

Yugoslav Chiefs Deepen Exposure of Stalin Crimes

The Soviet Union is now in the throes of an internal crisis, stated Milovan Djilas, member of the Yugoslav Communist Party Politburo, in one of the sharpest and clearest exposures of Stalinism since the break with the Cominform in 1948.

Djilas declared in his pre-election speech on March 18 before 25,000 students in Belgrade that the crisis was caused by a perversion of socialism by the privileged Soviet bureaucracy. He traced the cause of this development to the backwardness of Russia which had permitted this bureaucracy to seize the power.

CITES 8 CAUSES

According to the N. Y. Times dispatch, Djilas stated that a "crisis of socialism" in the Soviet Union resulted from the "contradictions between the development of the means of production and the social fabric" of that country. The following conditions, he stated, indicate what is occurring:

1. The non-Marxist treatment of the role of the leader (presumably Stalin) which often took the form of vulgar idolatry similar to that in absolute monarchies. 2. Differences in salaries that were greater than in bourgeois democracies, varying from 400 to 15,000 rubles. 3. Ideological aggrandizement of Russian nationalism and underestimation of the cultures and histories of other nations. 4. The policy of dividing the world into spheres of influence with capitalist states. 5. The use of lies and slanders in the workers' movement, ignoring the teachings of Marx and Engels. 6. Underestimation of the role of the people in the fight to establish a new society. 7. Tendencies to liquidate socialist democracy. 8. Suppression of initiative and revisionism of the philosophic basis of Marxism.

BUREAUCRACY'S METHODS

The Russian bureaucracy, Djilas continued, is using two principal methods for the solution of its internal difficulties: First, by transforming the basis of struggle against the United States from one aiming at the destruction of capitalism to that of division of the world into socialist and capitalist spheres of influence; and second by attempting "to suppress the crisis temporarily with successes abroad by exploiting and subordinating other socialist countries."

"This crisis," the speaker pointed out, "did not begin with the Cominform Resolution [issued against the Yugoslav CP in 1948] nor will it end because someone gives a theoretical explanation of its character and causes. . . . It demonstrates that the bureaucratic elements in the Soviet Union that have well established their privileges are attempting to find a solution for an internal crisis in the outside world" (by the policies cited above).

Judges E. Barrett Prettyman and James Proctor held that "the President may remove from government service any person of whose loyalty he is not completely convinced without assigning any reason and without giving the employee any explanatory notice."

By the same 2-1 vote, the court ruled, in an appeal brought by the International Workers Order, that the Attorney General's listing of "subversive" organizations is not subject to judicial review.

The "loyalty" purge is based on this arbitrary political blacklist.

Miss Bailey had petitioned for reinstatement to her job with the Federal Security Agency from which she was dismissed in Feb. 1949 on secret and anonymous charges that she was or had been a member of the Communist Party, had attended party meetings and had associated with "known" party members. She denied the charges.

While contending that the government has the right to fire anyone as disloyal, without trial or evidence, the Appellate judges ruled illegal a section of the "loyalty" board's order which barred Miss Bailey from government employment for three years.

They said, was punishment without fair trial within the meaning of a 1943 Supreme Court decision.

But the development of their conflict with the Kremlin is leading them closer to a correct Marxist understanding of the reactionary pattern of Stalinism. One of the clearest signs of that pattern is the gap between the wages

(Continued on page 4)

GOVT. PLANS TO INFLICT 12,000 UNDER SMITH ACT

The Department of Justice is preparing to prosecute another 12,000 people under the Smith Act and will begin the prosecutions without delay if the Supreme Court upholds that law when it hears the appeal of the 11 Communist Party leaders convicted last year. This information was given to a House Appropriations subcommittee, at an executive session on the Justice Department budget, by Raymond P. Wheary, acting Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, and was first made public by the N. Y. Post on March 17.

Wheary told the committee there were 21,105 cases pending in the Internal Security Section of the Justice Department at the end of last year. He said the CP would be "in effect outlawed" if the Supreme Court upholds the Smith Act.

EXTENSIVE PROGRAM

"There is a program of extensive suits to prosecute members of the Communist Party who can be shown to be sympathetic and appreciative of its views. We prosecute them as individuals under the Smith Act," he said.

In response to a question, he declared that "roughly 12,000" of these 21,105 cases depend on the Supreme Court decision.

Wheary expressed the opinion on behalf of the Department of Justice that the prosecution of this number of individual CP members during the fiscal year beginning July 1 must be looked forward to "as possible, and indeed very probable."

RELUCTANT STOOLPIGEONS

Speaking about the other cases, he called them "perfectly good trial cases, but can't be proven for the reason that the sole witness, Tom Clark,

is a cheap liar but a witch-hunter in no way inferior to his pre-

Workers of the World, Unite!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XIV - No. 13

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

Acheson's "Total Diplomacy" Offers No Hope for Peace

"LOYALTY" PURGE OK, COURT SAYS

In a sharply-worded dissent from the 2-1 majority opinion of the U. S. Court of Appeals, Federal Judge Henry W. Edgerton declared the "loyalty" firing of a government employee, Miss Dorothy Bailey, "abridges not only freedom of speech but freedom of thought."

Judges E. Barrett Prettyman and James Proctor held that "the President may remove from government service any person of whose loyalty he is not completely convinced without assigning any reason and without giving the employee any explanatory notice."

By the same 2-1 vote, the court ruled, in an appeal brought by the International Workers Order, that the Attorney General's listing of "subversive" organizations is not subject to judicial review.

The "loyalty" purge is based on this arbitrary political blacklist.

Miss Bailey had petitioned for reinstatement to her job with the Federal Security Agency from which she was dismissed in Feb. 1949 on secret and anonymous charges that she was or had been a member of the Communist Party, had attended party meetings and had associated with "known" party members. She denied the charges.

While contending that the government has the right to fire anyone as disloyal, without trial or evidence, the Appellate judges ruled illegal a section of the "loyalty" board's order which barred Miss Bailey from government employment for three years.

They said, was punishment without fair trial within the meaning of a 1943 Supreme Court decision.

SEES THOUGHT-CONTROL

Judge Edgerton, however, stated in his dissent that "dismissals for disloyal acts are punitive; that is what the Supreme Court squarely held in the Lovett case." A "disloyalty" finding in the public mind "is closely akin to treason" and "ostracism inevitably follows" such a dismissal.

He further said, "The appellant was dismissed for thinking prohibited thoughts. A Constitution that forbids speech control does not permit thought control."

He added: "Without a trial by jury, without evidence and without even being allowed to confront her accusers or to know their identity, a citizen of the United States has been found disloyal to the Government of the United States."

The outstanding "loyalty" purge case, that of James Kutter, the legless veteran, is now before a federal district court. His case is unique because he admits membership in the Socialist Workers Party, for which he was fired from the VA.

