

Anti-Trucks Law Fight Supported By Labor's Daily

DETROIT, Mich., Dec. 30 — The response to formation of the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law continued to mount this week. The Flint Weekly Review, official newspaper of the Flint CIO, gave it full treatment in its columns, as did Ford Facts, weekly newspaper of Local 600, CIO United Auto Workers, the world's largest union local. The Detroit Building Tradesman, official publication of the Detroit Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL, also reported the news.

Perhaps the outstanding development of the week was the strong editorial support to the fight against the fascist-like measure given by Labor's Daily, published in West Virginia. This nationally circulated publication, the first daily paper of the American labor movement, explained why it is in labor's interest to unite in common struggle against a "vicious law" like this despite differences of creed and political opinion. It explained why the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law was formed, described its widely representative character, and approved its aims.

The progressive stand of this important paper should help in bringing fresh support throughout the country to the Michigan Committee. Labor's Daily is sponsored by the AFL International Typographical Union and has been endorsed by the AFL and United Mine Workers conventions and by many CIO, Railroad Brotherhood and independent union bodies.

In view of the significance of the opinion of Labor's Daily, we are printing its editorial for the information of our readers. It appeared in the Dec. 27 issue under the title, "Unity for Freedom." The full text follows:

Throughout the nation, during this era of the Red scare, repressive laws have been enacted by various state legislatures. The fear of Communism has been used by powerful economic groups in order to cripple organized labor through the passage of such measures. Other bills are certain to be introduced which, if passed, will most certainly harass Labor and, in addition, obliterate our most fundamental freedoms as formerly guaranteed under the Bill of Rights.

Such laws are in flagrant violation of our Constitution as in the past led many liberals to await complacently the adverse decisions of the Supreme Court and other judicial bodies. Pending such decisions men have been jailed, free speech has become a memory, and fear of reprisal has forced many into craven silence. And legal decisions have been rendered which prove that those behind the judicial bench are not divinities but mortals, subject to all the prejudices of men behind the work bench. In short, the courts have with dismayed frequency upheld the validity of laws which stink to Heaven. All working men know this, and in their own localities they are generally able to name the judges whose anti-labor bias is notorious.

The lesson is clear. Freedom can not be entrusted to the judiciary, or to any other branch of government, as if it were a diamond to be left in a bank's safety-deposit vault. Freedom is indeed a precious jewel, but its very value requires that we, as citizens, be constantly on guard to prevent its rape. If in fighting to protect our fundamental rights as citizens, we also protect the rights of citizens who disagree with us politically, religiously

or otherwise, we must realize that this is necessarily true.

Political homogeneity in any large group of people is impossible, even when members of the group agree on fundamentals. It is the tacit agreement to ignore dissimilarities and concentrate on common objectives which enables any organization to get things done. It is this lesson of organization which must be learned by those decent citizens who resent the current drive toward thought-control and regimentation.

In the state of Michigan the legislature has passed what is known as the "Trucks Law." Under its provisions the state attorney-general is given power to pronounce any organization a "Communist front." Members of such organizations are required to register with the state police. If they fail to register, refuse to be fingerprinted, or refuse to testify against themselves or others they may be charged with a felony. It is not necessary that payment of dues or possession of a membership card be proven in order for the victim to be declared a member of a "subversive" organization. A stiff prison sentence awaits anyone guilty of so-called "sabotage" during a labor dispute involving defense work.

Isn't this a slave law? And it is in effect right here in the land of the free and the home of the brave. How this law could be used against not only Communists but, in the hands of an employer-dominated state administration, any really militant labor union is painfully obvious to any experienced unionist.

But it is on the statute books,

The Communist Party of Michigan brought a suit to test its constitutionality, and a three-judge Federal Court Panel upheld the Act. The bitterly anti-Communist Socialist Workers Party has filed another suit which challenges the Trucks Act.

Realizing the truth of Supreme Court Justice Black's recent opinion that "laws which stigmatize and penalize thought and speech of the unorthodox have a way of reaching, ensnaring and silencing many more people than at first intended," a citizens' group has been formed: the Citizens Committee Against the Trucks Law. The committee is evidently composed of people of widely varying religious and political creeds. The Methodist Council has said: "... the Trucks Law is so vague and loosely worded that it becomes a threat to our civil liberties and an instrument to be used against other groups as well."

The Wage Earner, organ of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists comments: "... the real danger of the Trucks Law is that it is so vague, so all encompassing so patently open to abuse that it could, if strictly enforced, permit half of the population of the state to put the other half in jail."

Catholic, Protestant and Jew, left-winger and middle-of-the-roader, have combined forces to fight a vicious law. Are there Communists in the organization? Probably. But this does not mean that it should be condemned out of hand. Senator McCarthy has been shrieking for a long time that there are Communists in the U.S. Government. But no one wants to abolish that institution, whether McCarthy's charges are true or false. The fight against the Trucks Law, and all similar legislation, deserves the support of all who love freedom.

DANGEROUS ILLUSION

There is no more dangerous illusion than of a cheap military solution in Korea. As one disgusted GI quoted in the press last week put it, "There's always more Chinese over the next hill." We have to understand that the Chinese and North Korean forces are part of a titanic revolutionary upheaval of a billion people in Asia. They aren't going to back down before technically superior foreign imperialist armies anymore than American revolutionaries of 1776 bowed before the British red-coats.

The U.S. had no right to go into Korea in the first place. The American people must put absolutely no dependence on any other way to end the war than the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. troops from Korea.

New Stalin Bid Meets Same Hostile Reception

By Harry Frankel

It has already been generally noted that the Stalin Christmas Eve negotiation offer will not halt the war drive, nor produce a deal between the imperialist powers and the Soviet bureaucracy. It does not set the stage for any kind of amicable or semi-amicable settlement. "What the Stalin offer and the reaction of the capitalist governments to it do show, however, is the source of the war danger."

Regardless of Stalin's motivation, which we can consider fully later on, his action has undoubtedly had an effect, like similar previous actions, in showing great masses of the people throughout the world that the source of the war danger is U.S. capitalism. It also has an important effect upon the vacillating and defeatist capitalist classes of Western Europe, reviving among them dreams of averting

the disaster they see coming over them, and increasing dissensions within the Atlantic bloc of capitalist powers.

TEXT OF REPLIES

Stalin's remarks, in the form of replies to questions posed by James Reston of the N. Y. Times, were as follows:

Q. — At the beginning of a new year and a new administration in the United States, is it still your conviction that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States can live peacefully in the coming years?

A. — I still believe that war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union cannot be considered inevitable, and that our countries can continue to live in peace.

Q. — Whence lie the sources of present world contention, in your judgment?

A. — Everywhere and in every- thing wherever the aggressive actions of the policy of the "cold war" against the Soviet Union find their expression.

Q. — Would you welcome diplomatic conversations with representatives of the new Eisenhower Administration looking toward the possibility of a meeting between yourself and General Eisenhower on easing world tensions?

A. — I regard this suggestion favorably.

Q. — Would you cooperate in any new diplomatic approach designed to bring about an end to the Korean war?

A. — I agree to cooperate because the USSR is interested in ending the war in Korea.

NOTHING SURPRISING

It is evident that there is no new remark in the entire message, this offer having been made numberless times by the Stalin

regime. One newspaper calculated that Stalin himself has made it fourteen times since 1946.

