

Truman Speech Covers Up Secret Wake Decisions

By Fred Hart

The significance of Truman's San Francisco speech on Oct. 17 lies not so much in what was said as in what was so deliberately left unsaid.

Truman disclosed nothing what ever about the purpose and results of his meeting with MacArthur on Wake Island where the twain met as if they were representatives of two sovereign powers, each initiating a joint communiqué which confined itself to meaningless generalities.

In an explanation which explained exactly nothing Truman affirmed that he went to Wake Island merely because he "wanted to talk to General MacArthur" and found the conference "very satisfactory."

According to Joseph C. Harsch, head of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, the "deepest secret" of the Wake Island conference was the one hour session which "preceded the formal conference" and in which the "military members of the presidential party participated."

BRASS HATS ELATED

Far-reaching decisions were obviously made. But no one knows what they are. Harsch reports that the military chieftains — General Bradley, Admiral Radford and their staffs — were elated by the outcome. They "got what they wanted — in fact they got more than they ever expected when the trip was extemporized so hastily." MacArthur reportedly "expressed equal satisfaction."

Harsch sums up what these militarists "got" as "an improved stage setting for the evolution of a more active and more vigorous Far Eastern policy."

The chief advocate of this "more active and more vigorous" policy is, as is well-known, MacArthur. He is for holding Formosa at all costs. He favors open military intervention in Indo-China. In fact, he is the proponent of the military conquest of the Asiatic mainland, in the first instance, of China.

This secret meeting wrapped up within the mysterious Wake Island conference which brought so much satisfaction to the militarists bodes nothing but evil for both the people of this country and the masses of the Far East. Truman did not have a Department suspended all visas

On Ballot Again, Off Again-- Minn. SWP Continues Fight

By Winifred Nelson

BULLETIN

MINNEAPOLIS, Oct. 16 — The Socialist Workers Party here today is planning legal action against the latest move to prevent Grace Carlson's name from appearing on the Nov. 7 general election ballot — a temporary restraining order issued by District Judge Frank E. Reed to keep her name from the ballot. The action was brought by Stanley E. Danielson, secretary-treasurer of the Transit Employees' Union.

Grounds for the suit are that Grace Carlson is a "felon," having been sentenced to a 16-months prison term upon her conviction in 1941 under the Smith Act for opposing World War II. Sydney W. Goff, attorney for Danielson, alleged today that, under the law, a person convicted of a felony is not entitled to vote, and one who cannot vote is not eligible to seek office.

MINNEAPOLIS, Oct. 15 — The civil rights cause won an important victory here last week when County Auditor Robert Fitzsimmons was compelled to concede the right of Grace Carlson to appear on the Nov. 7 ballot as Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress from the 5th District.

Fitzsimmons said Wednesday he had accepted Grace Carlson's nomination by petition after an opinion from Frank Williams, assistant Hennepin county attorney, as to signature requirements.

Williams' written opinion states that "electors" don't have to be registered voters in Minneapolis for purposes of validating their signatures on election petitions. After consulting with the state attorney general's office by telephone, Williams held the term "electors" to be broader than "registered voters."

DEFINING "ELECTORS"

This opinion permits anyone with the electoral right — i.e., a citizen of voting age who has not been convicted of felony — to sign a petition to get a candidate on the ballot. Williams' interpretation states that the term "electors" includes "all persons who possess the election franchise under the Minnesota constitution."

While this decision is a real victory for the democratic rights of the people of this state, reactionary County Auditor Fitzsimmons termed it a "mockery" and said he would ask the 1951 legislature to "tighten up on election laws." "It sets a dangerous precedent," he declared, "which

lessens the value of permanent registration of voters."

Actually, the registration provision is one applying only to Minnesota voters living in the metropolitan areas of the state.

REAL ACHIEVEMENT

Grace Carlson's campaign for Congress will go down in history as a real achievement in the broadening of the election laws for Minnesota citizens. Undaunted by the first and second refusals of a biased county clerk to accept petitions which were in legal order, the Socialist Workers Party aroused enough support for its campaign to set a significant precedent by liberalizing petition regulations for other minority groups seeking a place on the ballot.

This is the first time that a candidate's petitions had ever been challenged in the history of the state.

LAST TUESDAY

Last Tuesday, state SWP headquarters received word from the County Auditor's office that a so-called "check" of the 1,379 signatures on Grace Carlson's petitions showed only 402 signers to be registered voters, and that 130 of these had voted in the primary elections. Consequently, the office clerk said, Grace Carlson would be barred from the ballot.

The SWP, however, acting on legal advice, took steps to institute a mandamus action requiring Fitzsimmons to show cause why her name should not appear on the ballot. On Wednesday, Fitzsimmons himself phoned Grace Carlson and informed her that he would "reluctantly" accept her filing.

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XIV - No. 43

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

After Nov. 7: Taxes Up, Living Standards Down

Huge Arms Budget Reported Readied By Chiefs of Staff

Just what lies in store for the American people in the way of increased arms expenditures whose burden will fall entirely on their shoulders? The Truman administration is being deliberately vague on this score.

Truman himself, in his last "fireside chat," referred to the current \$30 billion dollar arms bill, and warned that bigger appropriations would be forthcoming.

Speaking before the Nebraska bankers' association on Oct. 12, Secretary of the Navy Matthews estimated that the next year's arms budget "might exceed" the entire national budget for this year, which amounts to more than \$42 billion. He then went on to add that the final sum would be "painful to contemplate."

Rumors persist of arms budgets of \$50 billion and more. The most sensational estimate was made public on Oct. 9 by columnist Robert S. Allen who flatly stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have drafted budgets for the Army, Navy and Air Force that "would bring the amount of military expenditures for this fiscal year to the stupendous total of \$62 billion."

This staggering figure does not include some \$7 billion for guided missiles and atomic explosives now under consideration by the National Security Council. Nor does it include additional billions for the expanded arms program of the Atlantic Pact countries. (France alone has been promised \$2.4 billion as her share.)

These items would send the projected arms budget well over the \$70 billion mark.

UNDER LOCK AND KEY

According to Allen, the projected estimates are now being kept under lock and key by order of Truman himself until after the elections are over. Then the plan is to put this arms program over, not all at once, but through a "series of so-called 'supplemental budgets' which will be appreciably smaller individually but whose sum total will be what the military want."

Allen's sensational report is, of course, no more definitive than the semi-official estimates of prominent administration figures like Secretary of the Navy Matthews. But they are highly significant nonetheless.

Expressed in these and similar reports is the determination of the military caste and the capitalist ruling circles to accomplish the shift toward full-scale war production as speedily as possible, behind the backs of the people and even of Congress itself.

Hanley's letter, dated Sept. 5, was written to W. Kingsland Macy, one of the leaders of the anti-Dewey faction in New York. Macy loaned Hanley \$30,000 for campaign "expenses" in running for the Republican gubernatorial nomination. Frank E. Gannett, a Rochester publisher, loaned Hanley another \$19,000 for the same purpose. In all, Hanley admits owing \$100,000. Macy and Gannett were backing Hanley against Dewey, and Dewey had promised to withdraw.