However, Wheary continued, the Justice Department keeps up pressure to get them to change their minds: "We communicate with the Bureau [FBI] many times, even asking the Bureau to reinterview them, with an idea to determine whether they are not willing."

McGRATH'S LIES

Wheary's statement that a validation of the Smith Act would in effect outlaw the CP recalls the speech made by his boss, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, on Oct. 20, just six days after the end of the Foley Square trial. Attempting to allay widespread apprehensions about the conviction and the use of the Smith Act, McGrath, a top Fair Deal politician, specifically stated that the conviction of the 11 did not mean the outlawing of the CP and that his department had no plans for similar prosecutions at that time.

Wheary's testimony about the Department of Justice's real views and plans, which fortunately have leaked out to the public, proves that McGrath is not only a cheap liar but a witch-hunter in no way inferior to his predecessor, Tom Clark.

By Emmett Moore

FLINT, March 19 — The anti-Reuther slate in Chevrolet UAW Local 659 headed by President Coburn Walker, won a smashing victory in the local union elections. A record vote of 5,800 gave the Walker slate a complete victory for executive board posts and ousted the Reutherite shop committee. There will be a runoff for financial secretary and trustee on Walker's slate. The Reutherites were completely shut-out.

This impressive victory came on the heels of a furious red-baiting campaign in which Walker and his group were accused of Trotskyism and Communism. The Reutherites implied in their campaign literature that Walker's



New York -- General Motors reports greatest profits in U. S. history -- \$656,434,232 in 1949.

San Joaquin Valley, Calif. -- Tens of thousands of jobless farm workers facing starvation line up for relief.

MINE UNION HITS CIO, AFL CHIEFS FOR REJECTING UNITED DEFENSE

The current United Mine Workers Journal hurls caustic criticism at the top CIO and AFL leaders for their brush-off of the UMW's proposals for joint defense in strikes and for their "weak-kneed" and "subservient" policies.

CIO and Steel Workers President Philip Murray's rejection of John L. Lewis' offer of a "mutual aid" pact is likened to the attitude of the AFL craft moguls last October in refusing aid to the striking steel workers. The AFL chiefs dismissed the UMW's plea that the nine largest AFL unions and the UMW jointly finance a \$2,500,000 steel strike fund.

The Journal is particularly scathing in its comments on CIO United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther who prior to the UMW's "mutual aid" proposal had turned down an offer of a \$1-million loan from the miners to back the prolonged Chrysler strike.

"The first rejection slip" from the CIO leaders, says the Journal, came from Walter P. Reuther, CIO United Auto Workers president. Reuther's letter to the UMW "contained some fancy phrases about 'maximum solidarity and working unity in labor ranks,'" but when it came to a practical measure to cement that working unity, "he said no."

THE MINERS' ACHIEVEMENT

In its lead editorial, the Journal assails the top union leaders who rely on their political ties instead of on the fighting qualities of their union members. It points with justified pride at the miners' recent victory as "an achievement which is the envy of the entire American labor movement." The militancy which gained this victory, says the Journal,

"should awaken a sense of responsibility in weak-kneed labor leaders who are linked with and subservient to political parties, and an appreciation of the manhood and staying qualities . . . of American men and women who comprise the rank and file of American trade unions."

"In fact, it is our considered opinion that the preponderance of thought among labor union members is rapidly developing a clear-cut dislike and distrust of the abundant gestures of expressed international goodwill of their leaders, who, at the same time, indulge in a self-glorified siesta on the domestic front."

This refers to the readiness of the CIO and AFL leaders to unite in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions to push their projects abroad as against their rejection of united action to defend American labor.

TREASURE DEMOCRACY

"Chevrolet workers have served notice on the top UAW officers to desist in their infamous practices of interfering in local union elections. We treasure the right to criticize and will fight to the end to retain full democracy for our members. The elections are a conclusive victory for local union autonomy."

Walker concluded, "We pledge to continue the fight for a more militant and democratic UAW. Once again the Chevrolet workers are leading the way for the whole auto union." The Chevrolet

Propaganda Move to Justify Continuation of "Cold War"

By Art Preis

Peace is the one thing we can be sure will not be achieved by Secretary of State Acheson's 7-point "peace" program, proclaimed in his March 16 speech at the University of California. Peace was not his object. His purpose was to build a firmer propaganda basis to justify, before a world fearful of Truman's H-Bomb threat, the continuation of U. S. imperialism's "cold war" and war preparations.

For this purpose, he laid down seven conditions which he said the Soviet Union must accept and carry out before there could be the possibility of "the establishment of peace" even "in its narrowest, most limited sense" — that is, a mere truce in the present "cold war."

Each and all of these terms are, on the face of it, unacceptable to the Kremlin. If peace depended on Stalin's acceptance of them, the world would hurtle without pause into the abyss of H-Bomb annihilation. Acheson knows he has laid down impossible conditions for Stalin.

But his aim — the aim of the Truman administration — is not to end the "cold war." It is to put upon the Soviet Union the full responsibility for making all concessions that might avert war and the blame for the inevitable failure to achieve peace.

WHAT HE DEMANDED

We need examine only the central point of Acheson's demands to see that what U.S. imperialism is now asking as the price for halting its "cold war" is a form of unconditional surrender. He calls on the Kremlin to withdraw its forces back to the USSR's original boundaries, to abandon its positions in Eastern Europe Germany, Austria and North Korea.

Is it likely that Stalin will agree to this one-way proposition while American military bases encircle the Soviet Union from Germany, through Greece, Turkey and Iran, all the way to Japan? Will Stalin agree to abandon his buffer defenses and turn them over to regimes hostile to the very existence of the Soviet Union and ready pawns of American capitalism with its overwhelming financial and military power?

No more likely than that American imperialism will voluntarily accept a Kremlin demand that it withdraw its troops from Germany and Japan, its military missions from Greece, Turkey and Iran, that it liquidate the iron perimeter it is forging around the Soviet Union with its North Atlantic military pact and foreign arms aid.

All the other points raised by Acheson, couched though they be in moral cant and expressions of peaceful intent, are designed to strip the USSR and leave it an easier prey for future attack by the capitalist powers.

In this light, Acheson's 7-point program appears as the crudest



DEAN ACHESON

type of power diplomacy. But it is not for Stalin that he made his speech. He aims at a different audience — an audience first of all in the United States.

DOMESTIC AIM

This is the answer to those in this country who claim — correctly — that the Truman administration has no alternative to the H-Bomb. Let the Kremlin now accept these specific seven terms, the White House has replied through Acheson, and there will be reasonable hope for peace.