Nor has there been any surprise in the reply given by Wall Street and its imperialist satellites. For the thousandth time it has rejected all overtures, not only with finality, but with indignation and anger. To speak of peace to the imperialists, apparently, is like waving a crucifix before the devil. Nothing can horrify them more.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

A. N. Y. Times editorial on Dec. 26 stated the following: "He (Stalin) would probably also welcome negotiations with the United States that might end the 'cold war'... He has never left any doubt, however, that both he personally and his regime are still dedicated to the 'world revolution'..."

The editorial then goes on to reject an end to the cold war which it admits Stalin wants. Of

course the Times is not telling the truth when it says that the Stalin regime is "dedicated" to the "world revolution." It maintains this in order to have a plausible excuse for the war drive.

But the capitalist rulers of the U.S. are bent on war as the only means of trying to save capitalism, and they regard offers of this kind from the Soviet bloc, whether "sincere" or not, in general as so many stumbling blocks in the way of the war, to be cynically pushed aside.

1952 in Review -- Year of Tremendous Events

World Capitalist Crisis Deepened, Revolts Grew

By Harry Frankel

The outstanding world trend during 1952 was the deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system. The significance of this great fact is that the relation of forces in the conflict between capitalist and anti-capitalist forces is bad for imperialism and becoming worse.

In the single year 1952, this trend has shown up in the following ways:

(1.) The spread of the colonial revolutions in Asia, and into new areas — Africa and So. America.

(2.) The growth of a clearly evident weakness, stagnation and even crisis-tendency in many parts of the capitalist world despite the large injections of the war-economy stimulant.

(3.) The sharpening of disputes between leading capitalist countries within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, due to the resistance of the European masses and the hopeless position of European capitalism.

(4.) The enormous economic progress of the Soviet bloc which continues at an astonishing pace despite the bureaucratic regimes which dominate the workers' states.

REVOLT IN THE COLONIES

The spread of colonial revolt is both a consequence and a cause of the world crisis of capitalism. On the one hand the people in the colonial regions find their conditions of life so worsened by the decline of world capitalist economy that they are impelled to action. They are aided in this movement by the weaknesses and troubles of imperialism. The excellent slogan of Irish revolutionists: "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity," has (in broader form) become the motto of millions of oppressed throughout the world.

NEW REVOLT IN AFRICA

In central Africa, Kenya, etc., the anti-imperialist movement has just recently begun its rise, with actions of individual or guerrilla terrorism playing a large initial role. This recent development strikes at the last of the formerly solid bases of British colonialism, thereby weakening the already depleted war-making powers of British capitalism. In South Africa the colonial upsurge continued, taking the form in 1952 of an impressive broad passive resistance, evidently the prelude to more serious struggles.

STAGE OF THE WAR CRISIS

In this situation of crisis and upheaval, the war danger continues to grow because world capitalism sees in total world atomic war the only means at its disposal whereby an attempt can be made to reverse the present world trend and reconstitute capitalism. This barbarous

JULY EXPLOSION IN IRAN

The July events in Iran displayed the great revolutionary power of the proletarian-colonial movement. The attempt to denounce Mossadegh and replace him with a pro-British puppet met with a

stormy mass resistance which effectively broke the attempted reactionary coup in only four days. It has become clear that Mossadegh is only the apparent leader of the Iranian movement. In actuality he is the prisoner of the mass movement which triumphantly returned him to power. Complete revolutionary victory is delayed only by the temporizing policy of the Kremlin which restrains the underground Tudeh (Communist) party out of fear of provoking imperialism.

In Egypt, the large scale movement which started with the denunciation of the two Anglo-Egyptian treaties by the Egyptian government in the fall of 1951 showed its power during 1952 on two fronts: The nationalist movement on the anti-imperialist arena continued to grow, and on the internal scene, the reforms which the demagogic General Naguib has been forced to proclaim showed the growing social consciousness of the Egyptian masses. However, in Egypt as contrasted with Iran, the strength of the capitalists remains more intact, and the organization of the masses is not as well integrated. Nevertheless the reform process will not quiet the mass movement, as General Naguib hopes, but will stir it to greater activity in this revolutionary situation.

The Tunisian and Moroccan upheaval, which has moved into an active revolutionary stage during 1952, is favored by inter-imperialist antagonisms. Wall Street is not above undercutting its French allies for its own advantages. The masses have taken advantage of this, but there is no sign that they have become corrupted by pro-Wall Street sentiments.

ECONOMY IN DECLINE

In central Africa, Kenya, etc., the anti-imperialist movement has just recently begun its rise, with actions of individual or guerrilla terrorism playing a large initial role. This recent development strikes at the last of the formerly solid bases of British colonialism, thereby weakening the already depleted war-making powers of British capitalism. In South Africa the colonial upsurge continued, taking the form in 1952 of an impressive broad passive resistance, evidently the prelude to more serious struggles.

THE MILITANT

In this situation of crisis and upheaval, the war danger continues to grow because world capitalism sees in total world atomic war the only means at its disposal whereby an attempt can be made to reverse the present world trend and reconstitute capitalism. This barbarous

attempt is visible in all fields, and is shown by bureaucratic mismanagement, waste, fraud and theft, and by the discouragement to that workers' initiative which could be the greatest aid to growth.

CONGRESS SHOWS 4 SIDES

Important in this connection was the first Communist Party congress of the USSR in the past 18 years. At this congress the following four main sides of Soviet society were clearly displayed: (1) The great growth of the economy. (2.) The bureaucratic impediments to that growth, which have become so great that the bureaucracy is itself compelled to attack the worst cases. (3.) The increasing questionings and suspicions in the Soviet masses and intellectuals, sharpened by the fact that Soviet society does not conform to the classic Marxist norms (withdrawing away of the state, more equality in the distribution of products, etc.) as Stalin pretends it does. (4.) The determination of the Soviet masses to defend the nationalized economy.

THE MILITANT

In summary, the total picture of the world during 1952 is one of revolutionary storm, capitalist crisis and preparation for greater crisis. More than any other year since 1847, when the socialist perspectives were first outlined in scientific fashion, 1952 has been a year of fulfillment of Marxist prophecy on a world scale. But, important as it was in itself, 1952 was even more important as a year of preparation for the forward movement of the coming years.

Africans Tried by British Imperialists



Members of the Kikuyu tribe in Kenya, Africa, line up in a Naivasha courtroom where they are being charged before a white imperialist kangaroo court with belonging to the secret Mau Mau society, the pretext used by the British overlords to smash with murder and terror the movement for national freedom.

LEFT SHIFTS IN EUROPE

In the capitalist countries of Europe, the consequences of the war drive (lowered living standards, fear of war), have inspired successful mass resistance. Most important is the impressive growth of the Bevanite left wing in the British Labor party, which gained greatly during the past year. In addition, the mood of the masses has moved noticeably leftward in Germany, where the pro-Wall Street trade unions were defeated in a struggle at the German Trade Union Congress, and in Belgium, as seen in the struggle against the extension of military service and the striking socialist electoral sweep.

Similar conditions in Japan were responsible for the great May Day demonstrations and the growth in the voting strength of the two socialist parties, especially the Left Socialist party. The decline of industry in several capitalist countries placed a certain temporary damper on mass working-class struggles. This has been true in France and Italy, where the vacillating and disoriented policy of the Communist parties, the chief mass movements of those two countries, has further muffled and restrained the struggle.

