

# SWP Committee Maps Election Drive for 1950

NEW YORK, Feb. 13 — Four days of plenary sessions of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party were concluded here tonight with the decisions to participate to the maximum of the party's forces and resources in the 1950 fall elections and to intensify the struggle against the witch-hunt and for the defense of civil rights.

In addition to discussing and deciding the party's general activities in the period ahead on the political and trade union fields, the plenum took up the evolution of the radical parties in this country and the internal problems and tasks of the SWP.

## POLITICAL REPORT

George Clarke, who delivered the political report, reviewed the domestic situation in the light of world political developments which, as he correctly stressed, dominate and determine domestic

politics. A year ago American imperialism in its drive for world supremacy appeared to be in full flush of victory with the Marshall Plan seemingly succeeding, the Atlantic Pact being forged, the battle for Greece and the contest for Berlin being won, and the atom-bomb monopoly secure. Today, the picture is drastically altered. The contradictions of the Marshall Plan are erupting to the surface, the problem of Germany remains unsolved, the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek in China has not only dealt a blow to the U.S. imperialists but caused the first breaches to appear in the hitherto united imperialist front; the atomic blast in the USSR has exploded the fiction of a-bomb monopoly.

### 'CRISIS IN MORALE'

All this has had repercussions at home where a division has been created in the top capitalist circles and a "crisis in morale" precipitated, Clarke noted.

He then analyzed the main elements in the domestic situation where, just as on the world arena, conditions for the outbreak of the economic crisis are maturing. He concluded that while elements of crisis are clearly apparent in the present unstable state of American economy, they constitute "symptoms of a trend but by themselves not strong enough as yet to alter the existing situation."

Turning to the alignment of political forces, Clarke emphasized that the coalition between the Trumanites and the labor bureaucracy, which dominates the domestic scene alongside Truman's social demagogery, has rested on this relative economic stability. This same "welfare state" which exercises a "restraining effect on the workers now will become one of the bases for mass radicalization when the economic crisis ultimately erupts."

In the existing circumstances, the reporter concluded, it is necessary to place first on the list of the party's immediate tasks maximum participation in the 1950 elections. Facilitating the SWP endeavors to counterpose the alternative of socialism to the demagogery of the "welfare state" and the dire threat of a police state, military dictatorship and war, are the disintegration of the Wallaceite movement and the pro-

## VIOLATE CONSTITUTION

In the second place, the suit contended that both the Hatch Act and Executive Order 9835 (Continued on page 2)

## U.S. Supreme Court Upholds Shipowners on Hiring Hall

By its refusal to review the decision of a lower court, the Supreme Court has upheld the outlawing of the union hiring hall in the maritime industry. While the action concerned an NLRB ruling against the National Maritime Union on the Great Lakes, it is applicable to all coasts and places the existence of all seamen's unions in jeopardy.

The action of the Supreme Court, composed entirely of Truman supporters or appointees, represents a major legal sanction of the Taft-Hartley Law. For the seamen, it is the most crushing blow to their main protection against involuntary servitude which has been provided by union control of hiring. Won as a result of bloody battles in the long drawn-out strikes of 1934 and 1936-37, union hiring had virtually eliminated from the waterfront the victimizing of seamen by shipping masters, crimps, gamblers and boarding houses.

This is the third and most serious attempt on the part of supposedly pro-labor administrations to break the backbone of maritime unionism after the shipowners had failed to do so with their own resources. Both other attempts, one in 1934 when the government tried to impose a "fink book" on the seamen and another in 1938 when the Maritime Commission tried to establish its own hiring hall, failed because of the uncompromising militancy of the seamen.

The present assault contains the greatest dangers because of the conservative policies of the union officialdom, their reliance on the "friendliness" of the government, their union-raiding and strikebreaking, their witch-hunting and purges against militants within the unions.

## CURRAN'S REACTION

Curran's first reaction to the Supreme Court decision, as reported by the N.Y. Times, was typical: "The Taft-Hartley Act has done greater service to Communism than anything else on the waterfront. We don't get any help when we try to clean up

Vol. XIV - No. 8

Workers of the World, Unite!

# THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

PRICE: FIVE CENTS



## Progressive Convention Faces Deep-Going Crisis

By George Clarke

The second convention of the Progressive Party which convenes in Chicago on Feb. 24 will be as different from the convention in Philadelphia where the party was launched in July 1948 as day is from night. In place of its wide popular support, and the crusading fervor of "Gideon's Band" that then animated it, the party today shows all the features of advanced decay.

The record shows that 18 months after its foundation, it has lost most of its initial mass support and most of its original momentum and enthusiasm. In most states it has been reduced to a mere front for the Communist Party. A wide breach has opened in the alliance on which the party was based, producing a split between the Left Wing Democrats of the Wallace vintage and the Stalinists. There are apparently irreconcilable differences on organization, program and perspective among the top leaders.

### WHY IT FAILED

How explain the precipitate decline of an organization which only 18 months ago had promised to supplant the two old parties and to wage war to the death against militarism and the monopoles?

The reasons are to be sought in the program and class character of the party. Its essential aim was to build a new middle class party, somewhat to the left of the Democrats but still determined to perpetuate capitalism in a somewhat reformed version. It lacked the decisive support of the organized trade union movement.

As such it was bound to follow the futile road of its predecessors, (Continued on page 3)

Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party and Robert La Follette's Progressives.

In fact, the Wallace party was quickly eclipsed by Truman even before the votes were counted in November 1948, although the Democratic Party had entered the campaign a divided and discredited organization. It was no great problem for Truman to outflank Wallace on the left, to outdo him in radical-sounding speeches and social demagogery. It was difficult for the masses to tell one from the other, except that Truman had the larger and older party and appeared to have a better chance for election than Wallace.

This situation has continued to the present. Learning that radical statements pay off, the Trumanites have draped themselves with the mantle of the "welfare state." It is futile for the Wallaceites to accuse the administration of insincerity because it is a well-known fact that there is just about as much or as little "welfare" under Truman as there was "new deal" under Roosevelt and Wallace. No more, no less. Besides, sincerity alone is a threadbare political program.

There is room in America for a mass party based on the trade unions, a party of the workers and/or a revolutionary Marxist party aiming at the abolition of capitalism. But for none other. O. John Rogge, who is leading the opposition to the Stalinists, has not yet grasped this elementary axiom of American politics. His draft program submitted to the Chicago convention calls for "a coalition of all left-of-center forces" to build a party that is "not radical and not Communist."

With tactical differences on foreign policy, Rogge's program is

not unlike that of the Americans for Democratic Action and must eventually lead those who support him into a coalition with the ADA within the Democratic Party.