PUT ON THE HEAT

However, Dewey decided to be "drafted" once more. He got the 74-year-old, half-blind Lieutenant Governor in a hotel and put the heat on him. Hanley wrote Macy:

"Today I had a conference with the Governor in which certain unalterable and unquestionably definite propositions were made to me. If I will consent to take the nomination of the United States Senate, I am definitely assured of being able to clean up my financial obligations within ninety days, so that I would be clear for the first time in twenty years of my life.

I am assured of an adequate living compensation if elected, in a perfectly legal and unquestionable way. Also I have an iron-clad, unbreakable arrangement whereby I will be given a job with the State..." This job would be given Hanley in case he lost the election.

Hanley wrote Macy, "I am humiliated, disappointed and heartbroken, but in fairness to myself, to you to whom I am indebted, and to my family, I can do nothing else."

From the lowest ward-heeler to the candidates for the highest offices in the land, these machines are nothing but graft-ridden networks that merge with organized crime. Truman himself is a product of the notorious Pendergast machine.

The connections with gangsterism are paralleled by ties with Big Business. This is graphically revealed in the case of Hanley. It

is the shadowy figures controlling the banks, industry, transportation, the press, etc., who dominate these parties.

Protected by the Republicans and Democrats in big-scale plundering of the public, they do not mind the petty larceny stuff carried on by the O'Dwyers, Hanleys and the rest.

How capitalist politics degrades human beings is seen in Hanley's writings over his double-cross of Macy and Gannett. But that does not prevent these same miserable creatures from piously proclaiming the "integrity of the individual," "human rights" and "morality."

From the lowest ward-heeler to the candidates for the highest offices in the land, these machines are nothing but graft-ridden networks that merge with organized crime. Truman himself is a product of the notorious Pendergast machine.

Placing all stress on the need

"to keep purchasing power down," Symington made no mention of any cuts in profits. "I'm for profits. That's our system." He, like Truman, demanded "much higher taxes" not on corporations or even excess profits but exclusively on "individuals," that is to say, on wages and salaries.

What could be plainer? The rich

will "sacrifice" exactly nothing.

They are to suffer no cuts either

in their living standards or in

the raking in of profits, while the

toilers are being called upon to

make more and more drastic

and more sacrifices.

Symington carefully skirted

around the question of the wage

freeze, but made it nonetheless

clear that there would be no price

controls without the wage freeze

and that the latter would be

(Continued on page 2)

Workers of the World, Unite!

MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS

New Squeeze Is Admitted By Symington

By John G. Wright

It is the calculated policy of the Truman administration to impose successive slashes of living standards upon the American workers and the mass of the people. If up to now this has been implied in every major policy statement issuing from Washington, then today it has been made clear beyond the shadow of a doubt by W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board and Truman's chief policy-maker in overall charge of the arms program.

Symington, who in these matters speaks with an authority second only to Truman himself, granted an interview to the weekly U. S. News of Oct. 20, clarifying administration policy.

Flatly declaring that Korea was "totally incidental to the overall problem," Symington affirmed that "military outlays are going to get much higher." This means "much higher taxes." Symington then went on to stress that the American people should be agreeable to a curtailment in their standard of living.

The crux of the interview came in the following carefully worded question: "Many people have thought that our productive facilities were so great that we could take it (the arms program) in our stride. Do you share that view?"

And here is Symington's very carefully worded answer: "I do not. I don't think we can build adequate security without cutting into the butter. I do not believe any responsible people have said

that we can build up the military properly without making cuts and sacrifices, although some statements may have been misunderstood. Certainly neither the President nor anyone in the Government has said this."

GUNS, NOT BUTTER

What makes this blunt and unequivocal declaration of the "guns not butter" program all the more noteworthy is that it comes in a pre-election period when the Truman administration is deliberately soft-pedaling the full implications of its own policy, particularly the impact of militarization on all basic aspects of life at home.

Placing all stress on the need "to keep purchasing power down," Symington made no mention of any cuts in profits. "I'm for profits. That's our system." He, like Truman, demanded "much higher taxes" not on corporations or even excess profits but exclusively on "individuals," that is to say, on wages and salaries.

What could be plainer? The rich will "sacrifice" exactly nothing. They are to suffer no cuts either in their living standards or in the raking in of profits, while the toilers are being called upon to

make more and more drastic

and more sacrifices.

Symington carefully skirted around the question of the wage freeze, but made it nonetheless clear that there would be no price controls without the wage freeze and that the latter would be

(Continued on page 2)

Bartell Routs ALP in TV Debate

By Paul Abbott

I saw it from a ringside seat in the studio. It was slaughter, just plain slaughter. I mean what Michael Bartell, Socialist Workers candidate for Governor of New York, did to Dr. Clementine Paolone, American Labor Party candidate for Lt. Governor, in a three-way debate on Oct. 15 over WPIX, one of the big television stations in New York.

Bartell started the debate with a three-minute presentation of the case against the Democrats and Republicans and for socialism. He was followed by Dr. Paolone of the ALP, who as an "obstetrician for 20 years" said she had become concerned about the effects of an atom bomb on the thousand or more babies she had delivered and therefore accepted nomination.

Lowell Limpus, the moderator, made a few cracks about the devastating effect of these questions on the opposing candidates, but having permitted it to start, he let the procedure continue. The

usual recitation on socialism com-

posed some 50 years ago by Daniel DeLeon.

The next part of the program was scheduled to be a cross-fire of questions directed by followers of the various parties at opposing candidates. The candidates themselves could join the fray if they wanted.

The ALP pulled a real "clever" maneuver. In the time allotted to them, its followers stood up and asked stooge questions of Dr. Paolone, instead of addressing the other candidates. She of course delivered her rehearsed answers without the slightest visible labor. It was all very smooth, syrupy and as exciting as the Jesuit catechism.

Lowell Limpus, the moderator, made a few cracks about the devastating effect of these questions on the opposing candidates, but having permitted it to start, he let the procedure continue. The

usual recitation on socialism com-

posed some 50 years ago by Daniel DeLeon.

The next part of the program was scheduled to be a cross-fire of questions directed by followers of the various parties at opposing candidates. The candidates themselves could join the fray if they wanted.

The ALP pulled a real "clever" maneuver. In the time allotted to them, its followers stood up and asked stooge questions of Dr. Paolone, instead of addressing the other candidates. She of course delivered her rehearsed answers without the slightest visible labor. It was all very smooth, syrupy and as exciting as the Jesuit catechism.

Lowell Limpus, the moderator, made a few cracks about the devastating effect of these questions on the opposing candidates, but having permitted it to start, he let the procedure continue. The

usual recitation on socialism com-

posed some 50 years ago by Daniel DeLeon.