ECONOMY IN DECLINE

In this respect, the economic developments of 1952 were, while not at all spectacular, extremely important. European economy stagnated and declined; U.S. production ceased its growth and leveled off at the 1951 height despite the fact that this was the very period of the biggest expansion of the war program. This is the rate of growth of production, as high as 15-20% annually, is greater than that of the USSR in the first year after the revolution. In the closing days of 1952, the Chinese government announced that its first 5-year industrialization program will begin in 1953.

THE MILITANT

In all the countries of the Soviet bloc, the progress has continued to be impeded by the bureaucratized regimes. This bureaucratization, worst in the Soviet Union itself, and least developed in China, is compounded in the Eastern European countries by the domination of the Soviet bureaucracy over the local bureaucracies as exemplified in the Czech and other frame-up trials. The bureaucratic impedi-

ment is visible in all fields, and is shown by bureaucratic mismanagement, waste, fraud and theft, and by the discouragement to that workers' initiative which could be the greatest aid to growth.

SOVIET BLOC MOVED AHEAD

In the Soviet bloc, where the means of production have been nationalized, thereby opening the way for social development on a new basis, the contrast with capitalist crisis is extreme. Production and productive capacity continued to expand in 1952, not only faster than anywhere in the capitalist world, but also faster than at any time in the history of capitalism. The great dynamism of the Chinese social overturn is of special importance. There is the rate of growth of production, as high as 15-20% annually, is greater than that of the USSR in the first year after the revolution. In the closing days of 1952, the Chinese government announced that its first 5-year industrialization program will begin in 1953.

THE MILITANT

In all the countries of the Soviet bloc, the progress has continued to be impeded by the bureaucratized regimes. This bureaucratization, worst in the Soviet Union itself, and least developed in China, is compounded in the Eastern European countries by the domination of the Soviet bureaucracy over the local bureaucracies as exemplified in the Czech and other frame-up trials. The bureaucratic impedi-

Wall Street Tightened Grip on U.S. Last Year

By George Clarke

There will surely be high wassail in the millionaires' clubs as the bells ring out 1952. It was their year. Profits were at an all-time high, business boosted by the expenditure of billions for war. The government was more firmly, more undividedly in their hands than it had been for twenty years. So far as the home front was concerned, everything was falling in line in preparation for their world counter-revolutionary crusade.

The outstanding event of the year, the biggest achievement of the corporation oligarchy was, naturally, Eisenhower's election as president. For the best part of the year, Big Business declared a moratorium on its foreign and domestic plans, single-mindedly concentrating — with the aid of tens of millions of dollars — on the one objective of delivering the knockout punch to the vestiges of the New Deal-Fair Deal.

In many ways it was a fight against shadows; the battle was more easily won than had been anticipated. Despite Truman's campaign radicalism the New Deal had long lost its substance as a program of social reform. It owed its survival to a continuation of the status quo, to old memories of gains once made by the labor movement. But above all it lingered on because the full employment generated by the war boom thwarted the rise of a radical, independent workers' opposition movement on the left.

Within the unions, the bureaucracy ruled supreme. Its purges, aided by the employers and the government, had crushed all vestiges of the left wing. The partially successful resistance of Ford Local 600 to Reuther's purge was the sole exception. In both labor federations, a succession of top leadership occurred without serious internal convulsions, let alone discussion of the program of the new chieftains of the CIO and AFL.

Continuing a sham opposition to the Taft-Hartley Law so long as Truman remained president, part of the union officialdom is now ready to openly reconcile themselves with this law. They had already recognized the standstill to union organization as their offering to the war program. Now they are hoping that they will not have to make a much greater payment as the price of peace with the Eisenhower administration.

But they stir uneasily before an uncertain future. The last of the government boards of the old era are closing down. Top government posts have been ostentatiously filled with tycoons and corporation executives. The White House will not be readily accessible. Yet they face the future without program, perspective, courage.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Once again in 1952, the question of civil rights forced itself to the forefront, but more as a portent of great convulsions to come than as a point of present battles. While judicial decisions took some of the sting out of the flagrant inequality suffered by the Negro people, and while an aroused public opinion restrained some of the more open forms of terror, Jim Crow remained essentially unchanged and race violence continued, though now assuming new forms such as individual assassination, police brutality, bombing and arson against Negro homes.

The Republican sweep in the Solid South, the new Eisenhower coalition with the Dixiecrats combined with the anti-communist drive on the domestic and world fronts threatens to give rise to new attacks against the Negro people. At the same time, it heralds a shakeup of the two-party system, but that is still in the future.

As the curtain rolled down over 1952, reaction was firmly in the saddle in the U.S. while the rest of the world was in the throes of revolution. The ruling class is now in the final stages of regimenting America for the task of hurling back that revolution. Despite the setbacks and suffering, the regimentation will burn out hundreds of illusions, unite and consolidate the opposition. The inevitable catastrophe that awaits this massed millions of the anti-imperialist camp will stir the great American labor opposition to great social struggles. Out of this terrible crucible will come a new America, a Labor America.

Phony POW Issue Blocks Truce for 12 Months

By Art Preis

U.S. truce negotiators first raised the "moral" issue of "voluntary repatriation" of war prisoners just at the close of 1951. They used this purely invented issue to block a truce or cease-fire for twelve months. By the end of this year, Washington had blown up truce negotiations completely.

While U.S. officials used their claimed solicitude for Chinese and North Korean captives, who allegedly are "unwilling" to be repatriated, as a pretext for continuing the war, another 25,000 American soldiers were added to the battle casualties. Still other U.S. casualties are the 4,000 captured Americans who are denied their voluntary repatriation home by Washington's policy.

The policy claimed other victims. As the year drew to a close, on Dec. 14, the U.S. command climaxed a whole series of massacres of unarmed prisoners of war. U.S. and South Korean troops, on orders, slaughtered 84 Korean "civilian internees" and wounded 118 others on Pongam Island off the South Korean coast. (See *The Militant*, Dec. 22.)

In Nov. 1951, when they were trying to stall a truce over the issue of a cease-fire line, U.S. negotiations began to haggle for a discussion over prisoners. The U.S. command opened a big propaganda campaign around alleged massacres of U.S. prisoners by the Chinese and North Koreans. The U.S. spokesmen implied that it was necessary to settle the POW issue quickly to save the lives of thousands of captured American boys.

These "atrocities" stories were proved to be a hoax. Four widely different figures of the number of U.S. prisoners allegedly "murdered" were put out in seven days. Finally Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway was forced to reluctantly completely violated the special

Geneva Convention of 1949 on war prisoners.

The "voluntary repatriation" issue was raised because the U.S. rulers did not want a truce. Once a cease-fire was attained, the claim that "atrocities" were dropped, never to be mentioned officially again. That was the day the Communists agreed to discuss the POW issue.

But the U.S. representatives did not immediately advance the "burning moral" issue of "voluntary repatriation." They proposed to deny any repatriation to all the 170,000 prisoners in U.S. camps except about 12,000 who would be exchanged on a "man-for-man" basis for the 12,000 prisoners, including South Koreans, held by the Communists.

The "moral issue" of "voluntary repatriation" — the very phrase was invented for the occasion — was discovered only after Dec. 16, 1952, the day the N. Y. Times reported: "The U.S. hedged on a proposal for an overall return (of POWs) which, it was conceived, might give the enemy a manpower and military advantage if the fighting should resume." Even after Rear Admiral Ruthven E. Libby, then chief U.S. negotiator, on Dec. 23, 1951, "injected a new and important note into the discussions" when he "told the enemy the U.N. would not send back at once men who decided against repatriation to Communist territory," he was still quoted as saying that this was "in order that neither side gain military advantage." (N. Y. Times.)