### DIFFERENCES NOT BASIC

The differences between Rogge and his supporters and the Stalinists are not of a fundamental nature so far as domestic politics are concerned. The Stalinists have no intention of inscribing the aim of communism in the Progressive Party program; they are content to have it remain a middle-class People's Front party whose main purpose is to try to soften Washington's attitude toward the Kremlin. Nor are the differences greater on foreign policy. Both groups believe that a peace is possible without the

intervention of the United States.

(Continued on page 3)

industry. This will give the communists a field day on the waterfront.

Expecting gratitude for his anti-red purge, he is outraged to find the government and the shipowners exploiting the weakness and divisiveness of his policies have produced within the NMU.

Curran's program to meet the crisis remains as cowardly and inadequate as ever. The emphasis is merely shifted from reliance on Truman's Supreme Court to reliance on Truman Democrats in Congress.

"We will not win this struggle by haywire demonstrations or

(Continued on page 3)

solidly behind the militarists and the projected war, are more than sympathetic to Rankin as against Einstein. They simply prefer a subtler way of saying and doing what Rankin aims at.

The huge Scripps-Howard newspaper monopolists, who still assume the pose of "liberals," lost no time in rushing to dispel the possible effect of Einstein's warnings. Their chief paper, N.Y. World-Telegram & Sun, hits at him editorially, Feb. 14, as an "innocent in politics" and hints rather broadly that it is exactly this kind of politics that produces spies like Dr. Klaus Fuchs, another "able and respected scientist." And in conclusion, they add cynically "that America will never be first to loose such a dread weapon upon the world."

These same editors apparently forgot that only eight days before they had turned thumbs down on another proposal by a group of "twelve of the country's leading physicists (who) want the

United States to make a public

declaration that we will never use the H-Bomb in warfare unless an enemy uses it first against us or our allies."

This proposal was "foolish," said the editors. "It would tie our hands, and give notice to a potential aggressor that our hands were tied. That might invite attack." This means stockpiling H-Bombs and start dropping them whenever the militarists decide that the need of "backing by force" has arisen.

### TRUMAN POLICY

Scripps-Howard opinion is of course in complete harmony with the Truman policy. Secretary of State Acheson reaffirmed on Feb. 8 that the Truman administration will not budge from its foreign policy "based on strength and backed by force."

And they all know, from Truman - Acheson through Scripps-Howard down to all the Rankins, that there is no defense whatever against the Hell-Bomb. Dr. Van

nevar Bush speaking in the name

of the Atomic Energy Commission and therefore semi-officially for Truman himself, has confirmed publicly that there is no defense whatever against atomic bombs.

The need for action is imperative. And yet unlike Einstein, all too many prominent scientists have chosen to remain both vague about the full meaning and consequences of the atomic arms race and to underwrite the production of the Hell-Bomb on the grounds of "defense."

### RELIEF GIVEN

There is only one rational proposal that can have any immediate effect on halting the insane war drive of American imperialism and, as an indispensable prelude for such war, the installation of a military dictatorship here. It is the one repeatedly made by The Militant, that is, take the war-making (and Hell-Bomb making) powers from Truman and Congress and let the people vote whether they want war or peace!

## Mine Struggle Shows Need of Labor Party

### Truman Injunctions Expose His Real Enmity to Workers

By Art Preis

Truman has again proved that he stands four-square on the side of labor's exploiters in any showdown between the workers and the Big Business profiteers. By hurling two strikebreaking Taft-Hartley injunctions against the miners, he has disproved once more the lying claim of Trumanite union leaders that he is a "friend of labor."

A serious riot by 20,000 textile workers against Communist authorities took place in Shanghai last month. It followed a wage cut and an announcement that the customary annual bonus paid by the China Textile Company would be converted to people's bonds.

"Angry workers tore down pictures of Mao Tze-tung and Chu Teh, while troops with machine guns were sent to the factory gates. One hundred were arrested."

This fits in with repeated reports from general news sources and the Chinese Trotskyists, published last year in The Militant, that the entry of Mao's armies into the large coastal cities was followed by measures to strengthen the capitalist elements and impose severe restrictions on the workers, including wage cuts and bans on the right to strike.

### WORDS AND DEEDS

Truman has again demonstrated, moreover, by the fact that this Democratic president, who promised so loudly before elections to secure repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, has personally invoked it not less than eight times now, while his NLRB Counsel has employed it not less than 61 times.

History does not record that there has ever been a president



HARRY TRUMAN

who talked so "radical" and acted so reactionary, who broke so many strikes or attempted to. There has never been a president who has talked so much against a law and used it against the working people with such regularity and ruthlessness.

This is what the pro-capitalist union leaders have brought on labor because they have opposed the formation of labor's own party and supported so-called "friends of labor" like Truman, who are nothing but cunning and demagogic agents of Big Business masked as "liberal" and "progressives."

The real responsibility for the existence of the savagely anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act and its repeated use by Truman rests with the union leaders who have chained labor to the capitalist two-party system.

In this regard, Lewis himself bears his share of blame. It is true he has not shown the miserable subservience to the White House of union leaders like Murray, Green, Reuther and Dubinsky. He has revealed exemplary courage and militancy in leading the miners' economic struggles. But he has never broken with capitalist politics. He has shifted back and forth between Democrats and Republicans. He has offered the workers no way out from the political trap in which they find themselves caught between the parties of Big Business, Republican and Democratic.

### ONE-WAY STREET

What more is needed than the latest Truman blow against labor, his latest use of the Taft-Hartley injunction, to prove that dependence on boss politicians and parties can lead labor only to defeat? What labor leader can honestly deny today that labor would have been in a more powerful position to combat anti-labor laws if it had built its own party and run its own candidates instead of backing the worst presidential strikebreaker in history?

Truman's assault on the miners is first of all a political lesson, a clarion call to the American labor movement: Build your own independent party of the working class! Dependence on capitalist parties and politicians is a one-way street to disaster.

**Next Week:**  
**Class Forces in the Chinese Revolution**  
by Li Fu-jen  
a review  
of Jack Belden's China Shakes the World

## H-Bomb Means Annihilation, Einstein Warns

By John G. Wright

Dr. Albert Einstein has once again shown himself to be a courageous, sincere and honest man. Appearing on a television network last week, he publicly opposed production of the Hell-Bomb and warned that its stockpiling and use would mean "radioactive poisoning of the atmosphere and hence annihilation of life on earth."

Every informed worker knows how true this is. The witch-hunters and the militarists have already dragged us along the road to naked dictatorship.