The

next

part

of

the

program

was

the

cross-</

Report from Europe

Failure of Stalinist Policy in Germany

By Ernest Germain

In no other country of Europe, and indeed in the world, have the Stalinists heaped so many blunders upon blunders as they did in Germany. There are many signs of the utter bankruptcy of their policy. Their party in Western Germany loses 50% of its votes at every successive election. It is losing its membership at an even faster rate and reducing itself to a "cadre party" — an orientation imposed by the overlords in the SED who know the ancient art of making a virtue out of necessity.

As to the SED itself, it has been losing first the support of the workers, then the support of the intellectuals, and next the support of the "allied" petty-bourgeois organizations and is today conducting a frenzied campaign of "purification" which is an indication of how intensely it is haunted by the ghost of "Titoism."

It is no small proof of the futility of the Stalinist policy that at the very moment when the heavy industry circles of the Ruhr are seeking to reintroduce into German politics the strategy of the "middle road between the East and the West," the "National Front" policy of the German Stalinists, which speculated on precisely such an eventuality, turns out to be a complete failure. The Stalinists have been going out of their way to woo the Ruhr industrialists in a manner so shameless that it has few precedents even in the long history of betrayals which is the history of the Russian bureaucracy.

TREACHEROUS LETTER

Recently, the leaders of the SED issued from Berlin an open letter to the industrialists of Western Germany at a moment when these capitalists found themselves for the first time since 1945 in the throes of a sharp wage struggle against their workers. This letter appeals to them "to unify the forces of all entrepreneurs and traders in Western Germany" because "as business men" they "understand better how reprehensible is the dependency of Western Germany upon the Western powers." "We are in agreement with you... when you

complain about the way your private initiative is being strangled (!) in Western Germany..." says this strange letter. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a more reactionary document, abandoning more completely every trace of a working class line, lining up more completely with the most backward and conservative sentiments of the ruling class.

But even such a document did not achieve any success whatsoever. The "committee of the National Front" is composed exclusively of Stalinist stooges and nobody else. The Ruhr industrialists, of course, want to trade with the Stalinist "German democratic republic." But in exchange for that trade they want the complete stifling of the Communist Party of Germany, without being willing to make any political concession at all.

Indeed, at the very moment they launched their campaign for a "middle road between the East and the West" — a campaign which the Stalinist press is supporting enthusiastically — they have been clamoring for the "elimination of the fifth column in Western Germany" and it was under their pressure that the Adenauer government decided to eliminate all members of the Communist Party or satellite organizations from government employ.

MASS SUPPORT LACKING

No less impressive is the failure of the Stalinists to line up any kind of mass support in Eastern Germany. The fake elections held this month could be prepared only by a ruthless purge of the satellite parties with which the Stalinist SED is "allied" in the National Front. Illegal organizations are stronger than in any other country of Eastern Europe. In the youth organization FDJ, there are strong illegal groups, mostly of a reactionary pro-fascist tendency, and it has just been made public that during the Easter demonstration of the FDJ in Berlin many thousands of illegal leaflets of these groups were spread in the Eastern zone of Berlin, together with many thousands of leaflets of working class oppositional groups.

SURE DEATH SENTENCE

After the proclamation of the "German democratic republic" the Bautzen camp was formally "dissolved" and handed over to the German authorities. In fact, the East German Stalinist police has kept it open ever since, and the only result of this change in administration has been the further deterioration of the food which is so insufficient — something like 700 calories a day — that it means a sure death sentence.

The cells of the Bautzen prison can normally hold 1,200 prisoners. Today, 6,000 are living there under hygienic conditions which can easily be guessed, 350 to 400 prisoners must stay all day in rooms no larger than 33x12 meters (about 36x13 yards). For every person there is something like 34 cm (14 inches) of shoulder-space to sleep upon. There is no work, no reading or educational material, no recreation, no smoking. The prisoners, among whom are boys 14 years of age, become completely demoralized by inactivity and starvation. 1,200 known cases of tuberculosis are counted among the 6,000 prisoners, and many other tubercular cases have simply not been discovered because there is no regular examination of prisoners at all. So great is the guards' fear of the contagion that they order the prisoners to turn their backs to them when they make their daily count.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Under the "loyalty" program it is regular procedure to dismiss persons temporarily as "poor security risks" without permitting them to know what is the evidence against them, or who their accusers are, or to permit cross-examination by the accused.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also heard by the Supreme Court last week in the cases of the International Workers Order, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. These organizations, all on the Attorney General's blacklist, challenged the constitutionality of the President's "loyalty" order and protested their inclusion in the "subversive" list.

WHAT TO EXPECT
Despite the critical comments on the star-chamber aspects of the "loyalty" hearings made by some of the Supreme Court justices during the Bailey appeal, it would be foolish to think that any confidence can be placed in that body of administration appointees, or to believe that it will throw out any of the reactionary measures subverting civil rights — either the administration's "loyalty" purge or the recently passed McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

THE BAILEY CASE
Miss Bailey, who was an \$8,000-a-year employee of the U. S. Employment Service and had worked for the government for 17 years, was dismissed, her attorneys contend, on anonymous, incomplete, confused or malicious information.

Neither she, nor her counsel, nor even her judges knew the identity of her accusers, her attorneys argued, and she was convicted on the testimony of "nameless" investigators who certified her nominal judges that her nameless accusers were reliable.

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman answered for the Truman

administration with the unique argument that the "loyalty" program gives government employees "more rights" than they had before — that is, hearings.

Arguments were also

Subscriptions: \$2 per year;
\$1 for 6 months. Foreign:
\$5.50 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, 1919."

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly by the Interests of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7460

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Vol. XIV - No. 43

Bundie Orders (5 or more
copies): \$2 each in U.S. or
each in foreign countries.
Signed articles by contributors
do not necessarily represent
The Militant's policies
These are expressed in its
editorials.

Monday, October 23, 1950



TROTSKY



LENIN

"While the magnates of monopoly capitalism stand above the official organs of state power, controlling them from their heights, the opportunist trade union leaders scurry around the footstools of state power, creating support for it among the working masses. It is impossible to perform this filthy chore so long as workers' democracy within the trade unions is maintained. The regime in the unions, following the pattern of the regime of the bourgeois states, is becoming more and more authoritarian. In war time the trade union bureaucracy definitely becomes the military police of the Army's General Staff in the working class."

— Leon Trotsky, Imperialist War and Proletarian Revolution, 1940.

Forced Confessions in the U.S. Too

We have heard and read much in recent years about the "Iron Curtain" and forced confessions, but always in connection with Stalin's totalitarian rule. The term, "Iron Curtain," has been used to express that almost phobic concern of the Kremlin to seal off the Soviet Union and its satellites and to bar outside ideas or influences. As for forced confessions, these have become the hallmark of Stalin's staged frame-up trials of political opponents.

