 1948.

How will the miners fare next year and the year after, when the

developing crisis of American

mining

miners as a whole and the greater competition of coal exports from Britain, among other places, forces more and more reductions in the number of American coal miners? What security will the miners have as the industry becomes ever more rationalized and mechanized?

The British workers have made a step toward a fundamental solution of this problem, a step which they could take only because they have built their own party and have put that party in power. They have nationalized the coal industry and removed it from immediate control by the parasitic mine owners.

## THE REAL OBJECTION

But, due to the false policies and compromises of the British labor leadership, the British workers have not been permitted to carry through this measure to the end. The owners are given government bonds which pay them huge interest that drains the resources of the industry. Workers' control has not been instituted; instead the old capitalist

managers still dominate — and sabotage — the operations of the industry. That is why the British coal industry cannot be properly modernized to the advantage of

the British miners and of the British workers as a class.

What Lewis should object to in the British example is the failure of the British labor leaders to break completely with capitalism. That is their weakness. It is his weakness too. He fails to put forward a program of independent labor political action in this country that will enable the workers to take political power and deal fundamentally with the coal and all other basic industries in the interests of the working population.

Lewis has spoken much about the need to "stabilize" the coal industry. He tried to effect this by a "share-the-poverty" move of reducing the industry to a three-day week. This was all right as a temporary move in strike strategy to reduce the coal stockpile.

BUT IT DOESN'T PUT MORE MEAT

ON THE MINERS' TABLES NOR GUARANTEES THEM FULL-TIME JOBS NEXT

YEAR. FOR THAT, IT IS NECESSARY

TO END THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM,

ELIMINATE THE ANARCHY OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION FOR PROFIT,

NATIONALIZE THE BASIC INDUSTRIES UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL AND INSTITUTE A PLANNED, COOPERATIVE SOCIALIST ECONOMY.

FOR THAT, AMERICAN LABOR NEEDS ITS OWN PARTY.

the British miners and of the British workers as a class.

What Lewis should object to in the British example is the failure of the British labor leaders to break completely with capitalism. That is their weakness. It is his weakness too. He fails to put forward a program of independent labor political action in this country that will enable the workers to take political power and deal fundamentally with the coal and all other basic industries in the interests of the working population.

Lewis has spoken much about the need to "stabilize" the coal industry. He tried to effect this by a "share-the-poverty" move of reducing the industry to a three-day week. This was all right as a temporary move in strike strategy to reduce the coal stockpile.

BUT IT DOESN'T PUT MORE MEAT

ON THE MINERS' TABLES NOR GUARANTEES THEM FULL-TIME JOBS NEXT

YEAR. FOR THAT, IT IS NECESSARY

TO END THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM,

ELIMINATE THE ANARCHY OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION FOR PROFIT,

NATIONALIZE THE BASIC INDUSTRIES UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL AND INSTITUTE A PLANNED, COOPERATIVE SOCIALIST ECONOMY.

FOR THAT, AMERICAN LABOR NEEDS ITS OWN PARTY.

## Auto Union Relief Caravan Hailed in Coal Mining Town

By F. Forest

PURSGLOVE, W. Va., March 6 — There was jubilation in Pursgrove today. Willis Massey, chairman of the Miners Relief Committee, got word from Tommy Thompson, president of UAW Local 600, that a food caravan from Detroit auto workers

had won the fight. He distinguished between "institutional and spiritual union."

## THE UNION SPIRIT

"It is true," he continued, "that the treasury, the building and all worldly goods that the union possesses could be confiscated by a Taft-Hartley government. But what they cannot confiscate is our spiritual union. And that is because the spirit of unionism and labor solidarity is not only in us as a group but is in every individual miner.

At the same time other UMW members began to decorate Dallas Hall to welcome their fellow workers from their fellow workers. The West Virginia University Students for Miners Relief offered to paint the signs. These were ready when the caravan arrived and read: "Welcome Food Caravan," "United Labor Can Lick the Taft-Hartley Law," "UAW and UAW Fight Together," "UAW District 31 Miners Greet Brother Thompson, President UAW Local 600." Meanwhile word spread quickly in "The Run" and 100 miners and their wives left to intercept the food truck at Washington, Pa., and escort it to West Virginia.