Lindsay Parrott, N. Y. Times correspondent in Tokyo, on Jan. 2, 1952 called the U.S. demand "a new departure in the history of warfare." Walter Lippmann, top-ranking political columnist of the N. Y. Herald-Tribune, pointed out that "voluntary repatriation" was put out in seven days. Finally Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway was forced to reluctantly completely violated the special

attempt to force prisoners to say they didn't want to be repatriated. Those who then were told their names had been turned over to officials of their own countries as "anti-Communists."

The *Militant* quoted Joseph C. Harsch, the Christian Science Monitor's special Washington correspondent, who raised the question whether the U.S. rulers "wish" or "dare" to "go to a conference table with representatives of Communist China in an effort to explore the possibilities of finding a long-term peace." This, said Harsch, would "imply a willingness in Washington to contemplate the possibility of the continued existence of a Communist regime in Peking for a long period. . . It would almost be accurate to say that American policy is committed today to the eventual overthrow of that regime."

The Chinese and North Koreans could not accept the "voluntary repatriation" proposal, as the U.S. negotiators well knew, because there was the very real risk for the Communists that some captured Chinese — for one reason or another — would say they did not want to be repatriated. U.S. imperialism needs this as a propaganda weapon which it hopes to apply likewise in the projected war on the Soviet Union and its allies.

USED FORCE

Thomas J. Hamilton, United Nations correspondent of the N. Y. Times, conceded on Nov. 1 that "the United Nations Command made it virtually impossible to send all the prisoners back by supplying to Communist authorities the names of those who said they did not want to return." What he means is that the U.S. command, aided by agents of Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, (see *The Militant*, Dec. 13), used the most brutal methods to

confront the fundamental issues involved in the Korean war, including the "voluntary repatriation" issue are the blackest crimes to be chalked up against U.S. imperialism this past year.

Some of the less-badly wounded survivors of the Dec. 14 massacre of Korean "civilian internees" by U.S. and South Korean troops on Pongam Island are marched from a prison compound to a hospital for treatment. 84 prisoners were killed and 118 seriously wounded for defying order to stop singing "forbidden" songs.

Massacre Survivors



Trenton Victim Dies

Collis English, one of the remaining defendants in the Trenton Six frameup murder case, died on Dec. 30 of a heart attack. Four others had been acquitted, and Ralph Cooper, sentenced to life with English, awaits retrial.

Subscriptions: \$3 per year; \$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign: \$4.50 per year; \$2.25 for 6 months. Canadian: \$3.50 per year; \$1.75 for 6 months. Bundle Orders: 5 or more copies 6c each in U.S., 7c each in foreign countries.

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 6-7460
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.

Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1939.

Vol. XVII - No. 1

Monday, January 5, 1953

Is Time Ripe for Labor Party?

AFL President George Meany recently expressed his views on forming a Labor Party. According to the Dec. 23 Labor's Daily, published by the International Typographical Union, "Answering a question about AFL support for formation of a Labor Party, Meany said that the AFL has traditionally opposed such a party on grounds that the time wasn't right for it; if it ever becomes necessary to form one, the Federation will."

The argument that "the time isn't ripe" or "now is not the time" was used by the AFL leaders back in 1935 in beating down a resolution proposing then to set up a Labor Party. It has been the stock answer given by the union leaders whenever the question has been raised. But they never tell us when they think the time will be ripe or under what conditions they will favor the immediate formation of a Labor Party.

Seventeen years ago the labor leaders argued with some semblance of plausibility that organized labor was then "too weak" and too lacking in support from the working class generally to build an effective party of its own. That is not a convincing argument today. The unions, with about 16 million members, are more than four times as strong numerically as in 1935 and immeasurably more influential among both their members and the working class at large.

Meany himself boasted that Gov. Stevenson, the presidential candidate endorsed by the union leaders, "got from the membership of organized labor every bit of the support that President Truman got in 1948 and a little more added to that." The workers, who supplied the overwhelming bulk of the 27,311,000 votes for Stevenson,

would give their heartiest backing to a Labor Party and its candidates if called upon to do so by the unions.

During 20 years of the Democratic-labor coalition it was argued a Labor Party could not be formed because it was necessary to back the Democratic "lesser evil" to avoid the Republican "greater evil." This policy led to growing reaction under the Democratic rule and failed in the end to prevent the victory of Republican reaction. Doesn't this show it is time for labor to set up its own party? No, says Meany. "I do not expect a crack-down on labor from the Eisenhower administration." In short, Meany finds a Labor Party isn't "necessary" now because he has discovered that the man whom the union leaders called a tool of Wall Street yesterday is actually a "friend of labor."

When Meany says "the time isn't ripe" for a Labor Party he really means "the time will never be ripe." For, the top labor bureaucrats, at peace with the capitalist class and its political agents, can never see the time when they can't adapt themselves to whichever of the two major capitalist parties is in power. They'll always be able to get along — they think.

But you'll rarely hear a union official oppose a Labor Party "in principle," and Meany himself says he will support one "if necessary." That's significant. It indicates his awareness that down deep inside the ranks of the unions lies the hope that one day labor will have its own party. The workers are indeed ripe to do the historic job of building such a party. They need but a nod from the leaders, who do not dare to oppose the idea of a Labor Party, but only stall it off with the ever-flimsier excuse that "the time is not ripe."

Beside Your Rent

Under cover of "safeguarding our democratic way of life" and "the struggle against totalitarianism," the witch hunters have turned their attention to federal housing projects. At the last session of Congress, the enemies of civil liberties jammed through another sweeping law, this time barring "subversives" from all federally-aided housing projects. "Loyalty-oath" certificates must be filled out by the principal tenant in each apartment that neither he nor any other occupant of the premises is a "subversive."

If any occupant of an apartment belongs to any of the 200-odd organizations on the U.S. Attorney General's black list, the entire family is evicted. The list of organizations is completely arbitrary. They are named by the Attorney General. None are given a hearing. New organizations can be added at his whim.

Persecution of entire families whenever a single member is involved is the hallmark of totalitarian regimes. The witch-hunters are now introducing this practice to supplement their previous thought-control legislation and to extend their doctrine of "guilt by association."

The "loyalty oath" started ostensibly to make secure "only" the sensitive federal agencies and "only" the government employees. Then it spread to the "sensitive" defense industries and was made by the Taft-Hartley Act to apply to the leadership of trade unions. Now in addition to imperilling the elementary right to make a livelihood, the witch hunters are invading the privacy of individual homes. Today it involves federal projects. Tomorrow it can be extended still further.

The Case of Rene Girondel

Enforcement of the reactionary McCarran Act has already created what the press calls "international tension." Seamen on foreign ships whose thoughts do not fit the pattern laid down by the law have been barred from shore leave in American ports. This has led to protests from the seamen and from the French, British and Dutch governments. These countries are incensed over the treatment handed their nationals in violation of the traditional hospitality accorded seafaring workers away from home.

Perhaps Britain, France and The Netherlands have not fully grasped the danger to American institutions which the McCarran-McCarthy vigilantes see. Here is a case that might make it clearer to them:

Rene Girondel, 51-year-old head pastry chef of the French liner *Liberte*, was questioned by immigration authorities. They found that his brain might not be free of moral turpitude. It seems that when the Nazis took Paris, they put him to work in a bakery. There he stole some bread to help feed his hungry wife and child. He was sent to a Nazi concentration camp and his body is still scarred from the beatings.