### ATTACKS ON EINSTEIN

White-supremacist mobster Rankin, a member of Truman's party and a powerful figure in Congress, rushed at once to defame Einstein as an "old faker" who is "simply carrying out the Communist line." The big dailies reported these snarls of Rankin without disapproval.

The most powerful section of

the citizens, in particular, of the civil servants by a police force growing more conspicuous every day. Intimidation of people of independent political thinking. Indoctrination of the public by radio, press, school. Growing restriction of the range of public information under the pressure of military secrecy."

solidly behind the militarists and the projected war, are more than sympathetic to Rankin as against Einstein. They simply prefer a subtler way of saying and doing what Rankin aims at.

The huge Scripps-Howard newspaper monopolists, who still assume the pose of "liberals," lost no time in rushing to dispel the possible effect of Einstein's warnings. Their chief paper, N.Y. World-Telegram & Sun, hits at him editorially, Feb. 14, as an "innocent in politics" and hints rather broadly that it is exactly this kind of politics that produces spies like Dr. Klaus Fuchs, another "able and respected scientist."

And in conclusion, they add cynically "that America will never be first to loose such a dread weapon upon the world."

This proposal was "foolish," said the editors. "It would tie our hands, and give notice to a potential aggressor that our hands were tied. That might invite attack." This means stockpiling H-Bombs and start dropping them whenever the militarists decide that the need of "backing by force" has arisen.

### TRUMAN POLICY

Scripps-Howard opinion is of course in complete harmony with the Truman policy. Secretary of State Acheson reaffirmed on Feb. 8 that the Truman administration will not budge from its foreign policy "based on strength and backed by force."

These same editors apparently forgot that only eight days before they had turned thumbs down on another proposal by a group of "twelve of the country's leading physicists (who) want the

United States to make a public declaration that we will never use the H-Bomb in warfare unless an enemy uses it first against us or our allies."

### RELIEF GIVEN

This proposal was "foolish," said the editors. "It would tie our hands, and give notice to a potential aggressor that our hands were tied. That might invite attack." This means stockpiling H-Bombs and start dropping them whenever the militarists decide that the need of "backing by force" has arisen.

The need for action is imperative. And yet unlike Einstein, all too many prominent scientists have chosen to remain both vague about the full meaning and consequences of the atomic arms race and to underwrite the production of the Hell-Bomb on the grounds of "defense."

There is only one rational proposal that can have any immediate effect on halting the insane war drive of American imperialism and, as an indispensable prelude for such war, the installation of a military dictatorship here. It is the one repeatedly made by The Militant, that is, take the war-making (and Hell-Bomb making) powers from Truman and Congress and let the people vote whether they want war or peace!

Local unions have taken the initiative in speeding relief to the miners and some are reported to have openly denounced

## European Notebook

# International Significance of British Election

By Ernest Germain

The British general elections will be of considerable importance in determining the evolution of Great Britain. A new Labor Party victory would give rise to a further differentiation to the left in the Laborite ranks. The vanguard of the British workers would exert a more pronounced pressure in an anti-capitalist direction. On the other hand, a Tory victory might halt the developing radicalization of the working class for several years to come. In such a case, we can expect fierce and extra-parliamentary defensive struggles, waged to defend the living standards of the masses which a government directly in the service of the trusts would necessarily seek to lower.

But the international significance of the British elections is of no less far-reaching importance than the purely national one. Great Britain is the key factor in the political-military Atlantic Pact set up in Europe. Britain is the principal — though not the most docile — ally of American imperialism on a world scale. The aggressive policy of the U. S. State Department is restricted, and to a certain extent held in check, by the British bourgeoisie's urge for independence.

## LIMITS IMPOSED

Because the maintenance of a unified apparatus in Western Europe is a vital question for the Pentagon super-strategists, the very existence of a Labor government in Great Britain is a block to the inclusion of Franco into the Atlantic Pact and reduces the chances of a de Gaulle putsch. Owing to the pressure brought to bear by the English working class on its leaders, and owing to the limits imposed on Laborite policies by the very existence of the working class base of the Labor Party, the working class of all Europe has gained an extremely important breathing spell, before the political offensive of the bourgeoisie could be unleashed in full force.

A Tory victory would produce a radical change in this situation. The German Social Democratic Party would lose the meager support granted it by the British occupation forces; and the Bonn regime would evolve rapidly to the right. It was not a spirit of historical justice which induced Churchill to include in his memoirs a significant passage on the aid afforded by Franco to the Allies during the war. Churchill in power would mean the use of combined Anglo-American resources to prop up the sinister dictatorship of the blood-soaked Caudillo. Lastly, while Churchill has never been a pronounced friend of de Gaulle, he is an intimate friend of Paul Reynaud, who is right now the leader of the right wing of the French bourgeoisie. The tendency to push the French and Dutch Social Democrats out of the government would be accelerated. Outside of Scandinavia, all Western Europe would be dotted by reactionary administrations. Winston Churchill would become not merely the spiritual leader but the actual guiding spirit of an ultra-reactionary Europe.

No less serious would be the economic consequences of a Tory victory in the British elections. The "regulatory" policy of Sir Stafford Cripps remains for the moment the main obstacle to the projected "freeing of the currencies," an obstacle, in effect, to the unlimited economic colonization of Europe by American imperialism. To be sure this resistance by the Laborites, which virtually paralyzes the OEEC, expresses the special interests of British imperialists, and it is doubtful whether a Tory government would depart radically from such a policy.

On the other hand, the economic policy of the Labor government likewise corresponds to the attempts of reformist leaders to maintain full employment and minimum subsistence for the toiling masses. The reformist leaders do not view this policy in any sense as a stage in the second postwar stage.

# Subscribe!

Start your subscription now. Clip the coupon and mail it in today. Send \$1 for six months subscription or \$2 for a full year to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name ..... Street ..... Zone .....  
City ..... State .....

\$1 Six months  \$2 Full year  New  Renewal

Ask Pledge on Hell-Bomb Use



Twelve of the nation's top physicists have issued a statement urging that the United States government make a public declaration that it will never use the Hell-Bomb in warfare unless an enemy uses it first against the U. S. or its allies. But, like most of the other scientists who have spoken up on the issue, they endorsed Truman's order to proceed with construction of the bomb. (One scientist was absent when this picture was taken.)

## Mine Owners' Strategy Based on Truman's Aid

FEB. 15.—From the start of the mine struggle nine months ago, the miners, the Truman administration's first injunction only infuriated them. To the 100,000 bituminous miners who were out at the time, another 20,000 joined forces. The Denham injunction, for which Truman sought to evade personal responsibility, did not prevent the miners from striking for a 95-cent daily wage increase and a 15-cent a ton increase in the royalty payments to the welfare and pension fund.