The audience cheered. The morale of these miners who had just won their contract fight against the operators was raised higher by the display of labor solidarity. They cheered the representatives of the auto workers, and took them on a tour of the mining community. There were no bands and no fanfare, just a simple showing of worker to worker of where and how he lives and of the why of their constant struggle against the greedy operators. The auto workers will have a story to take back to their fellow workers in Detroit which will further cement the labor unity of the two great bodies of organized labor.

## Local Addresses Of Socialist Workers Party

AKRON—For information, write P.O. Box 1342.

BOSTON—Workers' Educational Center, 10 Smart St., open 5-8 p.m. social and 8-10 p.m. meetings.

BUFFALO—Militant Forum, 622 Main St., 2nd fl. Phone Madison 3900. Every afternoon except Sun.

CHICAGO—108 W. Washington Street, 312-314. Tel. Dearborn 2-4787.

CLEVELAND—Every Sunday, 9 p.m. Parks Hall, 1446 E. 2nd St. Tel. Woodlawn 2-4787.

DETROIT—610 Linwood Ave., Phone 7-3267. Mon. through Sat., 12-5 p.m.

Subscriptions: \$5 per year:  
\$1 for 6 months. Foreign:  
\$3.50 per yr; \$2 for 6 mos.  
Entered as second class  
matter Mar. 7, 1944 at the  
Post Office at New York  
N. Y., under the act of Mar.  
2, 1873.

# 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)  
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN  
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Vol. XIV - No. 11

Monday, March 13, 1950



TROTSKY



LENIN

... it is precisely the international strength of the United States and her irresistible expansion arising from it, that compels her to include the powder magazines of the whole world into the foundations of her structure, i.e., all the antagonisms between the East and the West, the class struggle in Old Europe, the uprisings of the colonial masses, and all wars and revolutions. On the one hand, this transforms North American capitalism into the basic counter-revolutionary force of the modern epoch, constantly more interested in the maintenance of 'order' in every corner of the terrestrial globe; and on the other hand, this prepares the ground for a gigantic revolutionary explosion in this already dominant and still expanding world imperialist power."

—Leon Trotsky, Third International After Lenin, 1928.

## Bureaucratic Bankruptcy Exposed

The miners have done more than defeat the mine owners and their government agents. They have exposed the bankrupt policies of all those union leaders, like Philip Murray and Walter Reuther, who have opposed militant methods of union struggle and have urged the workers to depend on the "favors" of capitalist politicians like Truman.

Murray ran to Truman last summer and begged for a "fact-finding" board so he wouldn't have to lead the steel workers in a real fight. Truman's board handed the steel workers a solid wage freeze, with a small sop by way of welfare and pension funds that cost the steel corporations between six and eight cents an hour — and the steel workers had to strike six weeks anyway to get even that. Reuther stumped an even worse deal down the Ford workers' throats.

Compare this with what the miners have just won by refusing to kowtow to the government and beg favors of Truman, by defying the Taft-Hartley Act and fighting every inch of the way. They not only won more than the steel and Ford workers got for welfare and pensions — a 10-cent per ton increase in royalty payments on top of the 20 cents they already were receiving — but they got a real wage increase amounting to between eight and ten cents an hour.

These other union leaders, unlike John L. Lewis, bowed before the Taft-Hartley Act and shamefully signed their names to yellow-dog Taft-Hartley affidavits. They sold their unions politically

to Truman in hopes of getting small favors in return. But all they got for the workers was the back of Truman's hand — some 61 Taft-Hartley injunctions in less than two years and the steel "fact-finding" formula of wage freezes and "dead men's" pensions.