While American propagandists continue to make much of the "Iron Curtain" and forced confessions as expressions of Stalin's oppressive regime, they are singularly unconcerned about the "Iron Curtain" and system of forced confessions which have been introduced here by the new McCarran-Kilgore police-state law.

The far-reaching provisions in this law for the exclusion of aliens who at any time in their lives might have had the slightest connection with anything the Attorney General and immigration officials choose to call "Communistic" or "totalitarian," are designed to serve the same essential purposes as the Kremlin's "Iron Curtain."

Here, too, reactionary politicians, ridden with fear, are seeking to erect a wall against the outside world. If that wall is neither as high nor as impenetrable as the one the Kremlin has built, it is only

because official Washington has not dared, as yet, to push to the extreme a policy that so violates the traditions and sentiments of the American people.

In the matter of forced confessions, juridically the McCarran-Kilgore system comes close to anything the Kremlin has contrived. The registration features of the McCarran law literally compel individuals and organizations to sign "confessions" that they are engaged in activities which the law defines as criminal, including espionage, sabotage and terrorism aimed at the establishment of a totalitarian regime.

The law states that "affiliation with" a "Communist" or "other totalitarian" group is not deemed a felony "per se" (in itself). But if you are ordered to register as a "Communist" — that is, sign an admission that you belong to an organization whose activities the law defines as criminal — you must do so or suffer fine and imprisonment. The "crime," you see, is not being a "Communist," but refusing to "confess" to being a "Communist" if the government orders such "confession."

All "confessions" extorted by the Kremlin are juridically represented as "voluntary." To represent them otherwise would give the game away. The McCarran law disdains the cover of "voluntary" confessions. It brazenly orders you to "confess" on pain of imprisonment if you don't.

Yugoslavs Curtail Special Privileges

From embattled Yugoslavia comes heartening news. On Oct. 15, the Yugoslav government decreed an end to virtually all special privileges of functionaries, army officers and other officials.

According to a N.Y. Times dispatch, the decree "ordered the immediate closing of all special food shops, special rest homes, holiday resorts, villas and other establishments enjoyed by privileged officials." The basic principle underlining this decree, continues the report, "is that nobody in Yugoslavia, regardless of his job, can receive more food than the miners and forestry and railroad workers."

Thus while in the capitalist world, the gulf between rich and poor constantly widens, and in the countries dominated by the Kremlin the bureaucrats continue to increase their privileges as against the masses, Yugoslavia is leveling the standard of living of the entire population.

It is true that these measures were taken under threat of famine with the aim of bolstering the morale of the people. Obviously the ability of the workers and peasants of Yugoslavia to endure the

terrible hardships caused by the drought will be enormously strengthened by the knowledge that their leaders and officials are sharing their sacrifices.

Yet this is a significant move toward equality which will surely meet with a warm reception by workers everywhere. In the first place, this is not an isolated act. It is in line with a whole series of steps since the rupture with the Kremlin, aimed at democratizing the country, rooting out bureaucracy, and closing the gap between the government and the people.

Furthermore, the fact that the Yugoslav government did respond to the crisis by enforcing real equality of sacrifice is itself indicative of the progressive, pro-socialist forces at work there. Neither capitalist nor Stalinist regimes act in this manner. They react to similar crises by police terror to protect the privileges of the rulers and suppress mass discontent.

American workers, welcoming this highly progressive measure, should demand that the U.S. government grant immediate and adequate aid to Yugoslavia via no strings attached.

BARTELL ROUTS ALP OPPONENT IN TV DEBATE

(Continued from Page 1)
your late Gideon, Henry A. Wallace, whom you built up as the Messiah that would lead us to the promised land?"

"I knew that was coming..."
"Would you mind answering the question?"

"Now you're simply trying to create confusion..."

"Who is guilty of creating confusion?" demanded Bartell. Dr. Paolone couldn't have looked more pained if Bartell really had pulled one of her lovely teeth. But she managed to get out another smile for the benefit of the television audience.

I overheard one of the technicians say, "This guy is really good. Last week she looked like a hero against the Republicans. Now she looks like a bum." Haas, the dour SLP candidate, for the first time seemed to take an interest in the outside world and was laughing like a human being. I heard later from those watching television sets that the audience reaction was terrific. It's not often they get to see a fighting Socialist in action. The speed with which Bartell trussed up this ALP candidate amazed them.

Bartell, of course, as he pushed his cross-examination kept draw-

ing the lessons about how phony the ALP claim of independence is.

"INDEPENDENT NOW"

Finally, Dr. Paolone tried to come back at this shattering socialist attack by insisting that "then the ALP had a coalition policy with the Republicans and Democrats, but now I'm happy to say that's over with and we're running independent."

"Only because neither the Democrats nor Republicans will give you a deal. And what about your support of the Republican candidate Bianchi? Isn't that another mistake?"

"I was waiting for that... No, oh-my-no. This is different. It was Bianchi who came over to Marcantonio."

"The way Dewey, Lehman, O'Dwyer and Truman came over, no doubt."

Bartell then switched the subject to the struggle for racial equality: "You say you are for FEPC, and that Marcantonio is responsible for the legislation that's been passed. But these laws were the result of the March on Washington movement. Why did Marcantonio, along with the Stalins and the Daily Worker, oppose the March on Washington?"

The Doctor taunted up again. Admitting "mistakes" had n't

proved too happy. Maybe going into a clinch would gain her a breather. "We stand for FEPC. Marcantonio stands for FEPC very definitely." She put on her smile again.

ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"Do you favor defending the civil liberties of the Socialist Workers Party — of the Trotskyists, that is?"

"Why of course I do. The American Labor Party stands for everybody's civil liberties." Dr. Paolone's television smile looked almost relaxed, if not triumphant.

Bartell shook his head like he hadn't heard right. "You would defend the civil liberties of the Trotskyists?" he repeated incredulously.

"Why, of course," she responded grandly. "When I'm elected, you come up to my office and I'll take care of your rights." Her followers gave her a round of applause, the only one they ventured during the cross-fire.

"But last year on this same program," Bartell objected, "your running mate, Paul Ross, refused to defend the civil liberties of Trotskyists. In accordance with the Stalinist position, he flatly refused to defend the civil liberties of the 18 Trotskyist leaders falsely convicted under the Smith

Indo-Chinese Beat Back Army of French Despots

By Charles Hanley

After four years of war in Indo-China, the French colonialists have been unable to reconquer the greater part of that land of rice, cotton and rubber, although fully half of the existing French army — five divisions, including the Foreign Legion with many former SS men recruited in Germany — has been engaged in fighting the partisan forces of the Republic of Viet-Nam led by the Viet-Minh movement.

The French forces are now facing a Viet-Minh army which received material aid from Mao Tse-tung's China. Strengthened and reorganized, Viet-Nam President Ho Chi Minh's units have begun a counter-offensive wiping out a column of 3,500 French troops in Indo-China and driving out the French from an area of more than 5,000 square miles.