First on the petition of the leading operators headed by the coal subsidiaries of the steel corporations, Truman's NLRB General Counsel, Robert H. Denham, secured an injunction against the United Mine Workers under the "unfair labor practices" clause of the Slave Labor Law.

## COMPLAINT JUDGE

Judge Richmond B. Keech of the Federal District Court in Washington found that it was "probable" that the UMW was violating the Taft-Hartley Act by demanding the retention of four clauses of their old contract. These are the "able and willing" clause, a union welfare and pension fund for union members only, the union shop and the miners Memorial Holiday. The operators refused to bargain unless the UMW agreed in advance to eliminate these vital clauses. So Judge Keech compliantly ruled that "probably illegal" and enjoined the miners from taking any action to secure them in a new contract.

However, far from intimidating

the miners, the Truman administration's first injunction only infuriated them. To the 100,000 bituminous miners who were out at the time, another 20,000 joined forces. The Denham injunction, for which Truman sought to evade personal responsibility, did not prevent the miners from striking for a 95-cent daily wage increase and a 15-cent a ton increase in the royalty payments to the welfare and pension fund.

Truman could no longer hide behind his front-man, Denham. The whole capitalist class and its press, virtually the whole of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, were howling for the blood of the miners. Truman responded last week by invoking the Taft-Hartley "national emergency" clause for the eighth time within less than two years. He set up compulsory "fact-finding" through his own three-man board. The operators made a show of resumption of bargaining, but naturally didn't yield an inch. The "fact-finding" board reported back to Truman as quickly as possible and Truman hastily ordered the Department of Justice to seek an 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction to force the miners back to work.

JUDGE KEECH AGAIN

Once more Judge Keech—filling the role Judge Goldsborough had played in 1947 and 1948 when the miners were fined a total of \$2,130,000 for "contempt" of Truman-invoked injunctions—came through with a strikebreaking

order. He issued a temporary "restraining" order for 10 days, pending a permanent 80-day injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act. This required the miners to end their strike immediately without qualifications, and instructed the national officers of the UMW to force the men back to work.

John L. Lewis had said prior to the injunction that it would constitute forced labor and "involuntary servitude" and that he doubted that such "mass coercion" would get any willing work out of the miners. Nevertheless, confronted with the possibility of huge "contempt" fines and even imprisonment, Lewis has made at least formal compliance with the injunction.

## LEWIS NOTIFIES

He notified district officials of the UMW that the top officers are "required to advise you" that "our union will conform to the requirements of the court" and that "this office . . . has no alternative than to instruct you and all other agents of the union similarly situated" to carry out the instructions of the court and that the membership should "cease said strike and return to their employment forthwith . . ."

To date, the miners have failed to respond. They know that if they return and start stockpiling coal once more, the operators will stall until warm weather when the demand for coal slackens and there will be less pressure on the employers to make concessions.

## Rauh, Kutter Explain Issues Involved in Suit

(Cont. from page 1)  
were wrongfully applied in his case.

In the third place, the Hatch Act and the President's Loyalty Order violate the Constitution and deprive the victimized veterans of his rights of free speech, press and assembly.

"It is conceded by government representatives that Kutter did not have a job involving security in any way. He was discharged not for anything he had said or done nor because he represented any conceivable threat to the nation's security, but solely because of his political views," asserted Rauh.

## RAUH'S ESTIMATE

Because of his firing and blacklisting, Kutter's reputation has been destroyed; it has become impossible for him to obtain any employment; and he has in fact become far more unemployable by reason of the government's action than by losing both his legs in the war, the petition pointed out.

Rauh stated that he was violently opposed to everything the Socialist Workers Party believes in except freedom. He is chairman of the national board of Americans for Democratic Action and his firm is official Washington counsel for the International UAW-CIO and other unions.

In answer to questions by reporters, Kutter described the SWP as "Marxist but anti-Stalinist. My party is not only on Truman's blacklist but also on Stalin's."

He said, "We Trotskyists believe in a society of production for use, not for the profit of the few; in a Workers and Farmers Government where all basic industries are nationalized

trying to find even a little leak in the dam. And they've failed 100 percent."

"A prominent miner explained carefully to us that the so-called 'Brownsville revolt' was the miners' way of forcing the operators to sit down with Lewis and was in no sense a display of defiance of his suggestion they return. The suit of the Illinois operators infuriates them."

E. B. thinks that the articles in

The Militant were good but sug-

gests that "lots of workers are

poorly informed on the gains the

miners have made in contrast to

their conditions prior to the war

and prior to the CIO. Someone

should draft a chart or write a

brief article listing their achieve-

ments."

Harold of Philadelphia, a mem-

ber of the contingent who dis-

tributed 1,000 Militants in the

Scranton area, likewise reports

that talk of rebellion against

John L. Lewis is only a "legend."

In Hazelton "the working people

were vitally interested in what

The Militant had to say on the

coal situation."

One old timer told Harold, "In

January 1949 when there was no

strike, the anthracite companies

provided only 11 days of work.

This year, when the union pro-

claimed the 3-day week, we had

13 work days. Ours is a sick in-

dustry. It was made sick before

Lewis had power. The owners

themselves made it sick. They

didn't care as long as they made

profit. Lewis is trying to restore

health to the industry and a dec-

ent living to the miners. The

owners object, because they are

afraid their profits will be hit.

"Not Lewis, but the owners

should be held in contempt and

tossed in jail."

"Finally, I am not acting simply to safeguard my own rights and job but for the rights of all public workers and the rights of the whole American people."

## KUTTER'S EXPLANATION

"Both my party and myself are falsely accused of advocating the overthrow of the government by force. We believe that the socialist change can be achieved only through the action and democratic decision of the vast majority of the American people. The only time I personally ever employed violence was on the order of the government in the U. S. Army."

"I did not undertake this suit out of personal animosity toward any of the individuals concerned but to fight a vicious system which brands people as disloyal without hearing and punishes them solely for their ideas. I believe I have as much right to hold my socialist views and my job as a Democrat or Republican."

The conference room was crowded with reporters from the Washington, New York, New Jersey papers, the news and radio services, and weekly newsmagazines. The filing of the suit was front-page news in Washington where the "loyalty" purge against government employees affects the bulk of the population.