The danger of permitting such a character shore leave was obvious to immigration authorities. They kept him aboard for five and a half hours while they consulted Washington on whether his offense of

stealing bread from the Nazis "constituted a criminal record" in the meaning of the McCarran Law. His case went to the highest levels. Finally the District Immigration Director decided to let him down the gang plank for a whiff of the free air of America.

Girondel took no mink coats or deep freeze refrigerators. He did not take \$10,000 for an article from a corporation in a shady deal, as Sen. McCarthy did, or overlook bills owed hotels tied in with Nevada gambling interests, as Sen. McCarran did.

He did not take or give bribes on the gangster-ridden New York waterfront and was never involved with racketeers, corrupt politicians or big-time tax violators. He didn't commit the approved 100% American-type crime. His was a "foreign" crime — he was a poor victim of the Nazis and stole bread from them to keep his wife and child alive.

A person who would do that obviously does not fit into the American way of thinking as approved by McCarran and McCarthy. Such a record as Girondel's could not fail to arouse the suspicions of the authorities. His case should be called to the attention of the British, French and Dutch. Perhaps it will help them understand why the Democrats and Republicans had to safeguard our soil with the McCarran law.

The majority bloc, lead by the Revolutionary National Move-

Japanese Miners Wage Heroic 61-Day Strike

TOKYO, Japan, Dec. 17 — The Central Committee of the Japanese Coal Miners Union today bowed to government imposition of Japan's version of the Taft-Hartley Act and called off the heroic 61-day strike. The government plan called for a wage boost of 7% and an allowance of 5,000 yen (about \$14).

This meager concession in no way compensates for the terrible sufferings of the miners and their families in the long, bitter struggle. In Hokkaido, for example, where 110,000 miners were "out," there is about three feet of snow and the miners have gone without food and fuel.

The mine strike is only part of the autumn-winter upsurge of labor. Action began last September when Tanro (Japanese Federation of Coal Miners' Unions, 270,000 members) and Densan (All-Japan Electric Industry Workers Union, 116,000 members) spearheaded the struggle. These are the two giant pillars of Sohyo (General Council of Trade Unions of Japan, about 3,000,000 members).

FIFTEENTH STOPPAGE

Densan staged its fifteenth stoppage, plunging the whole country into darkness. Many medium and small factories and shops have gone bankrupt and others are on the very brink of utter ruin.

Tanro stopped work completely Oct. 17. As a result the supply of gas has been cut down seriously and the government has been compelled to reduce train service.

Kankoro (Japanese Council of National and Local Government Workers Union, 1,600,000 members) is also demanding wage increases. Kankoro is denied the right to strike, but beginning with the Teachers' Union (425,000) and State Railway Workers Union (380,000), the unions in this federation are resorting to leaves of absence and other legal measures of struggle. The Federation of UN Troop Workers Unions is also striking.

WOMEN PRESS STRUGGLE

What is most characteristic of the present strike wave is the fighting spirit of the masses, including their families. Especially noteworthy is the case of Tanro, where the wives of the miners are most determined. The miners are encouraged, and even pressed by their wives despite the acute suffering resulting from the great struggle.

Tanro appealed to its brother unions throughout the world for help, especially in frustrating the government plan to break the strike by importing foreign coal.

The United Mine Workers responded by sending \$10,000 to their beleaguered union brothers in Japan.

The Japanese capitalists, on the

Class Struggle in Japan



Appealing for public support in their strike for more pay, Tokyo railroad workers (top) stretch out in front of office of Transportation Ministry. They are wearing masks to protect them from tear gas. At bottom, other strike demonstrators ride bicycles through the main streets.

STRIKE ENDANGERED

The capitalist press is trying to mobilize public opinion against the strikes. Unfortunately, there is no attempt at counter mobilization by the union leadership. Sohyo even initiated the struggle without the necessary, serious preparation. It limited the fight to the narrowest economic demands.

But such big strikes in these vital industries affect the entire industrial life of the country. Against the united front between the Japanese capitalists and

American imperialism, victory cannot be won without developing the struggle into a general strike. The big factories, for instance, find their power cut off during the day but make up for the loss by night work at extra pay. Thus the medium and small capitalists suffer the most while full pressure is not brought to bear on the big outfits.

There is great danger that the heroic struggle of the miners and their wives will become isolated, and through utter exhaustion, finally crushed. Such a defeat would deal a mortal blow to the labor movement of this country and that in turn would directly affect the world situation in favor of reaction.

other hand, are determined to crush the strikes in cooperation with American imperialism which is backing them.

REVOLUTIONARY BOLIVIAN WORKERS OPPOSE FURTHER TRIBUTE ON MINES

The pressure of the State Department on the Bolivian government to grant indemnification to the former owners of the nationalized tin mines has had repercussions within Bolivia. The latest issues of *Lucha Obrera*, newspaper of the Revolutionary Workers Party (POR) contain several articles dealing with the division of opinion which has appeared over this important question.

The second November number, for example, reports the appearance of two main factions in the powerful Bolivian Workers Center (COB), one of which favors paying the tribute demanded by the stockholders, some of whom are American. The other faction opposes indemnification. This grouping, headed by the POR, is at present in the minority but it undoubtedly reflects prevailing sentiment among the masses of workers and field hands.

The working people of Bolivia feel that the mining monopolists long ago took more than enough from the country to Yanke imperialism. Our road, the road of the proletariat, the road of our party, leads to the reinforcement of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist political consciousness of the exploited, oppressed peoples of our Latin American colonies and thereby effectively helps to deepen, extend and generalize the revolution.

Lucha Obrera explains that the interests of the working class cannot be served by such compromises. "The revolution cannot be given an impulse from cabinet posts which the government graciously grants us in order to permit them to reestablish their own political equilibrium, later to kick out without the slightest consideration all those who have served them so objectively."

The defense and development of the revolution which has begun in Bolivia requires primarily direct mass action. *Lucha Obrera* does not reject progressive actions taken by the government under pressure, but holds that they are subordinate to the "prime method of struggle in

Kidnapping in Detroit

Two Alabama bondsmen kidnapped a Detroit auto worker at gunpoint in defiance of the Federal anti-kidnapping statute on Dec. 29, claiming he had jumped bail on an auto violation. They had no warrant.

The American Way of Life

The Left-Hook of Jake McKenny

The plot began on hot July 23, 1951.

Jake McKenny, a quiet, modest, young carpenter was working away (in the mechanical shop of Wilson & Company, meatpackers, in Chicago).

"How you doin' today, Sunshine?" said a voice he'd never heard before and a hand he'd never shook slapped him familiarly on the back.

McKenny turned and saw the white-management-man, Henry Baxter, standing over him.

"What do you mean by that 'Sunshine' remark?" McKenny straightened up.

"Why — you look like a sho-nuff happy-go-lucky boy with a bright smile on your face," Baxter chortled.

It was his last chortle of the year.

He suddenly found himself sprawled all over the floor, sent there by a left-hook from McKenny.

When Baxter was able to pick himself up he rushed to the General Foreman who rushed to fire McKenny on the spot.

What in the world had come over workman McKenny, who had always shown remarkable ability in restraining himself from hitting foremen in the mouth?

After all, didn't the fact that he had been referred to as "Sunshine" and "Boy" prove that the man only wanted to be friendly?

The company set it all down to the unpredictable nature of packinghouse workers — especially Negroes — and went merrily on their money-making way, minus McKenny.