Except for a tiny handful of big landowners and merchants, the Vietnamese hope for Ho's victory. The puppet government of former emperor Bao Dai, installed by the French, has no real authority or following and rests exclusively on French bayonets.

The U. S. State Department recognized this puppet regime several months ago, while refusing recognition to Mao Tse-tung's government which effectively controls the whole of China. The feudal anti-Communist Bao Dai, one of the most notorious playboys of the French Riviera, has been promised American aid for

the creation of an "anti-communist" Indo-Chinese army.

But the French generals know they cannot rely on Bao, who recently spent three months in Cannes and is only now returning to "his" realm (because the French have made him understand that his presence in Indo-China was necessitated by the seriousness of the situation). And they cannot and do not rely on Bao's troops. It's the French army which has to do the job. It's the French army which wants for itself most of the promised American aid, which thus far, according to French Commander-in-Chief General Carpenter, has been "insufficient."

American imperialism has to support reactionary regimes everywhere: without American aid, the French military machine in Indo-China might easily crumble. Without active American intervention, the Syngman Rhee government in South Korea would have disappeared in June.

The State Department declares that it does not intend to send any American troops to Indo-China, but General MacArthur is known to favor a "more active" policy in that part of Asia. In any case, an enormous amount of money — American taxpayers' money — is to be spent in defense of the colonial despotism of the French capitalists and their generals and in defense of the privileges of a small minority of landlords and native capitalists allied to the French occupiers. The French government has

asked for 3 billion dollars general rearmament aid, of which 300 million would be used for what the French workers correctly call "the dirty war" against the Viet-Nam Republic. Washington has just announced that the French will be granted up to \$2.4 billion for rearmament and "military operations in Indo-China."

The Viet-Minh movement which is fighting for the Viet-Nam's independence from the French colonial yoke and from feudal chieftains like Bao Dai, cannot be mechanically identified with the Kremlin, although Stalin, of course, always tries to use such movements for the Russian bureaucracy's own interests and purposes. The ties between Mao's China and the Viet-Nam Republic are far closer than those existing between the Viet-Minh leaders and the Kremlin. (Let us recall that Ho Chi Minh expressed his readiness to establish diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia and has thus shown a certain degree of independence from the Cominform.)

American labor should oppose any aid to the French reactionaries and their Bao Dais.

The people of the Viet-Nam have the same right to be free and independent and to choose their own form of government as the American people had in their fight against British colonialism in the 18th Century. American workers should protest against the "dirty war" which French capitalism aided by Washington is waging against a freedom-loving people.

The British capitalist press gave it considerable attention recently, in the aftermath of the parliamentary debate on steel nationalization. It centered around a report presented at the Trade Union Congress, a report ingeniously entitled "Report on Public Ownership" and which dealt with the trade unions' attitude not only to nationalized industries but toward enterprises owned by municipalities, etc.

This "Report" was presented for the General Council by Lincoln Evans, chairman of its Economic Committee and head of the federation of trade unions in the steel and iron industry. In guarded and concealed language, it proposed instead of steel nationalization a new supervisory board which would leave the industry in private hands while imposing controls similar to those of wartime regulations.

"COMPROMISE" PROPOSAL
This proposal had its origin with the Iron and Steel Board of the owners and was offered as a "compromise" alternative to nationalization by Churchill and the Tories in the House of Commons debate going on at the time. Shrewd observers in the capitalist press of England analyzed this TUC report carefully and deduced from it that, although this was not explicitly stated in it, the Evans report "should provide some feasible grounds for some sort of coalition."

The Report on Public Ownership was passed without special notice by the Congress, because the Labor government just at that time was announcing in Parliament that it was going through with steel nationalization. The political leaders saw the handwriting on the wall at Brighton more clearly than the trade union fakers. As the Tribune, Evans and other government of Aneurin Bevan covers up for the right wing on an issue such as steel nationalization and when the behavior of the latter borders on outright betrayal of all of their followers.

Behind the scenes in British politics, such a situation actually developed, although little has come to light about it from any source in the Laborite leadership.

It is, of course, understandable that, with the narrow majority they have in the present Parliament, the "left wing" as well as the right wing leaders would try to tone down differences of opinion when they face the Tory party of British capitalism in a vote on an important issue. To slay over conflicts of policy at meetings of their own party and their own trade union organizations is, however, something else again. It becomes particularly unprincipled and despicable when the so-called "left wing" led by Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan covers up for the right wing on an issue such as steel nationalization and when the behavior of the latter borders on outright betrayal of all of their followers.

"LEFT WING" ROLE
The right wing, as the incident on steel nationalization has shown, is ready to move toward a coalition with the Tories. For them, it is only a question of the proper timing. This is where the nefarious, unprincipled role of Aneurin Bevan's "left wing" comes in. Instead of exposing the collusion of trade union fakers like Evans with the plutocrats, instead of pillorying the preparations for treachery in public, they make their main concern the unity of a leadership which contains outright traitors to the cause they espouse. Thereby Bevan and Co. are not preserving the unity of the British labor movement but doing their bit to help the traitors to split and cripple it.

The attempt at collusion between the TUC General Council, the steel barons and the Tories on this question is further emphasized by the repercussions among the bosses over the parliamentary vote to go ahead with nationalization. The magnates have refused to serve on the board of the nationalized industry. The government has accused them of sabotage and of carrying on a "political strike."

To this, the steel owners have countered with questions about why Lincoln Evans, who has also refused to serve, is not likewise accused of sabotage. They are attempting to drive a wedge in the Labor leadership and, in their narrow concern with their own interests, throw disrepute to the wind when they explain the present unanimity of the Laborites. Thus, one of the steel barons,

ASIANS STILL RESIST U. S. IMPERIALISM

By J. B. Stuart

Despite the victories in Korea, or perhaps because of them, resistance to American imperialism throughout Asia is on the increase rather than on the wane. This fact was borne out last week by the international conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations being held at Lucknow, India; by a statement which Prime Minister Nehru issued to the press; by the sober comments of responsible bourgeois publicists and indirectly, also, in the speech delivered by Truman at San Francisco upon his return from the sensational meeting with MacArthur on Wake Island.

The Lucknow conference had among its participants Indians and Pakistanis as well as Americans, Canadians and Englishmen. The N. Y. Times, which carried daily dispatches on its sessions for a week, reported that on questions of policy the most "left wing" of the Western delegates appeared to be far to the right of the most conservative Asian. According to these reports, the Indians and Pakistanis "bluntly accused the United States of prostituting relief dollars for selfish ends." These speakers, mostly scholars from local universities, expressed grave fear of the "growing circle of United States bases in the Pacific." They protested against "excessive U.S. bombing of Korea" and bitterly complained that the U.S. "places no value upon Asiatic life." Anticipating "economic plans" for Asia, delegates discussed the Marshall Plan. One stated that its purpose was proven to be to "disrupt trade in Europe and redirect it across the Atlantic."