## THE MILITANT ARMY

### What Miners Say About the Strike



Comrade E. B. of Pittsburgh comments on the recent distribution of 1,000 copies of The Militant to striking coal miners in Pitts-

burgh area:

"First, we should have had 5,000 pa-

pers! In Coveland,

Lawrence and Li-

brary, The Militant

is remembered for its support of

the strikes in 1943 when every-

body else was against the miners.

"We looked up the local officers.

In each case, they and the men

about the union hall examined the

issue and after the first few lines

they were enthusiastic about cir-

culating the paper.

"We were immensely impressed with the high political thinking of these miners. Illusions about the government are gone. The miners all speak with grave pride of their union as the shock troops of the labor movement. They all feel that the blows being struck at their union are intended to bust through the first line of defense of the whole organized labor movement."

"In one town they invited us to

come down to the local when they

were to win their contract and celebrate with them. That will be some ball!

"I was impressed with the ab-

solute solidarity of the men be-

hind John L. Lewis. The local

press has been almost going crazy

reversed, if cancer could be taken out of the human body and used for bombs or biological warfare we may rest assured that the above percentage would also be quickly reversed.

It is no accident that atomic energy found its first development in the most powerful capitalist nation in the period of its ascendancy to world domination while the signs of capitalist decay on a world scale are multiplying.

In this new development all the contradictions of capitalism are compressed and given their most terrible expression. In atomic power we can see the productive forces of society straining to the utmost against the limitations of the system of private property.

Capitalism at war brought forth atomic energy but as a monstrous abortion ready to destroy all it touches. Its actual utilization on a large scale, and genuinely for the benefit of the society of producers, will no doubt have to await the dawn of the socialist society.

[This is the last in a series of six articles.]

### Quatrième International

Dec.-Jan. Issue 35c

## Contents

M. Pablo: Relations Between "Socialist States"

P. Frank: Crisis of Stalinism in France

E. Germain: Occupation of Factories and Agrarian Movement in Italy

Lenz: Adenauer v. Schumacher

S. Munir: The Middle East

T. Van Der Kolk: "Independence" in Indonesia

Stalinist Treachery in Greece

Order from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place</p

Subscriptions: \$2 per year:  
\$1 for 6 months. Foreign:  
\$3.50 per yr; \$2 for 6 mos.  
Entered as second class  
matter Mar. 7, 1944 at the  
Post Office at New York,  
N. Y., under the act of Mar.  
2, 1879.

# THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interests of the Working People  
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION  
118 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. (Phone: AL 4-9380)

Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN  
Business Manager: JOSEPH HANSEN

Vol. XIV - No. 8

Monday, February 20, 1950

"If you remember that the task of socialism is to create a classless society based upon solidarity and the harmonious satisfaction of all needs, there is not yet, in this fundamental sense, a hint of socialism in the Soviet Union. To be sure, the contradictions of soviet society are deeply different from the contradictions of capitalism. But they are nevertheless very tense. They find their expression in material and cultural inequalities, governmental repressions, political groupings, and the struggles of factions. Police repression hushes up and distorts a political struggle, but does not eliminate it."

—Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed*, 1936.



LENIN

## Class Justice in Action

Once in a rare while some exceptionally honest judge renders a decision in favor of civil rights or in favor of unions against employers. This is always the occasion for liberals to praise the "impartiality" of the capitalist courts and to point to them as "bulwarks" of justice.

This past week we have had outstanding examples of the fact that the American courts, from highest to lowest, are juridical instruments of reaction. Like every other governmental agency, they are conscious defenders of capitalist interests and tools of the ruling class.

The U. S. Supreme Court, highest tribunal in the land, on Feb. 13 refused to review a lower court ruling which had declared that the union hiring hall of Great Lakes seamen, organized in the CIO National Maritime Union, violates the closed-shop ban of the Taft-Hartley Law. This, in effect, gives legal sanction to the destruction of the union hiring hall for all seamen. If enforced, it will reimpose shipowner powers over hiring seamen against which the maritime unions have successfully fought since 1934.

In the past two weeks, the lower federal courts have also revealed themselves again as agencies for the defense of Big Business interests against the demands of union workers. Truman had no trouble finding a Federal District Court judge in Washington to slap two strikebreaking

## Three Revealing

The CIO Executive Board members last week took three major actions, in addition to their pledge of support to the miners. They disavowed CIO participation in the American Legion-sponsored, Hearst-promoted "United Front against Communism." They protested the State Department's moves for full diplomatic recognition of fascist Spain. And they expelled three more international unions whose officials oppose Murray's views on domestic politics and foreign affairs.

After weeks of evasion and silence, Philip Murray declared that "there was no necessity for the CIO to withdraw from the [Legion] conference, since it was never affiliated." He admitted that Harry Read, assistant to CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, had accepted membership on the Legion front's continuations committee, but claimed "he withdrew at the end of the meeting and was not there as a CIO representative."

All this is a miserable evasion of the fact that Carey and Read were leading participants in the conference, that Carey had said that "in another way we will join with the Fascists against the Communists" and that not one word of official CIO criticism has been directed at them. What we have, instead, is a surreptitious "withdrawal" made solely in

injunctions on the coal miners under the infamous Taft-Hartley Law. In fact, such is the anti-labor record of these courts, that it was a foregone conclusion that Truman and his agent Denham would get their injunctions without the slightest pretense of judicial "impartiality" by the judge.

A third case is even more illuminating. This was the action of the Maryland Court of Appeals in reversing a ruling by Judge Joseph Sherbow and revalidating the Maryland "Omnibus" anti-subversive law, commonly known as the Ober Law. Last September, Judge Sherbow had ruled this law unconstitutional, as a bill of attainder and ex post facto law in violation of both the U. S. and Maryland constitutions.

Liberals then hailed his decision and pointed to it as "proof" that the courts could be depended on to protect civil rights. The Militant warned, however, that Judge Sherbow's ruling was a rare and exceptional one and that it would be folly, in this and other cases, to depend on the courts. We have been fully confirmed in this opinion by the decision of the Maryland Court of Appeals.

Indeed, our whole analysis of the American courts as class institutions has been confirmed over and over again. Relying on them is relying on outright enemies of labor and civil rights.

## Actions

the hope that everyone will forget the shameful episode.

On the matter of Spain, the Board stated it "reiterates its policy that our government should not send an ambassador to Spain or take any other step in appeasement of the Franco regime." This suffices to "make the record," but not to wage an effective fight against the State Department's policy. It is certainly not the all-out way these CIO leaders campaigned to win support for the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic military alliance.

When these CIO leaders mean business, they know how to take effective measures. They mobilized all the resources and machinery of the CIO to kick out three more Stalinist-controlled unions and to launch civil war against them. For this Murray stops at no costs and no measures.