But to the executive officers of Wilson's Local 25 in District One (of the CIO United Packinghouse Workers of America), Jack Souther, Joseph Zabritski, Wilhelmina Pearson, Leroy Simpson and Arter Harris, there was no mystery about it and before McKenny had gotten out of the plant they had filed a grievance and demanded his reinstatement.

For McKenny had rightfully resented being slandered by the cheap race slurs of "Sunshine" and "Boy."

Through his nerves had flashed the terrible synapse of race oppression: the paralyzing paradox of being nicknamed "inferior" in the land of the "free" . . . the menial jobs he had held despite his worth and skill . . . the daily diet of slum-life . . . the wretched sight of the Bill of Rights lynched weekly with witch hunts . . . the ruthless profiteering from white supremacy . . . hypocrites in high places who promise peace and equality but deliver war and discrimination . . . and interwoven the snide denial of a man's simple right to dignified identity — to "Jake McKenny." Such is the stuff some left-hooks are made of.

For McKenny's anger was the anger of Jewish, Polish, Italian, Irish, Mexican, Chinese and other workers who resent the cowardly slurs of "Kike," "Sheeney," "Polack," "Hunkie," "Dago," "Wop," "Greaser," "Gook" and other mudballs hurled at great peoples by little bigots. Aimed at making prejudice "funny" and "popular." Aimed at undermining the respect owed one human to another.

What are race slurs? Bigot-made blades handed to common people to use against each other and so sharp they'll never know they've cut each others' throats until they try to put their heads together.

The Local's Anti-Discrimination Department had no intentions of accepting firings based upon a member's defense of his dignity.

So was born the grievance which finally came before Impartial Arbitrator Peter M. Kelliher with the question: "Was the discharge of Jake McKenny for proper cause?"

(To be concluded next week)

This report is reprinted from the excellent pamphlet, "Action Against Jim Crow," published by the United Packinghouse Workers of America.

THE MILITANT ARMY

Minneapolis Literature Agent Helen Sherman sends in a copy of the Christmas letter mailed to all their subscribers along with a Militant subscription blank. Helen writes, "Not only do we ask for gift subscriptions to the paper, but in this letter we took the opportunity to advertise the Labor Book Store and a selection of books and pamphlets which Militant readers can buy right here in town."

Literature Agent Bill Kelly writes to increase Oakland's bundle of *Fourth Internationals*, and to report progress in recent literature sales at the University of California in Berkeley. "Lillian R. and Jim S. were successful in selling some of our new as well as our old pamphlets — the pamphlet on India, the Pablo pamphlet, and Trotsky on Social Patriotism. And, of course, *The Militant* and *Fourth International*. In addition Lillian succeeded in placing the FI on one of the newsstands close the campus, and she has another stand which is going to sell the FI at the beginning of the new school term. Last week her stand sold out the entire amount of FI's left there the previous week."

The Los Angeles West Side comrades are also planning wider sales at the universities and colleges according to Literature Agent Louise Maxwell. "Just before the branch meeting last Wednesday Erroll and Leonard were on the campus for about 20

minutes and in that short time they sold five papers and one FI to the evening students."

Dan Roberts writes to increase Seattle's Militant bundle and to report the following sales: "We want to mention George F. who has been selling papers every week at the People's Forum. He sells between 10 and 20 copies each time. Recently Mary and Melba sold eight *Militants* at a rally of the Northwest Committee against the Smith Act at which Hugh De Lacy spoke. Also, several of the comrades have been selling *The Militant* each week to the workers in their plants."

Literature Agent Kay Kean tells about an encouraging sale in a new neighborhood in Akron. "This afternoon I went out doing door to door work in an entirely new neighborhood which I happened to bump into today. As a result of an hour and a half's work I sold six copies of the Dec. 15 *Militant* and one six-month sub. I was inspired by the eager response of the people I talked to after their realization that this paper exposed Eisenhower's peace fraud. By and large this was my major selling point."

Many thanks to B.C. of Flint, Michigan, for a \$3 contribution to help pay the printing costs of *The Militant*.

New York Forum

Lewis Scott will speak on "Crisis

"Suffer Little Children"

By Art Preis

In a colorful story on how the U.S. Army planned to celebrate Christmas in Korea, N.Y. Times correspondent Robert Alden included one little touch to show how sweet and good and kind the American invaders are to the Korean people — kiddies especially.

"There is no question that Korean children will have a good time Christmas Day. Almost every fighting soldier has contributed something so toys and clothing could be distributed on Christmas Day. At Eighth Army Headquarters, Santa Claus will arrive Christmas morning by helicopter. Further to the front, tanks will grind along with toy-tossing Santa Clauses perched merrily on turrets. Infantry companies excused from frontline duty will descend to orphanages and towns with trucks filled with good things."

That helicopter bringing Santa Claus may have been the very one in the picture in the American press showing a U.S. helicopter hovering over a gasoline-soaked peasant hut on which a phosphorus bomb had just been dropped. Those tanks a week or a day before may have been tossing "toys" like high-explosive shells or chemical fire from flame throwers at similar "military objectives." What "good things" have come to the children who used to live in these huts?

The orphanage children described in one Korea dispatch by N.Y. Times correspondent George Barrett must have been pleased with the present he tells of: "The inhabitants throughout the village and in the fields were caught and killed and kept the

exact postures they had held when the napalm (flaming jellied gasoline) struck — a man about to get on his bicycle, fifty boys and girls playing in an orphanage..."

And surely there was a merry, merry Christmas for the thousands of napalm-scarred, blinded and maimed children whom eye-witness Geraldine Fitch, in the Feb. 2, 1952 N.Y. World-Telegram, described as the "most pitiful" victims of "the bombs of their protectors, the Americans."

Helicopters bringing Santa Claus — toy-tossing tanks — trucks filled with goodies for orphanages and towns! Surely these will make the millions of Korean children forget their days of hunger and freezing on the bleak roadsides, their nights of huddling in alley-ways and ditches, their mothers and fathers blown up or burned alive by bombs and napalm, the agonized deaths of their brothers, sisters and playmates. Hundreds of thousands of children were among the more than two million civilians in South Korea alone who perished as the result of U.S. "saturation" bombing and "scorched earth" tactics. Additional hundreds of thousands from the more than 600,000 destroyed or badly-damaged homes in South Korea are wandering homeless.

In his article about the "good time" in store for Korean children on Christmas, Robert Alden also reported Cardinal Spellman's arrival in Seoul to lend the sanctity of the Church to the occasion. Did he ignore an appropriate Biblical message — say, those words of the Prince of Peace, "Suffer little children...?"

Things Will Roll

By Thomas Raymond

Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army and President-elect, is showing us that he is not only a man of high office but a man of parts as well. On Dec. 22 he spoke before the Freedoms Foundation, philosophizing on world conflicts and world perspectives in a truly remarkable way.

He began by establishing in no uncertain terms that "the great struggle of our times is one of spirit. It is a struggle for the hearts and souls of men — not merely for property, or even merely for power." Overlooking the fact that Wall Street's government struggles "for the hearts and souls of men" merely in order to get them to fight for Wall Street's property and Wall Street's power, Eisenhower then went on to a thumbnail sketch of his "good" friendship with Marshal Zhukov of the Soviet Red Army.