(Continued on page 2)

U. S. Military Display Protested By Indo-Chinese

While Secretary of State Acheson called on Kremlin leaders to "withdraw their military bases from Germany, through Greece, Turkey and Iran, all the way to Japan? Will Stalin agree to abandon his buffer defenses and turn them over to regimes hostile to the very existence of the Soviet Union and ready pawns of American capitalism with its overwhelming financial and military power?

The presence of U. S. military forces, sent to Saigon at the instruction of Acheson's State Department, set off a two-day demonstration of thousands of Vietnamese workers and students on March 19 and 20. French troops were finally used to subdue the militant demonstrators, who suffered three dead and an estimated 80 injured.

Although Acheson piously claimed on March 16 that "we do not intend nor wish, in fact we do not know how, to create satellites," that same day an Associated Press dispatch from Saigon reported: "The United States displayed military strength and drafted a program of economic aid today for the embattled French-sponsored state of Viet Nam."

PLANES, SHIPS, MONEY

It describes how "the United States aircraft carrier Boxer sent out forty-two planes on a flight over central Viet Nam (Annam) and the port of Tourane" while "the destroyers Stickwell and Anderson, with a French escort, moved up to Saigon" to intimidate the Viet Nam.

After the U. S. "show of force," two of the warships, the Stickwell and Anderson, were reported withdrawn. Meanwhile, more than 100,000 French troops, armed by the U. S., are continuing the war begun in 1945 against the popular Ho-Chi Minh regime, which still controls most of the country. The U. S.-recognized Bao Dai puppet regime was recently set up in Saigon by the French imperialist government, whose troops remain in full force.

Anti-Reuther Slate Sweeps Chevy Local

election would result in an attempt to take the local into the U. S. They denounced the Walker slate for its opposition to Reuther.

Walker's victory can be attributed to his opposition to the Ford pension settlement and his defense of the coal miners' strike. These two issues mobilized the support of the most militant members in the Chevrolet local.

WALKER'S EXPLANATION

The Chevrolet election was sharply contested because it was the first local to go to the polls in Flint. All other locals were looking to Chevrolet to see if a trend would be established there.

In a victory statement Walker said, "The vote signifies that Chevrolet workers are definitely not satisfied with the pension

settlement that was obtained in Ford's. Its inadequacies are apparent to all even if the average member is not a pension expert. We are determined to obtain a pension that will permit workers to retire at the age of 55 and at 20 years' service. Chevrolet workers believe that all workers should have an equity in the pension fund which will give them severance pay in the event they wish to quit their jobs at any time.

"Our members are disturbed by the strategy of Reuther in the Ford and Chrysler strikes. His policies seem to establish roadblocks to real workers' security. The time is overripe for a more militant and aggressive policy that will break through the corporations' policies of dragging out strikes endlessly. John L.

Lewis has pointed the way towards a rebirth of labor solidarity in fighting the corporations that are ganging up on industrial unions. We support Lewis

European Notebook

Struggle for the Workers' United Front

By Ernest Germain

The struggle for the united front is today the key task for all Trotskyist organizations in Europe. It is the principal slogan of the French and Italian Trotskyists, in their efforts to rebuild the unity of the proletarian front in the face of the political and economic offensive of Big Business. The same aim is served by the efforts of the British Trotskyists to spur the ideological maturing of the vanguard of the British proletariat, without splitting the united front around the Labor Party.

The struggle of the Dutch Trotskyists for trade union unity; that of the Austrian Trotskyists for the defense of the workers' living standards; that of the Greek Trotskyists for the reorganization and regroupment of class forces dissipated in the wake of the defeat and havoc of the civil war; the participation of the Belgian Trotskyists in the struggle against the return of Leopold III and against unemployment; the propaganda of the German Trotskyists against the resurgent menace of neo-fascism—all these specific objectives corresponding to the peculiar circumstances prevailing in each given country of Europe become meshed and interpenetrated with propaganda work and organizational efforts to promote the workers' united front.

TROT CARD

The existing split in the proletarian front is today the European bourgeoisie's chief trump card. This split is especially serious in the trade union field. With the exceptions of Great Britain and Germany, the trade union movement today is split from top to bottom in the principal Western European countries. In France, side by side with the Stalinist-led CGT there operate a reformist, an anarchist, a Catholic and a new de Gaulist "federation" and other autonomous unions which are beginning to federate among themselves.

THE CAUSES

In Italy there exist Catholic reformist and autonomous confederations alongside the Stalinist-led CGIL. In Holland, beside the priest-ridden confederations, the reformists and Stalinists each lead a trade union federation hostile to one another, and confused "leftist" elements are in process of forming an additional nation-wide body. In Belgium the FGTB, four years ago the organization of the overwhelming majority of the proletariat, is today bled white, sabotaged by the Stalinists, led into the swamp of permanent class collaboration by its reformist leadership and continually losing, even on this basis, its membership to the Catholic unions.

The split of the unity of the proletarian front was the objective result of the policies of reformists and Stalinists who have more or less directly organized most of the splits which have led to the present state of affairs. It is equally, however, the result of subjective factors. Deceived by a leadership which has proved incapable of utilizing to the advantage of its class the especially favorable conjuncture

of the first post-war years, the working class today shows alarming signs of skepticism and passivity.

Union meetings attract an insignificant fraction of the organized workers. Movements initiated for "political purposes" and viewed as maneuvers by one of the working class parties are looked upon by the workers with the greatest suspicion, if not simply ignored. This makes the adventurous policy of the Stalinists, who try "mobilizing" workers in a more than suspicious "struggle" against arms deliveries, all the more criminal and all the more pernicious since it tends to widen the breach which separates the communist from the non-communist workers, the vanguard from the bulk of the class.

LITTLE CONFIDENCE

The moods of skepticism and passivity, which appear as it were on the surface of workers' life in Western Europe, are not yet the fundamental features of the orientation of the workers. That is why the struggle of the Trotskyists for the united front is not only necessary but is still capable of bringing real success. If it proves a little more difficult to draw the workers again into the struggle after each lost battle, it is nevertheless possible to bring about a united front as soon as they feel that the movement to which they are summoned really corresponds to their own interests. That is why joint action by the leaderships of the various trade union federations, usually suffices to bring about a mass participation in strike actions, such as the general strike of November 1949 in France and the strikes in the Parisian area of February 1950.

But while the workers participate en masse in movements led jointly by the existing trade union organizations, they follow these movements without enthusiasm, without fervor, almost without hope. The fact is that they no longer have confidence in the respective trade union leaderships and in advance place no confidence in purely mechanical combinations of these crews of bankrupt leaders.

Wherever a new leadership rises from the depths of the working class, selected on the basis of the experience gained in the course of the preceding struggles, the workers plunge into combat with forces redoubled. That is why the Trotskyists combine the struggle for a united front with that for a new workers' leadership by putting forth a Marxist analysis of this vital subject.