A few evasive words, a mild verbal complaint — that is all the CIO leaders muster on the issues of the Legion's "anti-Communist front" and recognition of Franco's Spain. But the whole apparatus and treasury of the CIO are thrown into the fray, when it comes to purging Murray's political opponents and splitting the CIO.

## Negro History Week

Negro History Week will be finished by the time this appears. The Trotskyist movement has consistently supported this celebration and, as our press shows, actively takes part in it. We believe, with many Negroes, that its national celebration draws forcible attention to the studied and deliberate misrepresentation by American capitalist democracy of the role played by Negroes in the building of the country.

For this reason all support of this celebration is, in a sense, useful. At the same time there should be no misunderstanding of the thoroughly hypocritical character of the support it receives from capitalists and their political agents. Governors like Dewey make official proclamations of Negro History Week and papers like the N. Y. Times contribute a solemn editorial every year. Except for the Dixiecrats, they all utter the most pious and uplifting sentiments.

All this takes place for one week. Then for 51 weeks they constantly and persistently practice and promote segregation and race prejudice in forms crude and subtle, in ways direct and indirect.

Their history books are filled with lies about Negroes. If they were serious about what Negro History Week represents, they would at least rewrite these

books. For 300 years they have exploited the Negroes and, to justify it, have vilified and slandered them. Why then don't they make it a regular part of the school curriculum to teach the truth about Negroes? Important as history is, the actual social relations and evolution of society reflected in it are more important. Who can believe the capitalists are serious about Negro History Week when, flouting the will of the people expressed in the 1948 elections, all parties in Congress sabotage even the adoption of elementary legislation to restore Negro rights?

Thus capitalist participation, for one week a year, in the movement to right the historical wrongs of the Negroes, is essentially fraudulent and should be exposed as such. It is only another aspect of the latest maneuver of the capitalists, who join in words to oppose the persecution of Negroes, only all the more surely to sabotage efforts to end it. It is in this light that we should look upon the hollow support given to Negro History Week by demagogic politicians, Big Business newspapers and similar dyed-in-the-wool supporters and defenders of capitalist barbarism, one of whose important sources of nourishment is the vilification, segregation and super-exploitation of the Negro people.

Their history books are filled with lies about Negroes. If they were serious about what Negro History Week represents, they would at least rewrite these

# Worker in East Germany Defends Trotsky

## LIBERALS IN BITTER DISPUTE ON JIM CROW

By Albert Parker

Should the labor and Negro movements support anti-segregation amendments to welfare legislation in Congress even though their adoption will probably result in the Southern Democrats voting against the welfare bills and possibly defeating them? This became an important issue last year when the NAACP supported amendments prohibiting segregation in housing and education financed by federal funds, and when the liberal Senators (headed by Humphrey, Douglas, Morse and Glen Taylor) joined in an alliance with the Southern Democrats to defeat them.

We explained the principles involved in an article last May 16 and declared: "In this dispute we Trotskyists stand 100% with the NAACP and Walter White, and 100% against the liberal demagogues." Now the issue has been raised again by a controversy in the Social Democratic New Leader, where the NAACP position is attacked in two articles by William E. Leuchtenberg, a former organizer for the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and now a social science teacher at Smith College, and defended by Henry Lee Moon, public relations director of the NAACP.

Leuchtenberg takes the same line as his ADA comrades Humphrey and Douglas, and even pays tribute to their "courage" in opposing anti-Jim Crow amendments. (He discreetly omits quoting Douglas' statement in the Senate last year: "I do not want at this time to disrupt the United States of America during a period of grave national crisis when we are being threatened by the police state in order to force upon them [the Southern Democrats] what I believe to be correct.") Segregation is evil, says Leuchtenberg, but anti-segregation amendments are also evil because their effect is "no new schools, no new homes, no new hospitals." And anyhow, segregation isn't altogether evil, he contends, because new housing, even if segregated, will benefit Negro slum dwellers and increased educational facilities, even if segregated, "will create a more favorable reception in the South to reasoned arguments against racial discrimination."

### A Liberal With a Very "Gradual" Program

He doesn't believe that it will be possible to outlaw segregation by federal legislation for a long, long time ("even President Roosevelt did not venture to attack segregation") and he questions the wisdom of enforcing equality in a reluctant South. What, then, should be done? Go out, he says, and see to it that "a new pattern of non-segregation is established over considerable areas of the country to serve as a national model and as an impetus to federal legislation." Leave the South alone, concentrate on the North and West, don't bother so much with Washington (where presumably the national patterns are set). True, he admits, "We shall have used the funds of the American people to foster and strengthen racial segregation in the South, to construct new Negro ghettos." But that is the price he is willing to pay for his "gradual" program in the rest of the country. Then, "If segregation persists, there will be only one group to blame, the liberal forces — NAACP, trade unions, ADA and others — for not having done a good enough job in making segregation political issue and educating their neighbors on its evils."

The NAACP line, he charges, is politically "an act of desperation," which plays "right into the hands of their opponents." Moreover, "by placing in an impossible position the liberals who have been leading the civil rights fight," meaning the Trumanites like Douglas and Humphrey, the supporters of anti-Jim Crow amendments "are threatening the whole Fair Deal program." And of course all good Trumanites are more concerned about that than anything else.

While Moon's reply doesn't say everything that can be said, it says enough to tear Leuchtenberg to ribbons. "Many of our liberals," he says, "who will fight reaction on labor and other issues, are seized by a strange and enervating malady" that makes them "turn tail and flee ignominiously before the synthetic fury of Dixiecrat demagogues whenever the race issue is raised." This happens so often he wonders if it "stems from a subconscious sympathy with the southern point of view."

Moon says Leuchtenberg is one of these liberals, "faint-hearted and myopic," who would "accept" unsegregated housing and education but are unwilling to make a real fight for it, who are willing to fight where the forces of reaction are not so strong but counsel surrender to the Dixiecrats.

Moon contends that the patterns of residential segregation in the South are less rigid than in New York or Chicago. The NAACP, which opposes segregation, especially when it is supported by public funds, "opposed a housing program without safeguards against discrimination and segregation because we have seen the federal government introduce into areas both North and South, a rigid pattern of segregation which had not existed prior to the introduction of federally-sponsored housing." In other words, Leuchtenberg's line leads to the extension and therefore the strengthening of the segregation he deplores — an evil which thoroughly negates whatever "good" some people may see in segregated housing and education.