He had talked with Zhukov, he relates, "about the bases of our respective forms of government, our civilizations." He ran into a snag which he describes as follows:

"I must say that in just a matter of immediate dialectic contest, let's say, I didn't know what to say to him... since at the age of 14 he had been taken over by the Bolshevik religion and had believed in it since that time, I was quite certain it was hopeless on my part to talk to him about the fact that our form of government is founded in religion."

This profundity was immediately broadened as follows: "In other words, our form

of Government has no sense unless it is founded in a deeply felt religious faith, and I don't care what it is." Eisenhower doesn't "care what it is" so long as it is his own: "With us of course it is the Judeo-Christian concept, but it must be a religion that all men are created equal."

The religion of capitalism may be that "all men are created equal" as Eisenhower said (although I don't know which book of the Bible he got that out of), but the other half of the religion is that they certainly shouldn't remain equal while they are in residence upon this globe. But we will leave that aside and go on with Eisenhower's speech.

Having established that not only "property" and "power" are on his side, but God as well, he goes on to sketch out a perspective drawn from these precepts: "We will get so strong in our common support of that doctrine that no false theory such as communism can make any headway. It will gradually roll backward — because it must continue to roll outward or it is going to roll inward, for there is nothing static in this world — and when it begins to roll backward we will begin to breathe easier."

Thank you, General Eisenhower! I have already begun to breathe easier at the thought of the new administration, headed by such a penetrating mind, which will soon take office in Washington. It will roll outward, that is if it doesn't roll inward. One thing for sure: It will roll!

Stalin Bid Meets Hostile Reception

(Continued from page 1)

they want to avert war. As against the proposal of negotiations (which "foreign policy experts say" according to a Times Washington dispatch of Dec. 27 "are likely to be a far more effective propaganda forum for the Soviet Union than for the West"), the U.S. imperialists head towards broadening the Korean war and other hostile actions. The big business magazine U.S. News says quite flatly (Jan. 2, 1953): "This much seems certain. Communists... are winning World War III at this stage. Unless stopped by positive action on the part of the U.S., the prospects are that Russia will have more victories under her belt by the end of 1953."

Turning to the position of the Stalinist bureaucracy, it must be stated at once that, as always in the past, not only would that regime make a peace with imperialism, but it would make such a deal, if it were demanded, at the expense of proletarian and colonial movements and with the sole object of saving its own usurped power.

To say this is not however to say either that such a deal is coming or that such was the practical objective of the Stalin statement. A Soviet-Wall Street deal confronts not just one but two absolutely insuperable obstacles. Wall Street will not agree to any such deal, but will continue to drive for a war through which it hopes to reverse the world revolutionary trend and smash the Soviet bloc, opening it to capitalist exploitation. That is the first obstacle. And the second is that Stalin can as

longer deliver any betrayal of a scope on which a deal could be based. The world's masses are on the march on such a scale that it is not for him to say whether that march shall continue or not.

To the Far Eastern revolutions have now been added the African and South American revolts, making a world-wide upheaval that cannot be either ordered or tricked into submission.

With the war crisis in its present explosive and imminent form, Stalin's latest move must be regarded, like the Soviet proposals for trade with the West and on Germany some months ago, as actions designed to gain advantage in the cold war and not as actions seriously predicated upon a "deal."

MAIN SIGNIFICANCE

However, the most significant aspect of the Christmas incident is the exposure of the aggressive course of U.S. imperialism. Particularly in this country, where the belief is almost universal that the war danger comes from "Soviet aggression," this truth should be pressed by socialists.

Stalin is wrong when he says the two systems can co-exist peacefully. The Militant has fought this falsehood for 25 years, and the trend of world events is certainly proving us correct. War against the Soviet bloc is inevitable, so long as capitalism continues to exist. But this inevitability is not a mystical imperative. The inevitability of war is the consequence of the insoluble crisis of imperialism. Capitalism is what makes war inevitable, and that is why any successful anti-war struggle must be based upon the Socialist outlooks.

(2.) The willingness of the Soviet bureaucracy to negotiate over the dead body of the world revolution, not on the basis of the revolution, as genuine Marxists socialists would. If negotiations came about, which is unlikely and if Stalin could, which he can't, he would offer the corpse of the revolution in return for security for the bureaucracy. This would be his tendency, but in the present period it is not a perspective on a world scale. That is only to say

in other words that such a deal is not in the offing.

(3.) While Soviet negotiation offers are not wrong (with the above provisos), the Stalinist course into which these peace offers are fitted is wrong. The course of conscious socialists in this epoch of capitalist death agony must be the building of an anti-capitalist movement, not a line of maneuvering which obscures this central task from the masses. Since the Stalinist offers are not fitted into such a course, they help to maintain petty-bourgeois illusion about the future and about the nature of the required anti-war fight. This is particularly true in Stalinist peripheries in the petty-bourgeois section of the population.

PROSPECTS FOR U.S. WEIGHED BY CANNON IN 3rd L.A. TALK

LOS ANGELES, Dec. 20 — An enthusiastic audience of about 90 heard James P. Cannon last night in the third of his Friday Night Forum series on "America's Road to Socialism."

Discussing the "Prospects of Capitalism and Socialism in America," the National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party showed that despite superficial appearances to the contrary, America is subject to the same laws of development that have led the rest of the capitalist countries to bankruptcy and revolution.

To begin with, America was the most lucky of capitalist countries. It was free from feudalism, had a rich continent in which to expand and was aided by European investments in its railways and other industries. Thus, "the prodigious growth of the American economic giant was not entirely due to the genius of American businessmen and bankers."

As a result of World War I, America became the world's creditor, and ever since has been trying to sustain capitalist Europe to prevent revolution without making it strong enough to become a competitor for American markets.

The crisis of the Thirties demonstrated that America's capitalist economy has no immunity from the laws which govern the same capitalist economy in other countries. If its crisis was deferred by exceptionally favorable factors in the past, it was only to accumulate the

THE MILITANT

VOLUME XVII

MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1953

NUMBER 1

Their "Good Time"



These Korean children clothed in skimpy rags try to get a little warmth from a fire in ruins of Seoul. They are among the hundreds of thousands of homeless children facing death by freezing and starvation due to U.S. "scorched earth" policy. Army press handouts said they had a "good time" on Christmas. (See story in left column.)

KUTCHER SPEAKS OUT ON NEW PERSECUTION

(Continued from page 1)

The Attorney General's "subversive" list was drawn up without permitting the organizations involved to have a hearing at which they could answer whatever specific charges might be made against them. My contention that these lists are unconstitutional has not yet been upheld by the courts. But the Supreme Court has already rebuked the Attorney General for acting in a "patently arbitrary" manner when he issued the list without permitting hearings (April 30, 1951) and the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New York has called it "a purely hearsay declaration by the Attorney General... It has no competency to prove the subversive character of the listed associations..." (Aug. 22, 1951).

Membership in these organizations does not by itself prove anything. That opinion is not only mine and the courts' — it was the opinion also of the Attorney General at the time he issued the so-called "subversive" list. According to the Circuit Court decision on my case last October, Mr. Tom Clark, now Supreme Court Justice and then Attorney General, advised the Loyalty Review Board on Nov. 24, 1947 that "in connection with the designation of these organizations I wish to reiterate, as the President has pointed out, that it is entirely possible that many persons belonging to such organizations may be loyal to the United States; that membership in, affiliation with or sympathetic association with any organizations designated is simply one

piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion as to the action which is to be taken in a particular case..."

BY WHAT RIGHT?

If the Attorney General himself felt it necessary to warn that membership in these organizations cannot be equated with disloyalty, by what right is such membership to be used to throw law-abiding people out of their homes?