Those interested in the educational, social and political activities of the Socialist Workers Party Youth section, should send their inquiries to 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

UNCONDITIONAL STRUGGLE

This slogan meets today with an increasing response in the ranks of the workers' vanguard. In several union bodies such as the railway workers, in several large plants such as the Neuvemaisons factory in Lorraine, the French vanguard has taken some important steps on the road toward realizing this slogan in life. Indicative of the response to this slogan is the fact that it has been taken up by the opposition organized inside the French Com-

N. Y. YOUTH FORUM

"The Civil War in China," will be the subject of a lecture by John G. Wright, staff writer for the *Militant*, to be given at the New York SWP Youth Group forum, on Thursday March 30th, at Chelsea Workers Center, 130 W. 23rd St. at 8:00 P.M.

The speech evaluating the historical events shaping the Orient today, will give young workers and students a chance to hear a Marxist analysis of this vital subject.

Those interested in the educational, social and political activities of the Socialist Workers Party Youth section, should send their inquiries to 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Starvation Victim



First to report the desperate plight of migrant workers at a camp near Phoenix, Ariz., was Albert McWhorter, being comforted by his wife and 4-year-old son as he lies in bed, a starvation victim. Food and medicine have been rushed to the area to aid sufferers, including 100 children.

NO HOPE FOR PEACE OFFERED BY ACHESON

(Continued from Page 1)

clamor in Congress itself—as expressed by influential Senators like McMahon, Tydings and Connally—for a "new approach" to the question of settling the conflict between American imperialism and the Soviet Union, although none of these advocates of the "new approach" has anything different to offer except vague generalizations about "disarmament."

And, at the same time, it is an answer to the Republican charges that the Truman administration is not fighting "communism" effectively, that it is "appeasing" Stalin in China and elsewhere, that the State Department itself is honey-combed with agents of the Kremlin. Acheson is showing the world who is really taking a "firm stand" with respect to the Soviet Union.

ALLIES SOUGHT

Acheson has coined the phrase "total diplomacy" to express the method whereby he would persuade the Kremlin to accede to his seven points. It is on this "total diplomacy" in effect, that he would have the world rest its hope for escape from H-Bomb obliteration.

The only explanation Acheson has offered of the policy of "total diplomacy"—what an ominous ring it has of "total war" and "totalitarianism"—was made in a press statement on March 9. It means, he said, that the U. S. "must be prepared to meet wherever possible all thrusts of the Soviet Union" and to link up in this task all countries and governments that are "against Communism aggression and if they are

in short, "the end justifies the means," according to this vender of capitalist morality, and in the struggle to extend Wall Street's domination over the world, the rulers in Washington will accept as worthy allies and "defenders of democracy" any regime however bestial—yesterday the butcher Chiang Kai-shek, today the French imperialist murderers of the Indo-Chinese people, tomorrow fascist Franco.

Acheson's "total diplomacy" means alliance with capitalist reaction everywhere, propping up the despisers and oppressors of colonial peoples, H-Bomb production.

Against this "total diplomacy" must be hurled the power of the American workers. Capitalism has no way out. It must be eliminated before it eliminates mankind. The only road to peace is the road to workers' power, the establishment of Workers and Farmers Government and the construction of the socialist society.

While the American capitalist class has learned much from the

Letters from Our Readers

Problems of The Unemployed

Editor:

Enclosed find \$1 donation for The *Militant*. Forgive me for sending you this ridiculously small sum, but every little bit helps, eh? What? Besides, I have not worked for a long time.

Enclosed is also a list of factories I have contacted in search for a job, and this is only a small section of the Los Angeles industrial area, and only a few of the hundreds of plants contacted by me in search for a job.

The unions are useless to us unemployed once the dues payments stop. The UE of which I was a member had made an effort to set up some sort of unemployed council within its union structure, based upon the argument that it is the task of the unions to organize the unemployed, but was unable or unwilling to go beyond legislative committee action.

Such committees, with their futile appeals to legislatures, are to be charitable, a joke, and betray an unashamed opportunism by their mentors.

The self-same policy towards the unemployment question was adopted by the so-called Progressive Party (Wallace). That was last year; since then there is a steady growth of unemployment, yet the last flicker of interest in the problems of the unemployed has died.

There is some reporting being done and comment in the left wing press about it, but action—by which I mean going out and organizing the unemployed into a fighting force, which means militant class struggles—seems to have died out in America.

What is that so, comrade editor? I would appreciate it very much if The *Militant* would print an article clarifying the stand your

party takes toward the problem of this growing army of industrial cast-offs.

These lists I send you are to show what an average worker is up against here in Los Angeles when he goes out looking for a job. What chance is a man past 40 got? As much as a snowball in hell.

N. J. S.
Baldwin Park, Calif.

ED. NOTE: The lists enclosed by N. J. S. give a really graphic picture of the unemployment problem he discusses. During the week of Jan. 20 he contacted 30 factories where either "No Help Wanted" signs were out, or where he was informed that management was not hiring, or laying off help. He got the same answer at the state employment office. Since last May he has periodically visited another 52 plants. In only one case was an application even accepted; in all the others it was the same story. In one of the factories, to which he had been sent by the state employment office, he was told that he is too old. His age is 48. See Page 3 for an editorial dealing with some of the points he raises.

Workers Control Of Atomic Energy

Thank you for your splendid articles on the world menace of the H-Bomb, which show the difference between The *Militant* and the capitalist press on this most terrible question in the history of mankind. I'm in favor of the slogan, "Take the war-making power out of the hands of the President and Congress," but I feel something more is needed. May I recall to you a *Militant* editorial on the atom bomb: "There is only one way to avert the catastrophe. And that is to

establish the planned and rational order of socialism. But the workers can take an immediate step forward. . . . The workers must take control of atomic energy away from Wall Street and putting it in hands of responsible workers.

Workers' organizations take control of the dangerous dumps where the Truman administration is secretly storing atomic bombs. Taking control over the entire production of atomic energy away from Wall Street and putting it in hands of responsible workers.

It's even more important than the right of the American people to decide war or peace. They have the inescapable duty to save all

mankind from death at the hands of Hell-Bomb Harry and his Wall Street masters. They can do it, even under capitalism. They must do it. The *Militant* must repeat it constantly until the duty is accomplished.

Some workers may say, But what if Stalin attacks the USA, suppose he invades this nation and establishes a "communistic" dictatorship here, etc.? I think whenever you print an article against the H-Bomb, that same

Bert Cochran Speaks at Flint, Buffalo Meetings

FLINT, March 19 — An attentive audience of auto workers heard Bert Cochran, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, speak tonight on "The Outlook for Labor in 1950."

Cochran flayed the Reuther-Murray-Green labor bureaucracy for their State Department unionism. He contrasted their timidity and conservatism with the militancy that led to the formation of the CIO, an historic event in which the speaker was an active participant.