While the Murrays and Reuthers cringed before the Taft-Hartley Act, the miners, led by Lewis, fought the Slave Labor Law tooth and nail. They defied Truman's injunction and smashed it. And they wrested from the operators nearly three times as much as Murray and Reuther got by licking Truman's boots.

Of course, we can expect the Murrays and Reuthers to tell us now how Truman tried to "help" the miners, how he stalled off his use of the Taft-Hartley Law as long as possible, etc., etc. But the fact is that the coal operators would have capitulated long ago if it hadn't been for their expectation that Truman would eventually intervene in their behalf. He didn't disappoint them. And he got no little assist from the Murrays and Reuthers who have kept silent on Truman's strikebreaking.

Had the CIO leaders followed the method of Lewis and the miners it is safe to say the CIO members would have won far more substantial wage and pension gains last fall and the miners themselves would not have had to suffer such a prolonged struggle. And if the whole labor movement now followed the example of the miners in mass defiance of the Taft-Hartley Act, that infamous law would be effectively smashed in record time.

## The Wallaceite Sickness

Everybody, including the Stalinists who pretend otherwise, knows that the Progressive Party is sick and dying. Its second convention was not a meeting of people with confidence in its future; on the contrary, it was a demoralized gathering, and when it ended the delegates knew that, despite all the hoopla, its future would be even more difficult and unpromising than its past.

The state of the party can be gauged by the fact that the main achievement of the convention was a behind-the-scenes deal between the leaders of the liberal and Stalinist wings over such issues as Yugoslavia, civil rights and 1950 electoral policy which prevented a split in the organization.

This would be bad enough for a party which started out with such high hopes and optimism less than two years ago; but added to that is the fact that everybody at the convention sensed that the unity achieved there is highly tenuous.

The reasons for the deal are plain enough: The Stalinists are so discredited today, especially in the labor movement, that they need a front with some respectable leaders through which they can carry on the activity which is their main rea-

son for existence — that is, attempts to secure a deal between U. S. imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy. The Wallaceites, on the other hand, have been so isolated from their former supporters that they simply don't have the forces to run a party by themselves. That is why each side still has need of the other, and is willing to make concessions in return for the use they can make of each other.

But the forces separating them are much more powerful and will surely prevail in the long run. The Stalinist leaders are conscious agents of the Kremlin; the Wallaceite liberals owe their allegiance, more or less consciously, to U. S. capitalism, critical though they may be of some of its policies. When a showdown comes between Moscow and Washington, and in many individual cases before then, the Wallaceites will break with the Stalinists and go over to the Fair Dealers.

The split has been postponed for the time being — no one now knows for how long. But both wings know that it is inevitable, and it is this knowledge that incubums and paralyzes the Progressive Party today, even while its leaders are going through the motions of celebrating their "unity."

## Why No Action on

On the front page of this issue our readers will find figures and facts relating to the forces which are now inexorably feeding unemployment. It has grown by leaps and bounds for almost a year, until some 5 million are now admittedly without jobs. This official figure is a flagrant under-estimation. Actually there are at least a million more jobless and, barring an immediate outbreak of war, their number is bound to increase.

Just when will the official leaders of the labor movement start advocating effective steps, for example the institution of the 30-hour week with no decrease in weekly wages, to combat this terrible danger?

From all indications, these labor leaders still remain as unconcerned about the problem of unemployment as "Fair Dealer" Truman himself, who recently diagnosed the situation as altogether "healed."

Contrast this do-nothing attitude and pollyanna twaddle with the words and actions of such a prominent figure as Sewell L. Avery, chairman of both the U. S. Gypsum Co. and the mail order giant of Montgomery Ward & Co. He has told the Gypsum shareholders that the time to

## Laborite Chiefs Try to Straddle Vital Issues

By Paul G. Stevens

The new Labor Party government intends to pursue a cautious course, balancing itself between the pressures exerted by the working class on one side and the capitalists on the other. It expects, as the elections indicated, a mounting political crisis on top of the economic crisis that has become the normal feature of post-war British life. As a result, the reconstructed Attlee cabinet's main line is that of holding itself in readiness for social emergencies.