This one fact alone demolishes Leuchtenberg's entire position, so we will skip over most of Moon's other points and get to his conclusion. Charging Leuchtenberg with pessimism and the belief that there is no answer to the issues under discussion, Moon says: "We are convinced that there is an answer, and that answer is intensified and expanded political action in the South by such groups as the CIO Political Action Committee, AFL's political wing, the ADA and the NAACP." Specifically: "An intelligently conducted campaign to swell the number of voters in the Southern states and to hunt out and support decent candidates [like Senators Pepper, Graham and Kefauver], could result within a decade in a complete regeneration of Southern politics..."

Now wait just a minute, Mr. Moon. We agree that the political picture in the South can be changed radically and quickly with the application of the correct policy. But aren't you forgetting a few things? Isn't it a fact that ALL of the Southern Democrats, including the "decent" ones named by you, voted against the anti-segregation amendments last year? Isn't it a fact that all of the non-Southern Democrats, liberal and otherwise, did the same? And isn't it also a fact that all of these people were elected to office with the active support of the CIO, AFL and ADA leaders and the tacit support of the NAACP leaders? How will the election of more people like them, in the South or the North, help to improve the situation?

Moon has harsh though accurate words to describe "many of our liberals," like Leuchtenberg. But don't the same words apply to Truman and all the Trumanites whose election Moon himself supported? Calling Leuchtenberg to account while continuing to elect people sharing his views to the White House and Congress is not only contradictory — it is also proof that Leuchtenberg is not the only one in this dispute who is "faint-hearted and myopic."

Political action IS the answer. But not the kind of political action that has been practiced up to now by the leaders of the mass organizations. Political action can be meaningful in the fight against Jim Crow only if it is based on a complete break with all varieties of liberal capitalist demagogery — that is, only if it strives to build an independent Labor Party working to establish a Workers and Farmers Government that will abolish the economic and social roots of capitalist oppression and exploitation.

One other aspect of the dispute, although it concerns tactics primarily, is worth brief consideration. In defending NAACP support of anti-segregation amendments to welfare bills, Moon notes that the NAACP opposed the Langer civil rights amendments to the oleo bill in the Senate last month because "lynching, poll taxes and other such civil rights questions are not germane to, or involved in, the repeal of the oleomargarine tax." We don't say that civil rights riders should be introduced to ALL bills, but we think the NAACP made a mistake in this specific case. The Dixiecrat strategy is to postpone action on FEPC for as long as possible, because the later in the session the filibuster against it begins the harder it will be to defeat the filibuster. Langer's oleo amendment to establish an FEPC provided an opportunity to begin the fight against the filibuster in mid-January (instead of March or whenever the Truman administration will finally bring it into the Senate for a vote) and the NAACP, instead of tying its hands with formalities about "germaneness," should have seized this opportunity for immediate action.

### SAN FRANCISCO - OAKLAND

#### Annual Negro History Celebration

Public forums on:

##### "THE MEANING OF NEGRO HISTORY TODAY"

Speaker: William Gorman

Friday, Feb. 24, 8 p. m.

##### "FEPC, THE NEGRO QUESTION AND SOCIALISM"

Speaker: Allen Willis

Saturday, Feb. 25, 8 p. m.

Discussion, Entertainment, Refreshments

Socialist Workers Party headquarters

1739 Fillmore Street, 4th fl., San Francisco

Admission Free

## H-Bomb Liberals

By George Breitman

Since the end of the war we have seen Truman Doctrine liberals, Marshall Plan liberals, Atlantic Pact liberals and aid-to-Chiang Kai-shek liberals. It therefore should come as no surprise to learn that we have H-Bomb liberals with us too. Oh, the H-Bomb is a terrible thing, of course, of course — but still all, and despite everything, not to make the H-Bomb would be still more terrible from their viewpoint.

Others may have more appropriate nominations, but my choice for H-Bomb Liberal No. 1 is Arthur Schlesinger Jr., theoretician of Americans for Democratic Action and author of *The Vital Center*. Ever on the alert to protect the interests of U.S. imperialism, he takes Secretary of State Acheson to task in the Feb. 12 N. Y. Post for his refusal to utilize the H-Bomb to reopen negotiations with the Kremlin, as has been advocated in the Senate by McMahon and Tydings.

Schlesinger agrees with Acheson that "a new approach to the Soviet Union at this point has virtually no chance of success," but he believes "it still may well be worth trying if only as a means of uniting our own side. It may, indeed, be itself an indispensable component in Mr. Acheson's great drive toward the final re-establishment of western strength."

To prove this point, Schlesinger refers to the Yalta Conference. As we showed last week in our review of Stettinius' Roosevelt and the Russians, the Yalta agreements, far from giving Stalin anything he did not already have, were instruments by means of which the imperialists were able to justify the launching of the cold war. Schlesinger apparently agrees with this estimate, and quotes in its substantiation a recent comment by Andre Malraux, ex-fellow traveler of the Stalinists and now chief adviser to de Gaulle. Malraux said of Yalta: "Our attempt to reach an agreement with the Russians entailed a

liability which was, for France, very heavy. But would it not have been still heavier if we had refused even the attempt? I do not think that any one could have remained in power in France, or even in the United States, if he had brought about a break with Russia, which at that time would have seemed to have no justification."

Schlesinger says: "A similar argument, I believe, is applicable today . . . to justify so ominous and terrible a decision as our own to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb. Such a decision can be accepted by the world only in the conviction that every possibility of friendly negotiation has been tried and has failed."

And that's the essence of H-Bomb liberalism — excite the hopes and exploit the fears of the people in order to make the "ominous and terrible" decision palatable. Deplore the H-Bomb? Twenty-four hours a day. Oppose the H-Bomb? Not even by implication. Certain sections of the capitalist class are visibly worried at the prospect of winning the next war with the H-Bomb only thereby to make the whole world uninhabitable — even for capitalists. But apparently nothing frightens the H-Bomb liberals so much as the thought that "our own side" may not be united — that is, that the masses of this and other Atlantic Pact countries may rebel against the policies of Wall Street and the State Department and try to take their fate into their own hands.

It would be rash, however, to conclude that the liberal lackeys of H-Bomb democracy have reached the final stage in their degeneration and treachery. Give the ruling class time to perpetrate some new and even more monstrous crime against humanity than the H-Bomb and they will prove that there is really no limit to the depths of cynicism and servility to which they will not descend.

## Dogs, Steaks and Bells

By James E. Boulton

Well-fed, 235-pound Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, a Truman Democrat of purest stripe, has brought forth some ideas for trimming the national budget. The time has come, he discovers, for the workers to be satisfied with less. He would begin by cutting down the vacation leave of civil service workers; then kick ten percent of the civilian government employees onto the growing lines of the jobless; curtail the building of roads and of the dams that might otherwise ease some of the floods that ravage this country, etc.