Cochran pointed to the paradox of so-called "labor statesmen" out selling the Marshall Plan and American imperialism to the workers of Europe while the workers they are supposed to represent are being forced to bear the terrible burden of these predatory adventures.

Although the labor fakers seem to be firmly in the saddle today, their influence will be short lived. Cochran pointed to the lessons of history which demonstrate that there can be no peaceful progressive development under capitalism as the welfare-statists and labor bureaucrats believe. With the coming of the inevitable economic crisis and the end of the temporary stabilization, the workers will be forced to take militant action to defend their basic rights and this can only mean the appearance of a powerful socialist left wing ready and able to challenge the power and privileges of the conservative labor bureaucrats.

The meeting was ended with an interesting question and discussion period and a very gratifying collection.

BUFFALO, March 17 — Braving the traditional St. Patrick's Day blizzard in Buffalo, workers from the smoky Lackawanna Bethlehem Steel plant, the strike-threatened lake shore Ford plant, and the big Westinghouse and General Motors Companies plodded through the snow to hear a speech on "The Perspectives for American Labor" by Bert Cochran, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Socialist Workers Party.

The meeting was ended with an interesting question and discussion period and a very gratifying collection.

Winifred Nelson of St. Paul enclosed five renewals in her last letter, the result of Sunday visits made by five comrades. In addition they sold three copies of *Socialism on Trial*, and one each of *The Coming American Revolution* and *A Letter to American Negroes*.

Winifred emphasizes that the St. Paul sub-getters consider it important to carry on this work regularly so as to spread it evenly throughout the year. They regard consistent effort as the key to their success in building circulation of *The Militant* in St. Paul.

Among the subscribers, Winifred reports that a common remark about *The Militant* is "It's the only paper that tells the truth."

Freddie Forrest, Literature Agent for Pittsburgh, writes, "We are going around visiting everyone we know; so you should hear from us soon." She enclosed two renewal subscriptions on account.

Milwaukee sent in five renewals without comment and Buffalo fourteen. How about giving the Militant Army a report?

Literature Agent Dixon Woods of San Francisco writes that "we are beginning our renewal drive this Sunday; in fact some of the comrades have already started on their visiting during the evenings this week."

Sales at the San Francisco City College are encouraging. "A week ago last Monday we sold five copies. One of the students told us that he bought a copy at the same spot last year and was glad to see that we are back."

Literature Agent Lillian Russell reports from Oakland that "last month the sale of *Militants* here took another spurt forward. Our Militant Army representatives sold 50 copies of the paper on the University of California campus during February. Many students look forward to seeing us every Monday afternoon. Through consistent efforts we are confident of expanding Militant sales on the campus. We also sold 30 *Militants* at various trade union meetings during the month."

The workers should understand the true situation in the world today—American imperialism, the most frightful aggressor ever seen, striding over the prostrate capitalism of other nations, threatened by none, but itself threatening what is left of the revolution once accomplished by the workers in the USSR.

B. P.
Cambridge, Mass.
* * *

Sequel to The H-Bomb?

Editor:

Heard something like this on the radio: Will this be the H-Bomb sequel?

That all men are cremated equal?

I. W.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

* * *

Ho Chi Minh's Radio Attacks Yugoslav Leaders

Ho Chi Minh's radio in Indo-China has begun to attack the Yugoslav government and now calls Tito a "spy for American imperialism." This is less than a month after Ho, in violation of the Cominform line, asked Tito to establish diplomatic relations. It now appears that even if Ho favors an independent line, he will submit for the time being, publicly at least, so far as Tito is concerned.

debacle of 1929, nevertheless the same economic laws and forces are at work, and in spite of any artificial delaying of their action, a more devastating depression than any ever known is in the offing.

Because only the SWP has the program which coincides with the needs of humanity and the demands of history.

Following is the schedule for Bert Cochran's national tour on "The Outlook for Labor":

Chicago	March 29-31
Minneapolis-St. Paul	April 1-4
Seattle	5-8
San Francisco-Oakland	9-12
Los Angeles	15-20
St. Louis	22
Cleveland	23-24
Akron	25
Youngstown	26-27
Pittsburgh	28
New York	30
"	May 1
Philadelphia	2-3
Newark	6

THE MILITANT ARMY

Work on the problem of bringing renewals subscriptions to *The Militant* as close as possible to the 100% mark is proceeding smoothly in most branches of the Socialist Workers Party, according to reports of Literature Agents.

Winifred Nelson of St. Paul enclosed five renewals in her last letter, the result of Sunday visits made by five comrades. In addition they sold three copies of *Socialism on Trial*, and one each of *The Coming American Revolution* and *A Letter to American Negroes*.

A Group of Workers in Cambridge, Mass., like Laura Grey's cartoons featured in *The Militant*. They think that the cartoon, "Crococile Tears," depicting the hypocrisy of the backers of the H-Bomb in weeping over its possible consequences to mankind "is the supreme triumph of her art."

Our thanks to "

Subscriptions: \$2 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, 1879."

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. 13

Bundles Orders (5 or more
copies): \$6 each in U.S. &
each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contribu-
tors do not necessarily repre-
sent The Militant's policies.
These are expressed in its
editorials.

Monday, March 27, 1950



"The trade union bureaucrats, like the bureaucrats of false Communism, live in an atmosphere of aristocratic prejudices of the upper strata of the workers. It will be a tragedy if the Oppositionists are infected even in the slightest degree with these qualities. We must not only reject and condemn these prejudices; we must burn them out of our consciences to the last trace. We must find the road to the most depraved, to the darkest strata of the proletariat, beginning with the Negro, whom capitalist society has converted into a pariah, and who must learn to see in us his revolutionary brothers. And this depends wholly upon our energy and devotion to the cause."

— Leon Trotsky, A Letter to American Comrades, 1929.

TROTSKY



LENIN

'A Shame and A Disgrace'

The administration is expressing strong indignation at the smear of State Department officials and employees by Senator McCarthy, who charges there are 57 "communists" in that department.

John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under-Secretary of State, speaking for the administration on March 16, lashed out at McCarthy's use of the "guilt by association" technique. Other defenders of the administration complain that he is taking advantage of his position to publicly stigmatize and destroy the reputations of numerous people before they have even had a chance to learn the charges against them.

All this is true. But the Truman administration is hardly in the position to adopt a "holier-than-thou" attitude to McCarthy. For most of the witch-hunt techniques he is now employing against the administration have become standard operating procedure in the administration's own witch-hunt.

The victims of McCarthy's smears at least have the privilege of defending themselves and answering the charges at a public hearing. But the organizations proscribed by Truman's "subversive" list are denied not only the right to a public hearing before or after their names are placed on the blacklist — they are denied the right to know even the precise nature of the charges against them, or the "evid-

ence" on which these charges are allegedly based.