This much becomes clear from the "Speech from the Throne," the King's address at the opening of the new Parliament on March 6. According to the mumbum-jumbo tradition of the constitutional monarchy that the Laborites have left untouched, the "Speech" is usually ghost-written by the Prime Minister and is actually a statement of government policy.

The Tories were quick to press their advantage in the Commons — with the reduced Labor majority — by demanding that the government shelve the bill to nationalize the steel industry, passed at the previous session, which is to take effect next October.

### ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

### WORKERS' PRESSURE

But the capitalist pressure is only half the picture. The working class pressure, only weakly reflected by the Bevans and Crossmans — who can be appealed by a few elevations in cabinet rank or other personal shifts — is just as powerful.

Even as the new Parliament was meeting, a renewed wave of wage claims and strikes was beginning. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, representing 37 unions and 750,000 members, was conducting a strike vote for a \$2.80 a week raise. Railway union delegates were meeting to decide on a wage increase for 140,000 of their

opposition.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

### WORKERS' PRESSURE

But the capitalist pressure is only half the picture. The working class pressure, only weakly reflected by the Bevans and Crossmans — who can be appealed by a few elevations in cabinet rank or other personal shifts — is just as powerful.

Even as the new Parliament was meeting, a renewed wave of wage claims and strikes was beginning. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, representing 37 unions and 750,000 members, was conducting a strike vote for a \$2.80 a week raise. Railway union delegates were meeting to decide on a wage increase for 140,000 of their

opposition.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

### WORKERS' PRESSURE

But the capitalist pressure is only half the picture. The working class pressure, only weakly reflected by the Bevans and Crossmans — who can be appealed by a few elevations in cabinet rank or other personal shifts — is just as powerful.

Even as the new Parliament was meeting, a renewed wave of wage claims and strikes was beginning. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, representing 37 unions and 750,000 members, was conducting a strike vote for a \$2.80 a week raise. Railway union delegates were meeting to decide on a wage increase for 140,000 of their

opposition.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more apologetic in his tone. "There is nothing to be done in the matter of iron and steel immediately," he said, "as that statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament." He thus confirmed, by indirection as in the case of the King's speech, that the Laborites had no intention of pushing further nationalization.

But, his resort to the legal status of the steel bill shows that the reformist leadership is equally reluctant to actually reverse a nationalization measure that has already been taken. They do not want to antagonize the capitalists (whose views they gratuitously ascribe to the "middle class") but they are also afraid of arousing their working class base against themselves. They would like best, naturally, to stand pat.

ATTLEE'S REPLY

Attlee's reply for the government was that it would continue "in the same spirit and in the same principles as we have during the last four and a half years. Several days previously, within the parliamentary caucus of the Labor Party, there had been an outburst by Michael Foot, Richard Crossman and others identified with the government's "extremist" Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, demanding a defiant continuation of the party's full-fledged nationalization program.

According to reports, the Bevan

opposition was quickly "per-

suaded" by the party leaders to desist from pressing their point, in view of the slim Labor margin in Parliament. Attlee's remarks about spirit and principles were obviously a face-saving sop for this opposition.

On the crucial practical question of the steel industry, Attlee was more

## The Miners' Wives

By F. Forest

A trip to northern West Virginia, seat of some of the most militant mass picketing of the just-concluded mine strike, reveals that the miners' wives played an important role. This is one of the many facets of the successful mine struggle that the local press dealt with sketchily and the national capitalist press not at all. The most that could be gleaned from the big dailies was that the wives were "taking" the long fight and empty food baskets because they had no choice. In truth, however, the role they played was not a passive but an active one. Here are but a few incidents.

It seems that the union had permitted pump-ers and a few other maintenance men to work for the Purglode Coal Co. during the strike. The women took a different attitude. They threw up two picket lines, one blocking the road and the other the bridge leading to the tipple. They let only the foreman through. This action on the part of 50 women who took matters into their own hands not only stopped the maintenance men but quickly led the company to "reconsider" its decision to try to have maintenance men.