Douglas, you will remember, is the man who was the light-of-love of the labor bureaucrats during the last election campaign. They pressaged him and told us to vote for him. A reporter who called on Douglas to ask about his sudden penny-pinching ways, got a reply that told more than Douglas intended.

To explain his purpose, Douglas used a comparison that gives his real opinion of the workers, the poor farmers, and the unemployed. Douglas reminded the reporter of the famous Dr. Pavlov. We're just a bunch of dogs to him!

Dr. Pavlov had a number of dogs which he used for experiments. He rang a bell and fed them choice pieces of steak. The smell of good red meat made their mouths water. After they had gone through this routine for some time, they associated the sound of the bell with the taste of juicy steaks.

Finally Dr. Pavlov took the steaks away. He kept on ringing the bell. The dogs became confused. The bell rang, their saliva flowed in expectation, and they got nothing. Their digestive apparatus finally became so upset that dog psychiatry became necessary.

## I. F. Stone on Kutcher

The Kutcher case is a vivid, and cruel example of the assaults engendered by the cold war on the right of political opposition, columnist I. F. Stone wrote in the Feb. 12 N. Y. Daily Compass, shortly after the legless veteran filed suit in the Federal District Court in Washington for reinstatement to his VA job.

"The sole charge [against Kutcher] was membership in the Socialist Workers Party," Stone said. "The Socialist Workers Party is a Trotskyist group. It was listed as subversive by the Attorney General. It is also regarded as subversive in Moscow. Tom Clark and Vishinsky agreed.

"Kutcher was a Trotskyist when he lost his legs in battle. A generous country might consider his sacrifice ample demonstration of loyalty. The \$45-a-week clerical job in the VA office in Newark was little enough reward for his disability. There was no allegation that he did not do his work faithfully. The job, as the government admitted in the loyalty proceeding, involved no 'confidential' material. There are no atom bombs secreted in the Newark VA files. The Kremlin is probably the last place to which a Trotskyist would ship them, anyway. The Kutcher case shows the erosion of basic rights, good sense and humane feeling in this country under the pressure of cold war jitters. Fear creates cowardice, and cowardice creates cruelty."

## Akron Police Murder Defenseless Negro

AKRON, Feb. 12—Murder of an unarmed Negro veteran by a city policeman last Thursday night has produced a wave of revulsion against police violence in Akron and a demand that Policeman Robert Wilcox, admitted slayer of Ernest Fenner, be prosecuted on a charge of murder.

The local legal redress committee of the NAACP has intervened in the case and unearthed the following facts:

Ernest Fenner, 26, was discharged from the Army in 1944 suffering from nervous disorders. In the intervening years he had Veterans Administration medical care for his condition.

Thursday night Fenner went berserk and began beating his wife. Neighbors called an ambulance and the police.

Before the arrival of the police

a 17-year old neighbor had succeeded in pulling Fenner away from his wife and restraining him.

Even the Akron Beacon Journal, faced with the weight of evidence against the police, has felt under compulsion to demand an investigation of this brutal murder.

### Federal Judge Upholds Deportation of Hariesides

Deportation of foreign born workers for past membership in "subversive organizations" has been declared "constitutional" by Federal Court Judge V. L. Leibell in a far-reaching decision in the case of Peter Hariesides, a Greek journalist. Hariesides came to this country at the age of 13 and later joined the Communist Party from which he was dropped 11 years ago. His case will be appealed to the higher courts.

The self-defense argument of the police was finally exploded today when the Coroner's autopsy report on Fenner's body was made public. The report revealed that the fatal bullet entered Fenner's body from the back.

The only damage suffered by the police cruiser was the two bullet holes in the windshield caused by the bullets fired by Policeman Wilcox.

The police have made a feeble alibi to cover up this murder. They claim that Fenner attacked their cruiser with an ax or a club.

No weapon has been produced by the police to substantiate this claim, however.

The self-defense argument of the police was finally exploded today when the Coroner's autopsy report on Fenner's body was made public. The report revealed that the fatal bullet entered Fenner's body from the back.

The only damage suffered by the police cruiser was the two bullet holes in the windshield caused by the bullets fired by Policeman Wilcox.

# THE MILITANT

VOLUME XIV

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

NUMBER 8

## Cannon Honored for Forty Years' Service to Socialism

By Ruth Johnson

NEW YORK, Feb. 11 — Warm well-wishes came from all parts of this country as well as from abroad to James P. Cannon, founder of the American Trotskyist movement, and National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, which was celebrated at an SWP dinner here tonight at the New Starlight Restaurant.

A large gathering of friends and members of the SWP, including many who had come to New York for the Plenary meeting of the party's National Committee, expressed their deep affection to "Our Jim" as the loyal friend of revolutionary socialists everywhere and paid tribute to his 40 years of unstinting service to the working class of America and the world.

The joyous spirit, comradeship and solidarity of the birthday party was a tribute also to the unbound confidence and optimism of the party Comrade Cannon has led in 21 years of struggle for the principles and program of Marxism. It showed the morale of the party at a high peak in contrast to the complete demoralization and pessimism that pervades all other so-called "socialist" and "communist" tendencies in the labor movement.

### AFTER-DINNER TALK

Representatives of some sections of the population were not represented, as Comrade Cannon in his inspiring after-dinner remarks noted with approval. He observed that, unlike at the recent testimonial luncheon for Norman Thomas, there were no plaudits from capitalist tycoons and their agents, bosses of the Democratic and Republican party machines, union bureaucrats and labor lieutenants of the State Department, or renegades who have deserted the fight for socialism.

### "I like this celebration," Jim said. "It is a gathering of comrades and co-fighters for socialism. I would feel dishonored to have on my sixtieth birthday greetings and compliments from those I have been fighting all my life. I would consider such things an indication that they did not take my fight very seriously."

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'



JAMES P. CANNON

tenants of the State Department, or renegades who have deserted the fight for socialism.

"I like this celebration," Jim said. "It is a gathering of comrades and co-fighters for socialism. I would feel dishonored to have on my sixtieth birthday greetings and compliments from those I have been fighting all my life. I would consider such things an indication that they did not take my fight very seriously."

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on the problems of our day and we will return tomorrow morning to a continuation of the discussion."

### "IN A MINORITY"

Reminiscing on his 40 years of activity as a revolutionist, Jim observed: "The most important question a man can ask himself at a time like this is, 'Has your life been consistent with your youth?'

"I like this celebration too because it is not isolated from our life and our struggle. We come here from two days of discussion on