The Times correspondent shrewdly noted that in private conversation the Asian delegates were far more friendly and conciliatory to the Westerners than on the conference floor. The inference is inescapable that these cultural leaders, tied in with their government and the ruling class, have to express publicly sentiments which are far more in keeping with the moods and minds of the vast toiling masses than with those in their own circles.

Nehru Explains Indian Position

This was emphasized later on in the week in Nehru's carefully prepared statement which stressed: "the common features of Asia today are a reaction to the previous colonial regime, a resurgent nationalism, agrarian movements, a desire to get rid of our economic backwardness and passionate urge for freedom." Communism, he went on to say, although the methods of the Stalinist parties have been greatly disliked, "attracts many people" and appears "in the guise of a liberating movement." While this problem has "its military aspects," Nehru said, "we feel that it is a problem of winning the understanding and goodwill of the masses of the world. Unless people have some hope in the future held out to them, they seek other remedies. To think of the military issue only is to misunderstand the problem."

That is why, he explained, India opposed the crossing of the 38th Parallel in Korea, why it opposes U.S. action in Formosa, why it is in favor of bringing the "New China" into the UN, and why it opposes the U.S. proposals to create separate armed forces "on behalf of the United Nations" in each country. This last proposal, he stated, "seems like converting the United Nations into a larger edition of the Atlantic Pact and makes it a war organization more than one devoted to peace." All these considerations, he summed up, led India not to join the UN's Korean commission. What he was stating in diplomatic language was more bluntly expressed in various Indian newspapers — namely, that the UN was "becoming a stooge" of Washington and that India should therefore be careful in its commitments to this organization.

The reactions in Asia have strengthened serious misgivings here over the policy of which Korea was only the most striking example. A Columbia University professor of international relations and expert on Far Eastern affairs, Nathaniel Peffer, takes a particularly sober and dim view in an article for the N.Y. Times Magazine. "A few more victories such as we have had in Korea," he writes, "and we may well be undone." Why this dire judgment? Because "it is oversimplification to the point of fallacy" to regard outbreaks such as the Korean as "deriving wholly" from the "Russian-American conflict" and to seek a solution in resort to arms. The "foundation of stability" in Asia had been destroyed by two world wars and, "as everywhere else in the world, the poorest classes, both peasant and urban... refuse to submit any longer to the old order of perpetual poverty." The Russians may exploit this situation, Peffer admonishes, but they have not created it.

Economy of Money and Resources

To meet this situation, he advises, neither military strength nor propaganda for abstract democracy will help the U.S. It must simply pour in "adequate" economic aid and stop supporting the old ruling class and its Chiangs, Rhee's, etc. "If the absolute power of this class cannot be broken" by Washington and its satraps, he warns, "then it would be an economy of money and resources to write off East Asia at once, for the Communists will get it anyway."

U.S. Political Corruption

By Walt Whitman

(In 1856 the poet Walt Whitman wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Eighteenth Presidency*, dealing with that year's presidential election campaign, which was contested by James Buchanan, candidate of the Democratic Party; Millard Fillmore, candidate of the Whigs and of the American, or Know-Nothing, Party; and John C. Fremont, candidate of the new Republican Party. We reprint below some extracts from Whitman's pamphlet which apply in major respects to American capitalist politics in 1950.)

To-day, of all the persons in public office in the States, not one in a thousand has been chosen by a spontaneous movement of the people, nor is attending to the interests of the people; all have been nominated and put through by great or small caucuses of the politicians, or appointed as rewards for electioneering. . . . The berths, the Presidency included, are bought, sold, electioneered for...

Well, what more? Is nothing but breed upon breed like these to be represented in the Presidency? . . . Where is the real America? Where are the laboring persons, ploughmen, men with axes, spades, scythes, flails? Where are the carpenters, masons, machinists, drivers of horses, workmen in factories? Where is the spirit of the manliness and commonsense of These States? It does not appear in the government. It does not appear at all in the Presidency...

Never were publicly displayed more deformed, mediocre, sniveling, unreliable, falsehearted men! Never were these States so insulted, and attempted to be betrayed! . . .

Whence the delegates of the politicians? Whence the Buchanan and Fillmore Conventions? Not from sturdy American freemen; not from industrious homes; not from thrifty farms; not from the ranks of fresh-bodied young men; not from among teachers, poets, savants, learned persons, beloved persons, temperate persons; not from among shipbuilders, engineers, agriculturists, swine-swingers, corn-hoers; not from the race of mechanics...

Whence, then, do these nominating dictators of America year after year start out? From lawyers' offices, secret lodges, back-yards, bed-houses, and bar-rooms; from out of the customs-houses, marshals' offices, post-offices, and gambling hells; from the President's house, the jail, the venereal

hospital, the station-house; from un-named by-places where devilish disunion is hatched at midnight; from political hearse, and from the coffins inside, and from the shrouds inside the coffins; from the tumors and abscesses of the land; from the skeletons and skulls in the vaults of the federal almshouses, from the running sores of the great cities; thence to the national, state, city and district nominating conventions of These States, come the most numerous and controlling delegates.

Who are they personally? Office-holders, office-seekers, robbers, pimps, exclusives, malcontents, conspirators, murderers, fancy-men, port-masters, customs-house clerks, contractors, kept-editors . . . crawling, serpentine men, the lousy combings and born freedom-sellers of the earth.

You Americans who travel with such men, or who are nominated on tickets anywhere with them, or who support them at meetings, or write for them in newspapers, or who believe that any good can come out of them, you also understand not the present age, the fibre of it...

To butchers, sailors, stevedores, and drivers of horses — to ploughmen, wood-cutters, marketmen carpenters, masons and laborers — to workmen in factories — and to all in These States who live by their daily toil — Mechanics! A parcel of windy northern liars are bawling in your ears the easily spoken words Democracy and the Democratic Party. (Buchanan, the slaveholders' candidate, came from the North.) Others are making a great ado with the word Americanism, a solemn and great word. What the so-called democrats are now sworn to perform would eat the faces off the succeeding generations of common people worse than the most horrible disease. The others are contributing to the like performance, and are using the great word Americanism without yet feeling the first aspiration of it, as the great word Religion has been used, probably loudest and oftenest used, by men that made indiscriminate massacres at night, and filled the world so full of hatreds, horrors, partialities, exclusions, bloody revenges, penal conscience laws and test-oaths. To the virtue of Americanism is happening today what happens many days to many virtues, namely, the masses who possess them but do not understand them are sought to be sold by that very means to those who neither possess them nor understand them...

For these reasons the New Leader did not pass the Kilgore (concentration camp) bill alone (instead of tacking it onto the McCarran omnibus measure), for that would have satisfied the country's demand for some 'anti-Communist' legislation and would have given us a standby act for use in an emergency." Concentration camps and the New Leader of "social democracy" are clearly not incompatible.