I had hoped that I would be left alone until the courts make their final ruling on my appeal to be reinstated to my job with the Veterans Administration. Now I have no choice but to go to court again in defense of my right to live in my present home. The national Kutter Civil Rights Committee will continue to handle my job appeal. The American Civil Liberties Union has consented to handle my housing appeal. I want to express my deep gratitude to the ACLU. It should be needless to add, but in these witch-hunting days I think I had better add, that neither of these organizations bears any responsibility for my ideas, statements or associations and both are representing me solely out of their devotion to democratic principles and fair play.

I hope that the 700-odd national and local labor, liberal, religious and civic organizations that have helped me in my efforts to win reinstatement with the VA, will also extend moral and material support to the ACLU's suits against the housing oath.

employee under the "loyalty" program.

"Yet, in clear opposition to this ruling, the government is now proceeding from the view that mere membership in one of these organizations is sufficient cause by itself to justify eviction of tenants from the housing projects," Kutcher declared.

He also thanked the ACLU and voiced the hope that its suits against the housing oath would receive moral and material support from the 700-odd national and local labor, liberal, religious and civic organizations that have backed his efforts to win reinstatement in his VA job.

Several other large cities have announced their plans to start enforcement of the Gwin law, but Newark has moved most rapidly. Although actual enforcement has not begun, the oath has stirred some public criticism and discussion.

The Essex-West Hudson CIO Council, through a statement by executive secretary Joel R. Jacobson, denounced "Rep. Gwin (R., N.Y.), an arch enemy of public housing, (who) has acted as a tool of the real estate lobby. Democracy in the United States will not be extended by requiring loyalty oaths in public housing." The Council asked local Congressmen to check on the constitutionality of the oath.

The Newark citizens Housing Committee called for an early court test of the law. It also said, "Opponents of public housing, who have consistently attacked the tenant selection procedure as being sensitive of political demands, are solely responsible for the new twist by which political association can disqualify an otherwise needy family from housing."

"With two judicial decisions from the U.S. Supreme Court within recent months holding that mere membership in an organization on the 'subversive' list (the Socialist Workers Party in this case) was not sufficient ground for firing any government

"It Might Incriminate Me And I Refuse to Testify"

By George Lavan

"I refuse to testify on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me." A witness thus replying to a prosecutor or Congressional investigator is invoking his right under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. Does such a refusal to testify mean that the witness is guilty of something or other? Not at all, "although a big attempt is under way to 're-interpret' the Constitution to that effect.

The first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, were passed in a body by the First Congress. About one half of them make such guarantees as freedom of speech, religion, and the other half have to do with fair legal procedure such as trial by jury, confrontation of witnesses, due process of law and "no person... shall be compelled... to be a witness against himself."

The reason for the Bill of Rights being so concerned with guarantees of fair legal procedure stemmed from the experience of the people. They knew how tyranny could use the courts. The Stuart kings in 17th Century England used the courts for political and religious persecution. Star Chamber trials (today they would be called Gestapo-like trials), forcing of defendants to testify against themselves were among the abuses that led the English people to revolt, cut off their king's head and finally write into their Constitution protection against such legal abuses.

In the following century the American colonists in declaring themselves a free people wrote in their Constitution the Bill of Rights. That is how we have the Fifth Amendment which guarantees that you cannot be compelled to give testimony that might tend to be self-incriminating. If he answers one he surrenders his right and has to answer all or be in contempt of court.

When a witness refuses to answer on grounds of his constitutional rights, the court and the public are supposed to draw no conclusions. No prejudice is supposed to result from his or her exercise of basic rights. That is the way it used to be and is supposed to be. But in the fury of today's anti-Communist campaign the Bill of Rights is being junked. Now an opposite interpretation is steadily becoming official: that is: refusal to testify is proof of guilt.

This has been officially proclaimed by the committee of jurists handpicked by Trygve Lie to deal with the UN employees who refused to tell witch-hunting investigators whether they were or ever had been members of the Communist Party. UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie is a supposed politician from way back — in the 1930s he was prostituted to the UN by the UN employees who refused to tell what was called in legal language *peine forte et dure* — that was being stretched out on one's back and pressed with heavy weights until one testified or died. The question Lie refused to answer and for which he was crushed to death was whether he was or had been a witch or wizard. According to the stand of today's witch hunters, concurred in by Trygve Lie, Giles Cory deserved punishment for refusing to answer. The spiritual descendants of Cory's judges and prosecutors only favor the UN post. But if Lie has no respect for principles he has plenty for power, and the course of the cold war he became a faithful flunkie of the richer and more powerful U.S. So it wasn't unexpected when his in-

vestigators came up with the following witch-hunters' dream formula:

When a person refuses to answer a question, calling it self-incriminating, it is either (a) really incriminating or (b) not incriminating. If it is the former the person is guilty. If it is the latter the person has no legal right to refuse to testify. Therefore any UN employee who refuses to talk for the witch-hunters is automatically to be fired.

In a letter to the Dec. 7 New York Times Harold H. Corbin, a trial lawyer old-fashioned enough to believe in the Bill of Rights, makes the following points:

"It (the UN report) makes a mockery of a great protective right by turning its protection against self-incrimination into an act of self-incrimination. What good is the right, if to exercise it, is as destructive as to waive it?

"It assumes that the right itself was enacted for the protection of the guilty, which absurdly makes knaves or fools of our forefathers who conceived and preserved it. Our elders knew, as we know, that this protection to the innocent may also operate at times as a shelter to the guilty; but its value has long since been appraised and found essential as a safeguard against heedless, unfounded or tyrannical prosecutions.

"It assumes that an innocent man cannot honestly claim that his answers might tend to incriminate him, whereas long and bitter experience has taught just the contrary.

"The pitfalls and dangers of testing without immunity are so obscure and so manifold that experienced lawyers do not permit a client to thus testify, however certain they may be of his innocence."

Back in 1692 in Salem, Massachusetts, a Mr. Giles Cory refused to testify and was subjected to what was called in legal language *peine forte et dure* — that was being stretched out on one's back and pressed with heavy weights until one testified or died. The question Cory refused to answer and for which he was crushed to death was whether he was or had been a witch or wizard. According to the stand of today's witch hunters, concurred in by Trygve Lie, Giles Cory deserved punishment for refusing to answer. The spiritual descendants of Cory's judges and prosecutors only favor the UN post. But if Lie has no respect for principles he has plenty for power, and the course of the cold war he became a faithful flunkie of the richer and more powerful U.S. So it wasn't unexpected when his in-

Legless Veteran Faces Eviction

(Continued from Page 1)

"zen," he wrote. "I love my country and my home. I want to comply with all requirements for remaining in my home... I have begged him (James) again and again to leave this organization, but he refuses, saying that it is not subversive and he is not subversive... What should I do? I want to sign the certificate, I do not want to move, I do not want to break up my family because my son needs help to take care of him. Please help me, please tell me what to do, so that I can keep my home."

This letter was not even answered.

Yesterday, three days after the deadline for filing the oath, James Kutcher went to the American Civil Liberties Union for advice on how to ward off the threatened eviction move. The ACLU, through its New Jersey counsel, Emil Oxford, had announced that it was interested in challenging the constitutionality of the new oath.

Afterwards, Kutcher said that the ACLU would file suit for him in the federal courts later this week.

In his statement to the press, the legless veteran bitterly denounced the heresy-hunters for seeking to penal