We agree with Peurifoy that it is "a shame and a disgrace" when State Department employee John S. Service is subjected, purely on the basis of the guilt-by-association doctrine, to "humiliation, embarrassment and inconvenience." But isn't it equally a shame and a disgrace that the legless veteran, James Kutter, was fired out of his VA job solely because of his membership in the Socialist Workers Party? And wasn't it the Truman administration that was responsible for this guilt-by-association victimization?

When the Republicans see that the Democrats can successfully persecute Trotskyists and other dissidents, because of their political views, it is only natural that the Republicans should try to do the same to the Democrats. That is the logic of the "loyalty" purge, which tends to spread and widen even until the mildest liberal views are outlawed and complete political conformity (the police state) is achieved.

Meanwhile, the Trumanite denunciations of Republican-sponsored witch-hunts in the U. S. and Stalinist purges in Eastern Europe would undoubtedly sound more convincing and less hypocritical if they didn't come from the lips of such ardent-witch-hunters and purgers.

Union's Duty to the Jobless

In a letter printed on Page 2 of this issue, N.J.S., a jobless worker in the Los Angeles area, poses a question that must be in the minds of millions of other unemployed today. Like N.J.S., they had looked to their unions for a solution of the unemployment problem and found instead that the unions are doing little or nothing about it.

The unemployed have every reason to expect the backing and guidance of the powerful organized labor movement. But instead of getting an effective program and a fighting leadership, the unemployed find themselves thrown completely on their own pitiful resources. Who is responsible for this shameful and intolerable state of affairs?

The responsibility must be placed squarely on the shoulders of the top of official union leaders. They are reluctant to grapple with the problem of unemployment. The reason is political. A genuine struggle in the interests of the jobless is incompatible with the political support of capitalism. But the union leaders are staunch supporters of capitalism and of one of its main pillars, the Democratic Party of Truman.

They are banking on the Truman administration to alleviate a situation that is growing progressively worse. They are

hoping for the best while jobs grow scarcer and scarcer and more and more workers are thrown onto the scrap heap.

We have consistently criticized the inexcusable conduct of the official union leaders. They have failed even to fight for the demand for a 30-hour week with no reduction in take-home pay — a demand that has been an official plank in the programs of many unions both CIO and AFL, from the most advanced to the most reactionary.

With unemployment already beyond the six-million mark, the need is obviously urgent for the adoption of a broad social program to cope with joblessness. Coupled with the demand for the 30-hour week, an indicated part of such a program is the launching of large-scale public works and housing projects under the control of workers' committees and with the payment of full union wage scales. Such a program can be carried out only by mass action.

In view of the entire past record of the union leadership, it would be the height of folly to expect any initiative from them in this connection. The initiative must come from the ranks. It is the militant unionists in their respective locals who must raise the issue and prepare the ground for necessary actions.

Belgian Workers Oppose Leopold's Return

By Charles Hanley

Last week we wrote: "The Belgian workers certainly will not cease to be hostile to the royal admirer of Hitler. . ." This has proved to be true. Big strike movements have broken out in the industrial regions of Belgium, i. e., mainly in Wallonia, as well as in the port of Antwerp.

These strikes are the first major political strikes in Western Europe since 1945 which are not led by the Stalinists. (The Stalinist influence has diminished considerably in Belgium; they suffered a heavy defeat in the last parliamentary elections.) The Catholic-Liberal cabinet had to resign because the Liberal ministers resigned.

SEEK COMPROMISE

They avoid, however, any sharp attacks on Leopold, because they do not want to weaken the monarchy. Some Catholic and Liberal politicians are trying to negotiate a face-saving compromise: Leopold would be allowed to return, but would have to immediately abdicate in favor of his son.

ONLY A THOROUGHLY ORGANIZED general strike can now defeat the powerful Catholic reaction. (It was only the threat of a general strike that prevented Leopold's return in 1945.) Much will depend on the workers' eventual demands for bolder action and on their initiative in the coming days and weeks.

The final outcome of this struggle will also have some influence on the situation in other Western European countries (France, Italy) where the bourgeoisie is trying to set up "stronger" regimes.

The Socialist Party bureaucrats and those of the Belgian Federation of Labor, through their "Committees of Action," seek to use the strikes as means of

Why They Are Shifting Plants Out of Detroit

By Jack Meade

DETROIT — Since the war's end there has been a trend among the industrialists in Detroit to move their plants out. A rather large number of these plants have moved to towns around Detroit, frequently 70 to 80 miles away, because taxes are lower and because the UAW in these towns generally accepts lower wage standards than in Detroit proper (including Dearborn). Gar Wood, which manufactures trucks and garbage disposal units, is one of the better known companies in this group.

Another group of companies represented by Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. is moving completely away from the Detroit area and closer to the steel centers. This movement has been spurred by the Supreme Court decision to the effect that the cost of shipping steel must be considered as part of the price. Consequently, the closer a manufacturer is to his source of steel, the lower are his steel costs.

Kelsey-Hayes has moved to McKeesport (a suburb of Pittsburgh) for the sake of a tremendous threefold "saving" for this bunch of capitalists. They pay less for the steel, lower taxes and lower wages, and they pocket the extra profits.

Fruehauf Trailer, which was so well organized that it paid some of the highest wages and had just about the best working conditions in the Detroit area, laid off some 3,500 workers here when they moved to Avons Lake, Ohio. Fruehauf is now getting about the same production from 2,500 workers in that area because it is able to use the speedup and pay about 25 an hour less, and, to top it off, does all this under a contract with the UAW.

FORD'S PLANS

However, all this is overshadowed by the Ford Motor Company's decentralization plans. Underlying Ford's decentralization program is, first and foremost, the desire to make more money by "cutting costs." Ford proposes to do this by moving into lower wage scale areas such as Cleveland and Canton. O. Ford is building a foundry and motor plant in Cleveland, modern, up-to-date plants which will give greater production per man than at Rouge. Ford is also building a steel plant at Buffalo to replace the Pressed Steel building at Rouge. This will also give them extra profits because it will be modern and closer to the steel mills.

Up to now this Ford program has affected only a few of the smaller units at the Rouge, such as the Spring and Upset building with 3,500 workers, who have been dispersed throughout the Rouge plant, and the Aluminum Foundry which involved a smaller number

of workers. But the new plans, which affect the Foundry, Motor and Pressed Steel units involve some 30,000 workers — about half of all the Rouge workers.

Ford has an agreement with the UAW that its new plants will not come under the contract until the union can show a majority vote for the union in NLRB elections. Thus from the time new plants are opened until an NLRB election is held, the workers are completely at the mercy of management, without any union protection at all. The Ford management is left free to put the heat on the workers for greater and greater production and to get rid of the more militant workers. When the new shops fall under the union contract, Ford obviously plans to have the production standards sky high and the more docile workers in the new shops, who can be pushed around more easily.