In Charleston, W. Va., the women joined the picket line of their men. The snobbery of the owner's son particularly aroused their anger. The women pickets stripped his shirt and jabbed hatpins into his shoulders. The "roughing up" of the scion of wealth led to arrests but did not stop the women from continuing with their picketing.

The women also took an active role on the question of miners' relief. While the miners appealed to other labor bodies, the wives went door to

door in their own and surrounding communities, and then they helped decorate the hall, meet delegations of UAW and other workers who had displayed their labor solidarity by contributing to miners' relief, and aided in the distribution of the food to the most needy families.

Precisely because the role of the women was an active one it was inevitable that it should lead to organization. In Beckley, W. Va., the women decided to back up their husbands in the fight for a contract by organizing themselves into a Women's Auxiliary. They formed this organization "to help miners at all times, particularly during strikes." Mrs. Haynes Hayworth, wife of the treasurer of the UMW local at Amigo, and organizer of this women's auxiliary, was asked what the wives would do if their husbands decided to go back to work without a contract.

"Then," she answered quickly, "they'd have to do the housework too. They will have to build fires, cook their own food, wash their own clothes, clean the house and hire baby sitters to take care of the children while they are in the mines."

But there was never any question at all — except in the minds of capitalist reporters — of the miners returning to work without a contract. The miners themselves not only fought against the coal barons, they also welcomed the action of their wives. One miner said: "Our wives are right. We can't work on empty stomachs. And we won't work without a contract."

These actions on the part of the women will be sure to leave their mark on the community as a whole.

## A 'Do-Good' Minister

By Frank Rossi

The minister is a well-meaning man. Here in his little community in the mine area he organized a mission for the miners. All in all, he did a good job of rallying material support from the community for the miners. As a result, some \$2,000 worth of food and clothes was collected for the miners' families. A commendable achievement, especially when the miners were beleaguered. Yet we must note a deficiency.

The federal court injunction thrown at the miners was completely ignored by them. As the Charleston, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce observed, the injunction "has not even been treated with respectable contempt." Thus, in the final weeks of the strike, the miners' determination to defeat the operators, regardless of federal injunctions, created a problem for people like the minister. He was confronted with the miners and the government pitted against each other. What to do?

Maybe he wrestled with his conscience; we do not know. Anyway, he decided that he could not fight with the miners against the government and that he would have to resign his position as community leader of the miners. It was a bit more complicated than this, this was the gist of his actions. It's one thing for the miners to defy the government, but quite another thing for a respectable member of the community like the minister to do the same. Out of the question!

The miners needed help more than ever now that the injunction was hanging over them? That's true, but the minister decided that his higher duty was to respect not the miners, but the government. So he resigned his post.

A meeting which was called to establish a new organization to replace his mission was attended by a Miners' Relief Committee. This committee

comprised a number of militants from many locals. It was primarily a union affair while the mission was a community affair. The Miners' Relief Committee had been quite successful in getting the support of many other labor unions in the larger cities of Pennsylvania, Ohio, etc. I had already raised several thousand dollars for the miners. Now it came to offer the Mission Committee its help.

Then came the payoff. The Mission Committee accepted this help but soon began to imply that the chairman of the Miners' Relief Committee was a communist. Before long the mission was converted into a "loyalty" court for testing the political integrity of the leader of the organization that had come to offer its hand in aid to the miners!

That put everything in a new light for the minister who had just resigned. Now he felt no fear in continuing to be active, once such action meant he could play a leading role in impugning the "commies." Eager to show the stuff he was made of, he volunteered to bring "the facts" to the next meeting, proving the "guilt" of the leader of the Miners' Relief Committee. Better still, he would bring the FBI!