William E. Bohn, editor of the New Leader, went even further in his column. According to him, the Kilgore section of the law "provides that, in case of war, Communists are to be rounded up and segregated. That is a plain military measure. No one can complain that it contravenes anyone's civil rights." The number of errors or lies in this statement is almost equal to the number of words in it.

The Kilgore section does not apply only in case of war, but at any time the President declares an "internal security emergency" — during war, invasion or "insurrection." It does not apply only to "Communists," but to "each person as to whom there is reasonable grounds to believe that such person will probably engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or of sabotage." It does not provide for "segregation" but for "detention" in prisons or concentration camps — that is, arrest. It is not a "military matter," plain or fancy, but a political matter, which will be handled not by the armed forces but by the Department of Justice and its thought police. If Bohn really believes that arrest and detention for an indefinite period without jury trial don't contravene civil rights, then he can and should make a similar defense of Hitler's and Stalin's regimes.

The New Leader took note of some of the new law's anti-democratic features, but its main complaint was that "it will not only fail to stamp out Communism but may even encourage it. . . . Few Communists will register, and the great majority will go underground and become harder to deal with." Worse yet, the Communists may take the Act to the Supreme Court, and if the latter

declares it unconstitutional — as well it might — the Communists may eventually walk off with a victory which not even McCarran will be able to legislate against."

For these reasons the New Leader said its sole hope now is that the present Act will prove impractical by Nov. 27 that the Congress will have to amend it drastically — and soberly." The only thing that is unclear about its position is which it thinks is worse — the law or the possibility that it might be ruled unconstitutional.

The Socialist Call, published by the weaker wing of the Social Democracy, the Socialist Party, was somewhat more critical of the law as a whole. But its criticisms were on the whole restrained, as it said that the wholesale detention of

It would be unjust to say that an iron curtain has been erected to keep all dissident opinion and non-American ideas out of the United States. But a smoke screen has been set up which distorts or destroys what should be the major tenet of United States policy: that freedom is the best weapon we have to combat totalitarianism," etc.

Norman Thomas, writing in the same paper, said: "Unless we are to live in a dream world of our own, we Socialists must admit that this year it will make a lot of difference to us and the things we care about if the Republicans supplant Senator Lehman in New York or elect Richard Nixon in California over Helen Gahagan Douglas. I cite these as only two possible examples. Other things being equal or anywhere near equal, lovers of freedom and common sense in America must prefer candidates for the Senate and House who have the courage to oppose the McCarran Act and who will promise to seek its drastic amendment."

This is a back-handed plea for "the lovers of freedom and common sense" to vote for Fair Deal Democrats who have already promised that their "drastic amendment" of the new law will consist of retaining the concentration camp provisions. The Social Democrats' talk about "panic and ignorance" emphasizes that they have forgotten what even they used to know at one time — that where concentration camps are established, Social Democrats generally wind up among their occupants.

The Ford Foundation

By Larry Dolinski

SWP Candidate for Michigan Auditor General

Henry Ford II has bestowed \$225,000,000 on the Ford Foundation. This sum, the ballyhoo goes, is to be spent to fight for peace, establish security for the masses, guarantee democratic rights, etc. Ford's philanthropy is as fraudulent as his grandfather's.

Old Henry had a knack for winning applause for his "humanitarianism." He was the first to inaugurate the \$5 day, but those around Detroit knew what a fake that was. With the increase in pay came an inhuman speed-up that turned production workers into physical wrecks in a few years.

His grandson has just succeeded in forcing the Ford Steel workers back to work without the overtime pay for Saturdays and Sundays; Ford production workers are now knuckling down to work under a contract that ignores the growing speed-up of the production lines. For every penny granted the workers, grandson like grandfather gets his pound of flesh.

Philanthropy in general is nothing more than a means for the very wealthy to evade income taxes. The forming of foundations is the most favorite device. Thereby not only is the payment of taxes evaded, but complete control retained over the foundation funds. All this, while winning acclaim for humanitarianism, pays off in lush dividends — to Ford and all other foundations.

The Ford Foundation was incorporated in 1936 and is the depository of the bulk of the profits made by the Ford Motor Co. Both Henry I and Edsel Ford on their deaths added to this mass of wealth by leaving all their non-voting shares to

THE MILITANT

VOLUME XIV

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1950

NUMBER 43

'Pilot' Has Some Explaining to Do

The NMU Pilot, paper of the CIO National Maritime Union, had the following banner headline in its Oct. 5 issue:

"Commies Impose 5.49% Peanut Settlement on MC&S Members."

This referred to the wage settlement made by the leadership of the Marine Cooks and Stewards, which was recently expelled from the CIO as "communist-dominated."

On Oct. 9 the daily press reported that the NMU and the Atlantic and Gulf District of the AFL Seafarers International Union had negotiated contracts providing for a wage increase of 6.38%.

We look forward with interest to the next issue of the Pilot. In all justice it should explain why, if it is correct to call a 5.49% raise a "peanut settlement" in these times, it isn't correct to use the same term for a 6.38% raise.



Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin (l.) meets with Chairman W. Stuart Symington of the National Security Resources Board and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall to discuss problems of manpower and "labor's role" in mobilization. The workers themselves have no say on what happens to them or their living conditions; Big Business and Big Brass make all the important decisions in Washington.

Gov. Williams -- Record Of Millionaire 'Liberal'

By Howard Lerner
SWP Candidate for Governor of Michigan

Bow-tie sporting, polka-dancing Gerhard Mennen Williams, heir to the \$12 million Mennen shaving cream fortune, was catapulted to the Michigan governorship in 1948. He knows that in Michigan the Democrat seeking state office must look to labor for votes, as the conservative English weekly, *The Economist*, put it on Oct. 22, 1949.

His strategy for wooing labor votes without really stepping on the toes of Big Business is to blame the Republican majority of the state legislature for blocking practically all of his proposals. In this way he figures he can get credit for being a great "friend of labor" at absolutely no cost to himself or his fellow capitalists.

The record of Soapy Williams' accomplishments is to be found in a "Fact Book" which he has published for the purpose of smearing the labor vote. He takes the credit for raising old-age benefits from \$50 to \$60 a month. His "Fact Book" boasts:

"He carried out that promise and the Legislature approved the increase as recommended." Truly mighty accomplishment — even the "financial interests" didn't object. The old people starving to death on this pittance cannot fail to appreciate this great philanthropy.

Soapy also wanted to prohibit the state from regaining old-age

payments from the estates of the deceased. But the Republicans balked. Involved are some \$25,000 a month. Soapy prevented a telephone rate increase, added \$4 a week to unemployment compensation benefits and proposes a 4% tax on corporate profits to balance the budget. This just about sums up his "progressive" achievements.

SALES TAX REMAINS

While boasting of these piddling moves, he has meanwhile completely forgotten his own promise to wipe out the sales tax. Four out of every five dollars in taxes in Michigan come from the workers through this sales tax, which is a favorite method of milking the public. On this issue Soapy and his ADA-PAC backers are today silent as the tomb. They holler only about peanuts while coconuts are stolen.