IMITATING GM
Another basic reason for decentralization is to break up the tremendous concentration of 60,000 workers at the Rouge plant. Ford is here attempting to imitate GM, where the whole weight of the GM empire is brought to bear against the workers in an individual plant involved in a labor dispute without affecting the workers of other plants. This is made possible by the contractual agreements with the union, and the class-collaborationist policies of the present UAW leadership.

In the spring of 1949 there was the speedup strike at the Ford Lincoln and Rouge plants. The secondary leaderships and workers at these plants asked Reuther for strike authorizations to fight the speedup. Lincoln was granted that authorization but not the Rouge workers. The situation became impossible for the Rouge workers. Thompson, president of the Rouge Local 600, set a strike deadline which put Reuther on the spot, forcing him and the International Executive Board to grant the Rouge workers a strike authorization. In a short time all the rest of the Ford assembly plants, supplier plants and car dealers were laying off their employees. Over a million people were affected by that strike nationally. It also had a tremendous influence on all business in the Detroit area.

Decentralization will obviously benefit Ford — but not the Rouge workers. For should a similar situation again arise at Rouge, Ford will be in position to increase production at the Cleveland and Buffalo plants and hold out indefinitely against the Rouge workers. The situation became impossible for the Rouge workers. Thompson, president of the Rouge Local 600, set a strike deadline which put Reuther on the spot, forcing him and the International Executive Board to grant the Rouge workers a strike authorization. In a short time all the rest of the Ford assembly plants, supplier plants and car dealers were laying off their employees. Over a million people were affected by that strike nationally. It also had a tremendous influence on all business in the Detroit area.

Present California unemployment is estimated at 460,000 as compared to a labor force of 681,000 wage and salary workers. The drop in employment from December to January was 20,400.

the Ford workers. Thompson wrote in the local union newspaper that a meeting of civic, business and labor leaders should get together and put pressure on Ford to prevent this catastrophe to the Detroit community. Such line of reasoning is completely false because these so-called civic and business leaders invariably line up with the leading capitalists on all crucial matters.

The secondary union leaders are taking a more militant but not completely correct position of asking the Reuther leadership for strike action when Ford starts moving the first machine out of Rouge. By that time Ford will already have sunk his two hundred million dollar investment into the new plants. A strike under those conditions will obviously be much tougher, longer drawn out, and harder to win than militant action would be.

Through all these happenings that so vitally affect the Detroit workers, Reuther has remained totally silent. The Detroit auto workers will not forget this strange silence while this threat to their very existence hangs over them.

Unemployment in California Reaches A Critical Stage

By Al Lynn

LOS ANGELES, March 18 — California's labor force dropped "another 1,000" last month as the State Legislature continued consideration of special work projects to handle the growing wave of unemployment. During the past few months Long Beach was added to San Diego as a potential "emergency area." The City of Los Angeles requested that the state take over a considerable part of its relief load, which is reaching a critical point. From nearby Arizona reports have come of starvation in the camps of the agricultural workers; similar deaths were earlier reported in the San Joaquin Valley camps.

The California Division of Labor Statistics took satisfaction in noting that the decrease of 1,000 in employments compares favorably with a decrease of 1,000 in employment compares only 1.7% below Feb. 1949 whereas the continuous decrease of the past few months has been running 3.5 per cent below 1949 levels.

Present California unemployment is estimated at 460,000 as compared to a labor force of 681,000 wage and salary workers. The drop in employment from December to January was 20,400.

They displayed the initiative, independence and discipline which brought the victory. It was they who took the lead and forced the fight. Had they yielded to Lewis' request to halt their spontaneous walkout after Jan. 9 or followed his instructions to return to work when Truman invoked the Taft-Hartley injunction, the miners might have lost or faced a more prolonged struggle with smaller gains.

It is not because of Lewis' "benevolent despotism" but in spite of it that the miners have made their gains. And these gains are limited because the miners, so long as they lack real control over their union, cannot fully discuss and come to grips with the basic problems of capitalism. This requires the utmost freedom of thought, complete understanding and self-initiative. For the great and urgent task of reorganizing society so that the workers won't have to spend so much of their time and energy fighting for small wage gains, it is necessary to mobilize the whole working class. Here, even the most "benevolent despotism" is a towering obstacle to labor's advance.

Within the framework of economic struggles for small and immediate gains, Lewis appears as a great and brilliant union general, compared with such labor officials as Philip Murray, Walter Reuther or William Green. But he does not differ essentially from them in his fear of the democratic rule of the workers. Like them, he does not really believe in the power of the working class.

And that is why a Lewis, in the end, can not offer the kind of leadership and program that will fully emancipate the miners along with the rest of labor. That is why a Lewis cannot rise to the stature of a Eugene Debs, who was distinguished above all by his profound confidence in the abilities and capacity for self-leadership of the rank and file.

It is this confidence in the working class that must be the starting point for any leadership that hopes to rise above the limited aims of the day-to-day labor struggle within the capitalist framework and rally the workers to the vision and the achievement of the better, the classless socialist, society.

Lewis' Position On Union Democracy

By Joseph Keller

The March 13 Militant discussed John L. Lewis' opposition to formation of American labor's own party, as expressed in his March 3 N. Y. Times interview with Arthur Krock. We pointed out that Lewis believes in capitalism and offers no real solution to the miners' fundamental problem of unemployment and insecurity. Therefore, he sees no need for labor to build its own party.

Together with his belief in capitalism, there is another decisive reason why Lewis is opposed to freeing labor from its political ties with capitalism and its parties, Democratic and Republican. He has no faith in the ability or fitness of the working class to rule society. He believes that the capitalist class alone is fit to rule and run society — with the aid, naturally, of a few elite labor leaders.

Lewis does not say this, of course. But this attitude is clearly implied in his answer to another question posed by Krock — the question of the ability of the rank and file miners to make the right kind of decisions inside their own union, their capacity to rule the union properly. Lewis does not think the workers can be trusted with democratic control of their own union, so he certainly would not entrust the control of all society to them.

Krock asked Lewis why, in some mine districts, the miners are not permitted to elect their own district officers. Lewis replied:

"In perhaps a dozen districts the miners do not choose their district president and secretary. That is because these districts showed a tendency to make poor choices and the national organization decided its interest required that these officers be selected for them until their choices could be more relied on."

Trouble with 'Benevolent Despots'

Presumably, a "poor choice" is one who does not support everything that Lewis does or proposes, while a choice who can be "relied on" is one who never criticizes or opposes Lewis. And if in "perhaps a dozen districts" the miners can be deprived of the democratic right to elect their own leaders, every other district can also be denied this right if, in Lewis' opinion, they make a "poor choice." In short, Lewis is here arguing against union democracy and rank and file control of the union.