There we have it. Yesterday, the minister was the champion of distraught miners against the world. The miners openly challenge the government. Today the minister becomes the champion of the distraught government against — not the miners, exactly — only some of the miners. This is, the "reds." Tomorrow? If the miners had no won the strike, if they had been forced to continue in their "unrespectable contempt," we can safely conclude that the minister, like so many other well-wishers and do-gooders, would be savagely attacking the miners.

## From the Yugoslav Press

From time to time, The Militant will print information based on reports in the Yugoslav press which receive little or no coverage in American papers.

The joint Soviet-Yugoslav navigation company, "Youspad," was liquidated last year after two years of operations. Drawing the balance sheet of its record, Rad, official periodical of the Yugoslav Trade Union Federation, concluded that far from being a joint enterprise, it was "a purely Soviet shipping concern" in the operation of which the Kremlin "imposed on Yugoslavia's economic relations devoid of all equality in rights and exploited it economically."

In 1947-48 "Youspad" carried for Yugoslavia 220 million metric tons at the rate of 40 paras a ton. The Soviet Union shipped 190 million metric tons at less than half these rates. Other countries were charged 28 paras a ton. The deficit borne by the Yugoslav economy amounted to 38 million dinars. In addition Rad points out that the Kremlin failed to live up to a single one of its obligations to "Youspad."

Mosha Piyade, prominent member of the Yugoslav Politbureau, delivered a speech in December exposing the role of the Kremlin in blowing up the negotiations between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to form a federation. A direct meeting between the Bulgarian and Yugoslav representatives in Belgrade was countermanded by

direct orders from Molotov who instructed both parties to proceed to Moscow.

Piyade, as chief of the Yugoslav delegation, had occasion to meet twice with Stalin, who apparently played his customary game of duplicity. The Bulgarians demanded parity "in which Bulgaria would have one unit, and Yugoslavia, as a whole, another." We, however, considered that Bulgaria could be only one of the seven federal units."

"The first time, when the two delegations made a joint call on him, Stalin spoke in the spirit of the Bulgarian view, hence in favor of dual federation, offering as an explanation that Bulgaria had been an independent country. . . . When a day or two later we were at a dinner given by Stalin he himself reopened the conversation on the matter, and then firmly maintained the view that Bulgaria could be only one of seven federative units."

"Finally," said Piyade, "all these efforts of Nov. 1944 to almost the end of Feb. 1945, came to an end, and not only federation but any hope of a treaty of alliance [with Bulgaria] was finally abandoned. This was done at the request of the Soviet government."

The British also opposed a federation of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia; they wanted one "which would also include Albania, Greece and Turkey."

In conclusion Piyade said: "Now, these undeniable facts which I have here related, and which are only a part, as I have not told all, show most plainly that in the history of judicial scandal there has surely never been a trial based on such flagrantly false evidence as this Sofia trial. The only rival is the Budapest Trial."

"If Traicho Kostov was hanged merely for wanting a federation with Yugoslavia, although he insisted precisely on the same form of federation, with Bulgarian hegemony, as all the other members of the Bulgarian Politbureau, then from their standpoint, from the standpoint of the indictment of that shocking trial, they have hanged an innocent man."

According to Tanjug report, Belgrade, Jan. 30, elections for "workers' councils" in mines, factories and other Yugoslav enterprises have been taking place. The dispatch speaks of these "new bodies in the system of economic management, which, in cooperation with the management of the enterprises, will take measures to promote production, improve the workers' living standards, and control the management in the fulfillment of its obligations toward the workers."

The voting is by secret ballot. Among those reported elected in Bosnia-Herzegovina are "the best workers, the shock-brigadiers, the innovators and rationalizers." Singled out for special mention is Aliya Sirotanovich, "Initiator of socialist competition among Yugoslav miners for attaining high labor productivity."

# THE MILITANT

VOLUME XIV

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1950

NUMBER 11

## New UAW Group Makes Good Start In Toledo Election

TOLEDO, March 4 — As the strike of the Plaskon workers for pensions and other demands entered its fourth week, internal union developments took the spotlight.