When it comes to fighting against discrimination Soapy's record reeks. His current budget does not include a dime to enforce the Diggs Act which makes it a crime to discriminate in public places.

The governor could easily stop discrimination in the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission's notorious hiring methods. Yet he has never issued an executive order to this effect and the MUCC continues to send workers out on jobs in accordance with color calls.

A big to-do was made when an executive order was issued eliminating segregation in the National Guard. Aside from the fact that there are few Negroes in the Guard, this order is not retroactive. Says the "Fact Book": "The order applied only to the future, and did not require the breakup of any existing units or transfer of units." In other words, everything remains virtually as before.

Needless to say, Soapy appointed a Negro as a judge to fill a vacancy. Since the days of slavery, it has been a common practice to pass out a few jobs as a sop to keep millions quiet.

HIS FEPC LAW

Soapy's FEPC law was so rotten that even the Republican "financial interests" agreed to endorse it. Only after they realized that he would get the political credit for it did they back out at the last minute. Soapy's law included no penalties.

The Commission would have been empowered to receive and investigate complaints, and, by negotiation and conciliation, to obtain remedy without recourse to legal action." This toothless bill provided no fines, no imprisonment for violators, only "negotiation," "conciliation," "education."

On housing, Williams introduced a law, which did not pass, to build 20,000 homes over a period of several years. In Detroit alone there are 75,000 houses that should be razed and replaced by new ones.

He also proposed to give the vote to 18-year olds. Why? Because the youth are today 2 to 1 for the Democrats as against the Republicans. Great liberal!

The millionaire governor also boasts of obtaining some modification of the vicious Bonine-Tripp anti-labor law, already weakened by the courts because the Taft-Hartley Act has precedence over it.

"ANTI-RED" LAW

The crowning achievement of this shyster was sponsorship of a law against "subversives." While he could not spare a cent for enforcing the Diggs Act, he did find a quarter of a million for a Michigan gestapo.

In addition to his talks before unions and community organizations, the candidate has already spoken at the first of a series of street-corner meetings.

Open forums are also being held every Friday evening at the Myra Tanner Weiss headquarters, 3012 East 1st Street. Murry Weiss was the principal speaker at the opening forum, where he discussed Marxism and Pacificism.

Precinct work has likewise gotten under way. Initial response tends to confirm the impression of friendliness shown to Comrade Weiss by union audiences. Workers already visited show a willingness to discuss political issues and to purchase copies of *The Militant* containing the candidate's platform.

Among union meetings already addressed are the Chrysler and Alcoa locals of the CIO United Auto Workers, locals of the AFL Carpenters Union, AFL Sheet-metal Workers, AFL Bricklayers and Stone Masons, CIO Oil Workers, CIO Communication Workers of America, CIO Rubber Workers, AFL Butchers, AFL Plasterers and the International Association of Machinists.

A number of other union meetings are scheduled for the current week. In addition, Comrade Weiss has been invited to speak before the American Jewish Congress. Their actions have largely contributed to the slowing down of the revolutionary socialist movement throughout the world.

When questioned about firing a "communist" in view of the fact that the CP is still legal, he said that "a department head can find some reason for dismissal, much as I dislike to circumvent the law." Weiss is quite ready to circumvent the law when it comes to firing people for their opinions, but he is unwilling to enforce laws when it comes to fighting against Jim Crow.

The tragedy is not that this slick faker seeks to pull the wool over the eyes of the people, but that the CIO and ADA leaders help him. No, it is not the CIO and ADA leaders who have captured this millionaire, but he and his ilk who have captured them. And the chief victims of this contemptible game are the workers of Michigan.

Witch-Hunters Open Trial of 5 Ford Workers

DETROIT — Amid much publicity in the local capitalist press, the trial of five alleged Communist officers of Ford UAW Local 600 started on Oct. 9. This trial is part of an anti-red campaign initiated by Carl Stellato, Local 600 president, under the inspiration of Walter Reuther at the outbreak of the Korean war. The Reutherites were able to get a hand-picked 11-man trial board since they have a mechanical majority on the lame-duck General Council.

The five unionists are: Paul Boatin, John Gallo, Nelson Davis, Ed Lock, and David Moore, all old-time Ford workers and founders of Local 600. They are accused of following the Communist Party line, and of being subservient to the CP and Russia. The accusations against them were very broad and general. As the Detroit News put it, Stellato charged them with signing the local's "loyalty" pledge "with mental reservations and in bad faith."

The defendants' requests for "specific" charges on the opening of the trial were ignored by Reuther's prosecuting attorney, A. Zwerdling, and the trial committee. Composed of Stellato's stooges, the trial committee will no doubt render a verdict conforming to the charges. Zwerdling, a personal friend and henchman of Reuther's, is another one of the many in top UAW circles who used the socialist movement as a stepping stone to personal advancement in the labor movement.

LONG TRIAL EXPECTED
The five defendants are going to be tried individually. The local press say that the trial will last until next February, and blame a lengthy trial on the defendants even before it is started. In reality, it will be Stellato, Reuther and their stooges who will drag out the trial for two main reasons.

"We call upon our union to find Carl Stellato guilty of obvious malice in filing the charges" as provided by Article 48, Section 14 of our Constitution and to punish him accordingly.

"And we will document these charges."

LOCAL 400 "OATH"
The recent introduction of "loyalty oaths" in Ford Highland Local 400 is additional proof that the red-baiting in the UAW is directed against the interests of the rank and file and against trade union democracy. It is common knowledge in Detroit union circles that for the last five years at least, there have been no Communist Party members or fellow-travelers holding office in Local 400.

Al Musilli, president of Local 400, admitted there were no CPers in Local 400. But under pressure of the International, he introduced the "loyalty oath" just the same. The Reuther machine looked upon Local 400's rejection of the 5-year contract as the work of McCarthy-like smear in a desperate attempt to take over control.

So far Stellato's attorney has been dragging in a lot of professional red-baiters. J. R. Adams, his own housing program, has precedence over it.

BOHANNAN OUTLINES SWP HOUSING PROGRAM
NEWARK, Oct. 16 — The Housing Act of 1949 is "not a real slum clearance program, but a mockery of one, whose chief aim is to promote the political fortunes of

demagogic politicians." This was the view expressed today by William E. Bohannan, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Congress from the 11th District, in a letter to the New Jersey Association of Housing Authorities regarding his own public housing and slum clearance program.

To substantiate his charge, Bohannan called attention to the inaction of Northern Democrats and Dixiecrats which last year prevented the adoption of a provision to abolish segregation in public housing.

The SWP candidate outlined his own housing program, as follows:

HOMES, NOT BOMBS
"If elected to Congress, I will fight for a federal program to clear the slums and erect 25 million low-cost, low-rent housing units.

"To finance this program, I will advocate the transfer of the billions now being used for war preparations, and the transformation of