What he upholds, in effect, is the concept of the "benevolent despot." And like all such "benevolent despots" he justifies himself on the grounds that the people themselves — in this case, the miners — don't know what's good for them or how to get it. If self-designated superior individuals don't rule them "for their own good," they will easily fall prey to "bad" leaders.

One trouble with "benevolent despots" is that they are irremovable when they turn out to be more despotic than benevolent. They are beyond control. If they prove to be less infallible than they set themselves up to be, they cannot be replaced by better leaders.

Let us assume — which is not the case — that Lewis himself is an ideal leader for the miners, infallible in his judgment and decisions. Will he live forever? What kind of "benevolent despots" will follow him? Will they all also be infallible? They will claim so. But if the miners cannot be trusted to make "good choices," how will they ever free themselves from bad leadership, if such arise?

In view of the miners' advances in the economic struggle for wages and better working conditions under the leadership of Lewis, it is more difficult to show the disadvantages of "benevolent dictatorship" in the case of the UMW than in other leading unions. But Lewis himself would be the first to admit that the "benevolent despotism" of Philip Murray in the CIO and of types like William Green in the AFL is a calamity. We have a first-class example of this in their rejection of Lewis' proposal for a common defense pact of the big unions in strikes. Would such a pact be brushed aside if the CIO and AFL ranks had anything to say about it?

Lewis himself, however, has not always proved to be the infallible leader which his concept of union rule presupposes. There was nothing in the defeats and decline of the United Mine Workers from the first World War until the rise of the CIO in the middle Thirties to prove his superiority over the collective judgment of the miners. Even the latest mine struggle shows that when it comes to fighting for their own interests not even a John L. Lewis is superior in judgment to the miners themselves.

The Miner's Qualities

They displayed the initiative, independence and discipline which brought the victory. It was they who took the lead and forced the fight. Had they yielded to Lewis' request to halt their spontaneous walkout after Jan. 9 or followed his instructions to return to work when Truman invoked the Taft-Hartley injunction, the miners might have lost or faced a more prolonged struggle with smaller gains.

The judges took the easiest way out. They did not want to reverse the conviction because they did not want to displease Stalin and his friends; they did not want to write an opinion upholding the Holmes doctrine inapplicable to the Smith Act because that would have constituted a sharp change on the part of the liberal judges from their adherence to that doctrine. That, he says, is why they refused to hear the appeal.

MIRAGE AND REALITY

Nothing to Worry About

By Ruth Johnson

Hell-Bomb warfare may end all life on earth, warn the scientists who know. "You haven't a thing to worry about," reply the militarists and the doctors in their hire. There is a fighting chance that Wall Street may win a war one bomb short of world annihilation; maybe you, having worked in a lead-lined cave, will survive the H-Bomb. What then?

The reassuring words spoken before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy by Dr. Shields Warren on March 17 are something to console you as you crawl from your shelter. Survivors of atomic bombings, he assured, may expect to have "a reasonably normal life," assuming they find some more survivors. "There was no ground for fears that an atomic blast would cause widespread sterility or other debilities," he says. True, in addition to burns, you can expect "eye cataracts, infections, anemia and a tendency to bleed" — but why should that disturb you?

You will even be able to tell when to claw through the ruins of your city to forage for food — provided you haven't lost your portable geiger-counter. If it shows a green light, you're safe; if the light is yellow, you made a mistake; if the light is red, the air is heavily radioactive and your mistake is fatal.

Lucky you, the light was yellow, and you just have a burn; nothing at all! As another man-in-the-know has explained, "We are going to have a terrific amount of skin burns" — a kind that never heal. That was Rear Admiral Clifford A. Swanson, top Navy doctor, who told the House Appropriations Committee how the Navy is preparing for such things:

"We can take off skin, keep the skin for a period of two weeks, and we have been able to graft it back. Incidentally, we have learned that the skin does not die for several hours after the death of the individual... A bone bank is another recent development. Bones can be kept in-

definitely." And finally, there's "A blood vessel bank, for the preservation of blood vessel segments."

If these skin, bone and blood banks still stand, and a doctor has lived through the raid, he will be able to patch you up. At least you now know that capitalist warmakers are NOT wasteful; taking a lesson from the meat-packing plants, they will use "everything but the squeal" from the corpses of World War III. The bitter poem beginning "The unknown soldier, here I lie... One man's elbow, another man's thigh," will become a living reality; the mutilated will become living patchwork of the dead.

Incidentally, the Atomic Energy Commission has developed a small and simple Geiger counter, which could be sold for as little as \$10 or \$15 if put into commercial production. A real bargain at half the price.

I would have liked to end up on this note of comfort, but it's not the last word in steps being taken to improve our welfare. While Dr. Warren and Dr. Swanson were uttering their words of cheer in Washington, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson was in an optimistic mood in Chicago.

Addressing the Irish Fellowship Club, Johnson boasted that American scientists are "developing brand new, unprecedented devices that challenge the existence of all known weapons." If you think the H-Bomb is fearful — well! "The President's decision to proceed with the production of the hydrogen bomb is but the most dramatic example of 'technological advances,'" said Johnson.

"I assure you that we are equally alert to possibilities inherent in the biological and chemical fields as well as in the radiological."

So don't worry about the H-Bomb; Truman's "welfare state" is hard at work to provide bigger and better plagues or chemically produced disintegration as alternative farewells from this earth.

VOLUME XIV

MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1950

NUMBER 13

THE MILITANT

Yugoslav Leaders Deepen Exposure Of Kremlin Crimes

(Cont. from page 1)

of the Soviet workers and of the bureaucracy, which Djilas cited

The parasitic position of this bureaucracy, as Trotsky explained since 1923, led to the national degeneration of the dominant Stalinist leadership which, after usurping power, destroyed the great political and social achievements of the October revolution and instituted the most savage dictatorship against the Soviet masses. It led also to the policy of collaboration with world imperialism in which the workers movement was converted from a vehicle of social revolution into a pawn of Stalinist diplomacy.

PIYADE'S SPEECH

Additional evidence of this was brought forward last week in the speech of another Yugoslav leader, Moshe Piyade, who revealed that Stalin, far from aiding the partisan struggle during the war, actually refused them assistance in their most critical days in 1942 because of his alliances with Western imperialism. Said Piyade:

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at the time] and others because the Russians had agreements with him... We received material assistance from them only in October 1944... but in that same October they agreed with Churchill on a 50-50 division of Yugoslavia into two spheres of influence."

"We know now that it was not technically impossible to send us assistance, but the Soviet government did not want to cause bad relations with King Peter Karageorgevitch [supported by British and American imperialism at