"Then," she answered quickly, "they'd have to do the housework too. They will have to build fires, cook their own food, wash their own clothes, clean the house and hire baby sitters to take care of the children while they are in the mines."

But there was never any question at all — except in the minds of capitalist reporters — of the miners returning to work without a contract.

The opposition program correctly analyzes the administration's regime as one which has weakened the union. They call for a return of the union to the fighting spirit of the 1930's, an honest and democratic administration, full support to the current pension fight, wage increases out of profits and rank-and-file participation in union affairs.

The administration sought to hang the "communist" tag on the new group but those familiar with local UAW developments know that the few Stalinists who adhere to it have been successfully isolated and their policies rejected in favor of a program of democratic and militant trade union principles and a pro-CIO orientation.

REPLACEMENTS

In the Spicer unit of Local 12, where the opposition has its main support, the right wing suffered a heavy defeat in the elections. The leading candidates were replaced by militants pledged to restore conditions to what they were before the right wing won control of the unit. This victory for the opposition is especially significant because the Spicer plant now employs only 1,300 workers whereas the last time the opposition was represented in the leadership to any extent over 3,000 were employed.

The decline in the number of

workers, leaving in the plant

those who are traditionally more

conservative, resulted in a clean

sweep for the right wing a year

ago. Now, having had a good

taste of the right wing's inability to

to maintain even the old conditions,

to say nothing of improving

them, the membership turned

them out of office.

In another unit election at the

large Champion Spark Plug plant,

7 out of 9 oppositionists were

elected to office, turning out the

right wing administration which

had been in continuous control

since the unit was organized. In

the elections at DeVilbiss, the op-

position to the right wing was

victorious.

These developments in local

UAW circles have brought a new

atmosphere to Toledo, the begin-

ning of a resurgence of the old

UAW fighting spirit. The main

reason for this is the current at-

attack on the unions by a million-

aires' committee of bankers and

industrialists which seeks to make

this a low wage-scale town in or-

der to attract business. It augurs

well for the future that a section

of the local labor movement has

come forward with a fighting pro-

gram to meet this challenge.

"Finally," said Piyade, "all these efforts of

Nov. 1944 to almost the end of Feb. 1945, came

to an end, and not only federation but any

hope of a treaty of alliance [with Bulgaria] was finally

abandoned. This was done at the request of the

Soviet government."

The British also opposed a federation of

Bulgaria and Yugoslavia; they wanted one "which would also include Albania, Greece and Turkey."

In conclusion Piyade said: "Now, these

undeniable facts which I have here related, and

which are only a part, as I have not told all, show

most plainly that in the history of judicial scandal

there has surely never been a trial based on such

flagrantly false evidence as this Sofia trial.

The only rival is the Budapest Trial."

"If Traicho Kostov was hanged merely for

wanting a federation with Yugoslavia, although

he insisted precisely on the same form of

federation, with Bulgarian hegemony, as all the other

members of the Bulgarian Politbureau, then from

their standpoint, from the standpoint of the

indictment of that shocking trial, they have

hanged an innocent man."

\*\* \* \*

According to Tanjug report, Belgrade, Jan. 30,

elections for "workers' councils" in mines,

factories and other Yugoslav enterprises have

been taking place. The dispatch speaks of these

"new bodies in the system of economic

management, which, in cooperation with the

management of the enterprises, will take

measures to promote production, improve the

workers' living standards, and control the

management in the fulfillment of its

obligations toward the workers."

The voting is by secret ballot. Among those

reported elected in Bosnia-Herzegovina are

"the best workers, the shock-brigadiers, the

innovators and rationalizers."

Singled out for special mention is Aliya

Sirotanovich, "Initiator of socialist

competition among Yugoslav miners for attaining

high labor productivity."

\*\* \* \*

According to Tanjug report, Belgrade, Jan. 30,

elections for "workers' councils" in mines,

factories and other Yugoslav enterprises have

been taking place. The dispatch speaks of these

"new bodies in the system of economic

management, which, in cooperation with the

management of the enterprises, will take

measures to promote production, improve the